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ABSTRACT

“Modernist Vintages” considers the significance of wine in a selection of modernist texts that includes Oscar Wilde’s Salomé (1891), Dorothy Richardson’s Honeycomb (1917), James Joyce’s Ulysses (1922), and Evelyn Waugh’s Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder (1945). The representations of wine in these fictions respond to the creative and destructive depictions of wine that have imbued the narratives of myth, religion, and philosophy for thousands of years; simultaneously, these works recreate and reflect on numerous wine-related events and movements that shaped European discourse in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The modernists use wine’s conventional associations to diverse and innovative ends: as the playwright August Strindberg writes, “New forms have not been found for the new content, so that the new wine has burst the old bottles.” Wine in these works alternately, and often concurrently, evokes themes that were important to the modernists, including notions of indulgence and waste, pleasure and addiction, experimentation and ritual, tradition and nostalgia, regional distinction and global expansion, wanton intoxication and artistic clarity. This project also discusses various nineteenth- and twentieth-century contexts that informed these works and that continue to shape our reading of them, including the propagation of restaurant culture; the development of a gastronomic literary tradition; the condemnation of alcohol by temperance strategists; the demarcation of wine as a “luxury good”; the professionalization and slow democratization of wine drinking and buying; the rise of popular,
philosophical, and professional interest in the psychological and physiological
effects of intoxication; and the influence of war on wine markets and popular
attitudes toward wine. “Modernist Vintages” aims to demonstrate that the inclusion
of objects like wine in modernist fiction is purposeful and meaningful, and thus
inspires new and fruitful discussion about the works, writers, and nature of literary
modernism in Europe.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

“I know how hard you’ve worked those hills aflame
With summer sun to pluck from each young vine
The wherewithal to make me what I am
How could I be ungrateful, or malign?”

- Charles Baudelaire, “The Spirit of the Wine"

In Baudelaire’s The Flowers of Evil (1857), wine sings through the walls of a glass prison, lingers on the breath of Parisian rag pickers, and enrobes the corpse of a murderer’s wife. Though vanguard in their unflinching depiction of urban street life, Baudelaire’s poems work within a long tradition of Western literature that takes wine as its muse: from Gilgamesh to Ecclesiastes, Homer to Shakespeare, and Keats to Kerouac, the language of wine has saturated the literary text for almost as long as we have record. In the following chapters, I examine the significance of wine in a selection of modernist texts that includes Oscar Wilde’s Salomé (1891), Dorothy Richardson’s Honeycomb (1917), James Joyce’s Ulysses (1922), and Evelyn Waugh’s Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder (1945). I argue that references to wine and wine drinking in these works respond to and revise the creative and destructive representations of wine that have imbued the narratives of myth, religion, and philosophy for thousands of years; as Pericles
Lewis argues, most of the modernists sought not to abandon tradition, but looked instead to “enter into a sort of conversation” with it, “sometimes reverently, sometimes mockingly” (Cambridge 27). By engaging with an object valued by powerful religious, political, intellectual, and social institutions, these writers are able to critique cultural values, reveal power structures and social dynamics, and challenge dualistic models of the mind and body that have persisted in philosophical thought since Plato. Furthermore, wine’s intoxicating properties conveniently align with the modernists’ interest in loosened inhibitions and permeated boundaries; thus, these writers recurrently use the trope of inebriation via wine to reflect on the nature of the self, the object world, and language. The writers considered in this project use wine to contemplate issues that tend to be central themes in modernist literature: for example, wine is used to evoke notions of indulgence and waste, pleasure and addiction, experimentation and nostalgia, regionalism and nationalism, ancient myth and modern religion, ambiguous states of intoxication and vital moments of artistic clarity. “Modernist Vintages” aims to demonstrate that the use of wine in modernist literature is purposeful and meaningful, and thus inspires new and fruitful discussions about the works, the writers, and the nature of the European Anglophone modernist period.

Throughout this project, I also consider numerous wine-related contexts that informed these fictions and continue to shape our reading of them: as Martin Jay argues, any reading of a text should see that text as being situated within “a dynamic force field of contending contexts, both synchronous and diachronous, that never
fully resolves itself into a single meaningful whole with a clear order of influence” (561). The nineteenth- and twentieth-century contexts considered in “Modernist Vintages” include the propagation of restaurant culture and the development of the gastronomic literary tradition, the demonization of alcohol by temperance strategists, the increased perception of wine as a “luxury good” in many European markets (thus associating the drink with new and highly ritualized practices complete with socially-imposed hierarchies on wines, wine services, and wine drinkers), the professionalization and eventual democratization of wine drinking and buying, the rise in popular and professional interest in the physiological effects of intoxication, the devastation caused by a phylloxera infestation on European vines and wine production, and the influence of war on wine markets and popular attitudes toward wine. The portrayal of wine in the fictions considered for this project demonstrates that the modernists both recognized and drew from these contexts in significant ways; moreover, these contexts may have influenced these writers in ways beyond their immediate perception. While the multiple and simultaneous influences on these works may resist single or even consistent readings, I believe the study of wine in these fictions gives us a fuller understanding of, and appreciation for, the works and writers of the European Anglophone modernist period. But before we can turn to a more focused analysis of the literature at the center of this project, it is important to have a working understanding of some of the key literary, mythical, and historical presentations of wine that the modernists alternately worked in, from, or against.
Humans have experienced, shared, questioned, and celebrated wine for thousands of years—archeological evidence dates the presence of wine found in what is now modern China and northern Iran as far back as the Neolithic period—and have chronicled those experiences in a long tradition of literature. One of the oldest pieces of deciphered writing of significant length in the world, the Code of Hammurabi—a set of Babylonian laws preserved on stone steles dating back to 1772 BC—contains three articles that pertain directly to wine trade (37). The tenth tablet of the Standard Akkadian version of The Epic of Gilgamesh (complied between 1300 and 1000 BC from earlier material) relates the tale of the hero’s discovery of a magical vineyard and wines that are said to grant immortality (100); as Iain Gately notes, while water is the drink that fuels the daily activity and heroic deeds of the Sumerians in Gilgamesh, wine is “de rigueur” in the scenes of celebration (5). Homer’s eighth-century Odyssey is replete with wine reference and metaphors. Odysseus carries two kinds of wine with him on his voyage on the “wine-dark sea”: a supply from Ithaca, his home island, and a strong “red wine, honey sweet,” taken as ransom against Maro, the priest of Apollo at Imarus in Thrace (140). When captured by Polyphemus, Odysseus offers the giant the Maronean wine: the potent drink overcomes the Cyclops, and Odysseus is able to escape (145). Harold Tarrant notes that Homer’s epic marks one of the earliest references to wine as a symbol of more refined, “civilized” society: the “uncivilized” Cyclops does not know that the wine should be mixed with water and is unaware of its inebriating effects (15). Homer’s tale also provides us with one of the earliest
accounts of wine as a means to both positive and negative ends: the intoxication of wine saves Odysseus and exposes the Cyclops’ weakness. While the modernist writers may not have known much about wine’s ancient origins, the first translations of *Gilgamesh* were available in the 1870s, and even the most rudimentary education in the classics would have included readings of the Greek epics.

Homer’s poems suggest that wine was a mainstay in Ancient Greek society. Anya Taylor notes that a wide variety of classical Greek texts variably correlate wine with “life, blood, semen, the liquid in plants, the life-fluid and vitality, and even the genius in human beings” (8). At Greek symposia, attendants would gather around the *krater*, a large vessel in which wine and an appropriate amount of water were mixed. Before the discussion of love in Plato’s *Symposium*, the participants give speeches about wine and the accepted conditions for intoxication; Marty Roth argues that between the numerous accounts of drinking and hangovers, and the multiple correlations of drunkenness with *eros*, we might say that “drink is embedded in the very center” of *The Symposium* (51). Agathon even gives wine the final word during a spat with Socrates: “We’ll argue our rival claims to wisdom a bit later, and Dionysus will be our judge” (Plato, *Symposium* 7). But wine was more than an arbitrator for the Athenians: the spirit of Bacchus was also an important source of poetic inspiration. In Plato’s *Ion*, Socrates declares:

>For all good poets, epic as well as lyric, compose their beautiful poems not by art, but because they are inspired and possessed. And as the Corybantian revelers when they dance are not in their right mind, so the lyric poets are not in their right mind when they are composing their beautiful strains: but
when falling under the power of music and metre they are inspired and possessed; like Bacchic maidens who draw milk and honey from the rivers when they are under the influence of Dionysus but not when they are in their right mind. (Dialogues 223)

Socrates’ correlation between the state of intoxication, the god Dionysus, and the experience of poetic creativity resonated with two subsequent centuries of thinkers, artists, and writers.

Dionysus, later known as Bacchus in Rome, was the god of wine, harvest, theater, and revelry in the Ancient Greek pantheon: his name appears on the Linear B tablets, ca. 1250 BC, distinguishing him as one of the earliest Olympian gods (Mikalson 58). By the fifth century BC, Dionysus served as a source of inspiration for a number of major and minor Ancient Greek playwrights, including Aristophanes, Sophocles, and Euripides. By the nineteenth century, Dionysian myth represented a form of existence free from the strictures of reason, a model famously taken up by thinkers like Max Müller, Friedrich Schelling, Walter Pater and Friedrich Nietzsche; the presentation of Dionysian myth in Nietzsche’s philosophical tracts and Oscar Wilde’s plays, essays, and novels will be further considered in the next chapter. While not directly relating to wine in its original context, another aspect of Greek thought that will be addressed in this project is the Socratic belief that the body “fills us with loves and desires and fears and all sorts of fancies and a great deal of nonsense,” and hence, “we literally never get an opportunity to think at all about anything” (Phaedo 49-50). For Socrates, all “real lovers of learning” must separate the “soul,” or the mind, from the body, because the body holds the mind prisoner. Human existence is thus divided into two realms: the physical or material
realm, and the privileged spiritual or mental realm. I will argue that the treatment of wine and its effects in *Ulysses* poses an important challenge to the binary constructions of mind/body, self/other, and material/spiritual that manifest in some of the earliest and most influential texts of Western philosophy.

The importance of wine in the seminal texts of some of the most powerful religious orders of Western civilization further demonstrates its cultural influence as a symbol of divinity and earthy distraction. Wine plays an integral role in the early doctrines of Judaism: Moses’ followers’ name their Promised Land “Valley of Eshcol” after spies sent into Canaan bring back large cluster of wine grapes, and the *Book of Jonah* is the only book of the Old Testament that does not make reference to vineyards or wine. Hugh Johnson notes that for Jewish followers, there is no “communal, religious, or family life without [wine]” (43-44). The most significant reference to wine in the New Testament is made during a description of Christ’s Last Supper in Saint Paul’s *First Epistle to the Corinthians*: by Paul’s account, on the night of his betrayal by Judas, Jesus gave thanks and broke bread with his disciples. After Christ’s persecution, his followers used the Eucharist—the meal where bread and wine are taken, blessed, broken, and shared—in rituals that mark his death and resurrection. In the Catholic Church, the bread and wine that are consecrated as the Eucharist cease to be bread and wine: they become, respectively, the body and blood of Christ. The centrality of the concept of transubstantiation to Catholic doctrine and liturgy became a key point of conflict during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation and thus, as Douglas Burnham argues, had an “unparalleled role to play
in the formation of modern Europe” (8). Burnham further notes that by the end of the nineteenth century, many writers use the concept of transubstantiation as a metaphor for “the dissolution or intermingling of identities” (10).

Wine also plays a significant role in the religion of Islam; Johnson goes so far as to call Mohammad “the man who was to have the most profound effect of any individual on the history of wine” (54). The banishment of wine in the Muslim community derives from a single verse relayed by God to Mohammad after one of the followers of Mecca strikes another on the head with a meat bone. When Mohammad asks God for advice on how to control his followers, God replies, “...wine and games of chance, idols and divining arrows, are abominations devised by Satan. Avoid them, so that you may prosper” (Sura 5:90-92). However, early verses of the Qur’an hail wine (khamr) as one of the “good foods” of the earth, “the fruits of the palm and the vine, from which you derive intoxicants and wholesome food” (Sura 16, Ayat 67). This dichotomy, as Katherine Kueny argues, presents wine as an “object of profound ambiguity... pliable enough to accommodate and facilitate the necessary manifestation of the divine will, as well as the proper responses to them” (3). Buddhist thought also has conflicting attitudes towards the drinking of alcohol that vary according to regional customs and personal considerations. Jennifer Oldstone-Moore notes that the teachings of Buddha prohibit laity and clergy from drinking alcohol; as Buddhism teaches a Middle Path between self-indulgence and self-mortification, alcohol is considered “unnecessary and often detrimental to physical health and mental well-being” (121). However, in later schools of
Buddhism, there is a marked shift in attitude towards alcohol: in Tantric Buddhism, for example, substances that had been prohibited in early schools, such as wine and meat, can be employed as “tools of enlightenment when used by the properly initiated adept” (Oldstone-Moore 121). \textsuperscript{xviii} The modernists’ variable interest in religious iconography, spiritual intoxication, and the nature of transubstantiation will be further considered in this project through readings of Wilde’s re-imagined chalice and paten imagery, Leopold Bloom’s ruminations on ritual and sacrifice in \textit{Ulysses}, and Evelyn Waugh’s configuration of sacramental wine as a site of memory in \textit{Brideshead Revisited}. \textsuperscript{xix}

In every period of Western literature, writers have taken up the celebration or vilification of wine and wine drinking; for pragmatic purposes, my overview focuses predominantly on European, primarily Anglophone, literary influences and begins in the late eighteenth century. Some of the most celebrated writers of the English Romantic period—such as Charles Lamb, William Blake, John Keats, Samuel Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning—make substantial reference to wine (and often other intoxicating substances) in their poems and essays. As Anya Taylor notes, drinking is a prominent theme in Romantic-era songs, narrative poems, elegies, sociological studies (namely focused on the drinking habits of the working classes), philosophical considerations of the nature of the self, and confessional literature (5). Kathleen McCormack further argues that the Romantics deserve most of the credit (or blame) for establishing two important connections between intoxicating substances and modern literature: their roles as “stimuli to
artistic creativity” as a “metaphors for intense and dangerous love” (George 1). Just as it had in classic literature, Romantic poetry presents wine as having, often simultaneously, creative and destructive aspects. Blake’s equivocation of the wine harvest with the new apocalypse—at once an image of death and rebirth—in his illuminated prophecies would profoundly influence modernist writers like William Butler Yeats (who would, with Edwin Ellis, complete the first full edition of Blake’s prophecies in 1899). Coleridge references wine in a number of his poems, including *The Fall of Robespierre* (1794), “The Pains of Sleep” (1803), *Biographia Literaria* (1817), and *Aids to Reflection* (1825). In 1808, he recorded a desire to draft a poem in which Man is “possessed of the Heavenly Bacchus,” then enters a “savage state as a water drinker,” before finally “the Bastard Bacchus comes to [Man’s] relief” (Coleridge, *Notebooks* 3623). Those drafts would develop into “Kubla Kahn” (1816), a poem where intoxication is “imagined as an imperfection but also a gesture of the highest human aspirations” (Nicholls 76).

Many of the Romantic poets imbue the ecstatic element of Dionysian revelry in their lines with a melancholic longing for immortality. In Lord Byron’s *Don Juan* (1819), lines such as “the best of life is but intoxication” describe a merry escape from rationality, but in “Lines Inscribed Upon a Cup Formed from a Skull” (1808), Byron reminds us that the specter of death is always present in life: “Where once my wit, perchance, hath shone,/ In aid of others’ let me shine;/ And when, alas! our brains are gone,/ What nobler substitute than wine?” (276). Keats relies on the immortal promise of transubstantiation in his abandoned epic poem “Hyperion”
(1820): “Pour into the wide hollows of my brain,/ And deify me, as if some blithe wine/ Or bright elixir peerless I had drunk,/ And so became immortal” (314). In the introduction to “Endymion” (1818), in “Ode on Melancholy” (1819), and in his own reflections on the properties of claret in his personal correspondences, Keats portrays wine as both a stimulant for the imagination and a threshold through which one can pass to escape the pain of living.xx Many of these writers drew upon the trope of intoxication to upset the epistemological and ontological claims to reason that permeated popular and philosophical discourse after the Enlightenment. Taylor notes that the Romantic poets’ presentation of drinking was “remarkable” in that they were able to simultaneously explore the “fragmentation of the self, the defeats of the will, the pressure of hedonistic anxiety, the power of predictive language, or the vivacity of poetic fervor” (221). I will argue that these subjects and aims directly and circuitously inspired the English modernists, who often addressed similar themes under different contextual pressures.

Many of the canonical Victorian novelists discard with the Romantic interest in wine as a source of inspiration or a conduit for transcendent experience. While writers like Anne Brontë, Wilkie Collins, Charles Dickens, and George Eliot refer to wine in their fictional works, drink is rarely portrayed in any positive sense, and often serves as a metaphor for the degenerate city or the failing “Condition of England.” For example, the deep red wine that spills from a cask into the streets in A Tale of Two Cities (1859) foreshadows the blood that will spill during the Revolution:
Some men kneeled down, made scoops of their two hands joined, and sipped, or tried to help women, who bent over their shoulders, to sip, before the wine had all run out between their fingers [...] others, directed by lookers-on up at the high windows, darted here and there, to cut off little streams of wine that started away in new directions; others devoted themselves to the sodden and lee-dyed pieces of the cask, licking, and even champing the moisture wine-rotted fragments with eager relish. (Dickens 33)

Dickens’ novels are also full of harmless, hapless drunks; Thomas Hardy’s “winos” tend to be depressed and destructive; and Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) and Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897) both contain deadly wine-like potions. Many of the Victorian writers sought to create socially responsible, didactic literature, though, as Deborah Anna Logan points out, these portrayals of drink often highlight a principal contradiction of Victorian social ideology: “sensual self-indulgence,” including addictive habits, generally signifies “moral depravity in the lower classes while being a privilege and right of the upper classes” (130). Kathleen McCormack argues that by the end of the nineteenth century, beliefs in scientific rationalism were matched by anti-Positivistic desires to seek non-rational ways of knowing, an effort exemplified by the growing popularity of séances, mesmerism, spirits, and intoxicating substances (“Intoxication” 146).

While European realists like Emile Zola, Honoré de Balzac, and Gustave Flaubert provide increasingly more dynamic portrayals of alcohol in their fiction, it was the *fin de siecle* writers like Oscar Wilde who most clearly broke away from their Victorian predecessors by reviving the Romantic interest in wine drinking and intoxication as a source of inspiration and creativity. While Victorian writers “recoiled from the irresponsibility and self-preoccupation of Romantic excess and
escapism,” the modernists would react in even stronger measure against Victorian propriety, “including the prudery of moderation or abstinence” (McCormack 147). As I will argue, Wilde clearly reacts to this “prudery” in Salomé, while Richardson’s reaction to nineteenth-century values in Honeycomb pertains more to what she sees as a distinctly Victorian obsession with pomp, ritual, and material displays of wealth (an aspect of Victorian society that Waugh looks nostalgically back to in Brideshead).

“Modernist Vintages” also explores the modernists’ response to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century treatises regarding the nature of aesthetic and sensory “taste” that can be read through their references to wine. In developing their concepts of aesthetic “taste” within an empiricist framework, many of these thinkers used the vocabulary and metaphor of sensory taste to reinforce their claims: Kevin Sweeney cites Voltaire, Immanuel Kant, David Hume and Joseph Addison as thinkers whose “hedonic assessment of eating and drinking [...] was considered the metaphorical basis for all critical appreciation” (“Alice” 19). Voltaire, for example, compares “tastes” for fine art with the “tastes” of the palate in Diderot and D’Alembert’s Encyclopédie (1757):

Taste then, in general, is a quick discernment, a sudden perception, which, like the sensation of the palate, anticipates reflection; like the palate, it relishes what is good with an exquisite and voluptuous sensibility, and rejects the contrary with loathing and disgust; like the palate also, it is often doubtful, and, as it were bewildered, not knowing whether it should relish or reject certain objects; and frequently requires the influence of habit to give it a fixed and uniform determination. (213)

For Voltaire, the pleasure we experience when we are confronted with a sensation precedes cognitive judgment; thus, taste is intrinsically non-cognitive, non-rational,
and inherently subjective. Interestingly, some of the most prominent aesthetic philosophers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century use wine drinking to exemplify their theories: Hume, for example, famously uses an example of wine tasting in his influential essay “Of the Standard of Taste” (1757) to make a distinction about the “great resemblance between mental and bodily taste” (141). To emphasize his point, Hume refers to passage in Don Quixote where Sancho’s kinsmen are laughed at because they offer different evaluations of a wine: one detects a taste of leather, the other identifies a hint of iron (141). The kinsmen eventually discredit their critics when an iron key with a leather thong is discovered at the bottom of the wine barrel (141). Hume uses the analogy between sensory and aesthetic taste to demonstrate their similar reliance on “delicacy” to distinguish fine differences in the object being perceived; however, his example suggests that general rules (symbolized by the iron key) will always operate to impose uniformity against refined, and subjective, taste. Like Hume, Kant also makes an example of wine to make a point about taste, but for Kant, if a man states that Canary wine is good, he makes only a subjective judgment. He means, “It is agreeable to me” (55). In the Critique of Judgment (1790), Kant offers an account of authentic aesthetic experience that allows for the perceiver to make objective judgments via subjective experience, but denies a correlation between gustatory and aesthetic taste because the sense of taste is, as he argues, inherently subjective and reliant on personal preference. Hume and Kant’s theories of taste and their influence on modernist
thought will be discussed more thoroughly in my consideration of taste in the “Lestrygonians” episode of Joyce’s *Ulysses*.

Along with a movement of chefs from the kitchens of the aristocracy into the public markets after the French Revolution, the philosophical discussion of aesthetic taste in the eighteenth century influenced the gastronomic literary tradition that developed, first in Paris, then throughout Europe, in the first half of nineteenth century. French gastronome Grimod de La Reynière and his English counterpart Lancelot Sturgeon both allude to Hume’s "Of the Standard of Taste" in their essays on food and dining. Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin’s *Physiology of Taste* (1825) makes similar gestures to Kant’s aesthetics: although Brillat-Savarin never specifically refers to Kant in his discussion of gastronomy, there are unmistakable parallels between the writers’ topics and terminology. Sweeney argues that Brillat-Savarin clearly opposes Kant’s deductions on gustatory judgment by insisting that the things we taste and smell have an “equal right to be the object of a reflective contemplative hedonic experience as what we see and hear” (“Hunger” 53). For Brillat-Savarin, our common physiology allows for taste and smell to serve as the basis for the universal appreciation and evaluation of food and drink that mirrors Kant’s understanding of the role of sight and hearing in aesthetic perception and judgment. While Joyce would take up this philosophical overlap between aesthetic and gastronomic writing in *Ulysses*, another important effect of the rising interest in restaurants and gastronomic writing that plays out in modernist literature is the development of haute cuisine and fine dining practices in the public sphere.
Restaurants that began to serve “luxury” fare, including wine, in the nineteenth century in turn inspired new tastes, buying practices, and social rituals in the homes of the European bourgeoisie. Dorothy Richardson offers a decisive critique of these practices in *Honeycomb*, where Miriam’s participation in, and exclusion from, the leisure classes gives her the unique ability to experience and judge the guests and activities at a Newlands country estate; her position as both an insider and an outsider makes her particularly sensitive to the systems of exclusivity that work to create class “distinctions” with regards to drinking and dining rituals.

By the mid-nineteenth century, writers increasingly responded to the popular and philosophical discussion of gastronomy and taste. For example, Baudelaire caustically dismisses Brillat-Savarin in the beginning of the essay “On Wine and Hashish” in *Artificial Paradises* (1860) calling the gastronome an “insipid brioche” who says far too little about wine and fails to recognize its potential to open and alter the mind (3). The intoxication of wine introduces the drinker to “artificial paradises” that induce a state of sublimity. Baudelaire writes:

> What man has ever known the profound joys of wine? Whoever has had a grief to appease, a memory to evoke, a sorrow to drown, a castle in Spain to build—all have at one time invoked the mysterious god who lies concealed in the fibers of the grapevine. How radiant are those wine-induced visions, brilliantly illuminated by the inner sun! (5)

For Baudelaire, the wine drinker is capable of finding more than inspiration for artistic creativity in his intoxicated state: he is also granted an opportunity to more fully understand the fundamental nature of man (6). Wine “exalts the will,” is “a psychic support,” “renders one pleasant and sociable,” and, “produces fruitful
Baudelaire’s early contemplation of intoxication in Artificial Paradises developed into a full scale aesthetic and epistemology by the time he penned the essay “Richard Wagner’s Tannhauser in Paris” in 1861: as Allen Weiss argues, the intoxicating effects of wine, opium, and great opera now had, for Baudelaire, the ability to “create an ecstatic temporality that overcomes the quotidian irreversibility of time and the partition of the senses” (22). Against realism, against classicism, against a Hegelian reconciliation of opposites, Baudelaire’s aesthetic is “an epistemology of perpetual poiesis, slippage, transfer, metamorphosis, deviation, drunkenness” (Weiss 24). Baudelaire’s The Flowers of Evil (1857), which has an entire thematic section devoted to wine, served as an important source of inspiration for the modernist writers (T.S. Eliot called The Flowers of Evil the greatest example of modern poetry in any language) and is frequently associated with the origins of the modernist movement. The freeing, destroying, and synaesthetic effects of wine first celebrated by the Romantics were taken up by a new generation of writers in the second half of the nineteenth century: writers like Baudelaire, Paul Verlaine, Arthur Rimbaud, and Nietzsche embraced the trope of intoxication as a challenge to traditional metaphysical and epistemological ideologies. Their theories of intoxication in turn became a hallmark of the modernist movement; each of the four primary texts considered in this project owe something to their volumes.

While the religious, mythological, and philosophical attributes of wine certainly play a role in the modernists’ treatment of the drink, wine and wine
drinking also made significant inferences about class and power in Europe at the turn of the twentieth century. The perception of the drink as a rare, extravagant, and, in some circles, immoral material good made wine an especially desired luxury commodity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The history of wine production in United Kingdom, for example, dates back to the Norman Conquest, when vineyards were established and wine was made in a substantial number of English monasteries. When Eleanor of Aquitaine divorced Louis VII in 1152 and married Henry Plantagenet—who became King Henry II of England less than two months later—the regions of Aquitaine (and, thus, the entire wine region of Bordeaux) were added to England’s crown, cementing the association between wine and the aristocracy in the English-speaking countries of Europe.xxvi The association of wine with wealth became especially visible after the War of Spanish Succession, when the power and global influence Great Britain inherited after the war inspired an unprecedented bureaucratic and popular desire to craft a national image of sophistication. Ireland, Wilde and Joyce’s birthplace, also has a history with wine stemming at least as far back as the ninth century: by the eighteenth century, Ireland was importing four times as much fine wine from Bordeaux as England.xxvii In fact, some of the most prominent wine merchants in Bordeaux in the eighteenth century were Irish: the traders sent wine to their home country and ships returned with beef and butter. After the seventeenth century, high taxes on wine in England and Ireland meant that the drink was primarily only available to the wealthy; thus, after the Interregnum—the period after the execution of Charles I in 1649 and
before the restoration of Charles II in 1660—wine became increasingly associated with aristocracy, privilege, and political elitism. The growth and development of city centers like London and Dublin meant the emerging “urban elite” (a non-aristocratic upper class) increasingly sought to distinguish themselves from the common worker, prompting unprecedented demands for the kinds of upscale goods, like wine, that would form the base of a growing luxury market (Callahan 37).

By the nineteenth century, the gradual democratization of European tastes for “luxury” goods prompted the owners of coffeehouses and common grocers to begin selling items like wine, tea, sugar, and spices out of their storefronts. The nineteenth century also saw the professionalization of wine buying, tasting, and writing that was marked by the publication and success of books devoted to wine—such as Jean-Antoine Chaptal’s Traité sur la vigne (1801), André Jullien’s Topographie de tous les vignobles connus (1816), Cyrus Redding’s History and Description of Modern Wines (1833)—and the growth and emergence of independent wine companies such as Berry Bros. and Rudd, Justerini and Brooks, John Harvey and Sons, and Avery’s of Bristol. However, in the United Kingdom, even with unprecedented reduction in duties on wine and the popular conviction, spurred by the temperance debates, that wine was less addictive and thus less dangerous than beer and gin, the drink continued to be “largely the preserve of the aristocracy and to some extent the bourgeoisie” (Unwin 327). The nineteenth-century temperance debates also inspired a slew of scientific studies, often racist and frequently classist, on the effects of drink on the body and the mind. The access
to and popularity of wine was further diminished by a phylloxera infestation that devastated European vineyards in the 1870s: researchers from all over the world worked to find a solution to the epidemic, eventually concluding that the vines could only be saved by grafting European vines onto American rootstocks, or hybridizing the vine species (much to the chagrin of the French). As Iain Gately notes, the diminished supply of available French wine inspired a “spirit craze” throughout Europe, epitomized by the meteoric rise in demand for absinthe. At the turn of twentieth century, the vineyards had largely recovered with one unexpected outcome: the prices of fine wines were reduced to a level that made them available to a wider and less-affluent public. A new proliferation of amateur oenophiles generated a growing catalogue of books about wine, including Andre Louis Simon’s multivolume *History of the Wine Trade in England* (1906-1913) and the emergence of social wine and dining clubs like the Wine and Food Society.

While temperance efforts never found the same footing in Europe that they did in United States, the influence of temperance strategists can be found in some of the most prominent works of literature and philosophy in the early twentieth century: critics have noted temperance themes in the works of Joseph Conrad and D.H. Lawrence, and as I will argue, temperance ideology can be found throughout Dorothy Richardson’s *Pilgrimage* series. Temperance themes can even be found in the recurrent themes of intoxication and sobriety in the theories of Sigmund Freud, one of the most influential thinkers of the early twentieth century. For Freud, the psyche remains almost always in a state of intoxication (in opposition to many
rationalist theories that frame the mind as innately “sober”); as Julie Barmazel argues, psychoanalysis therefore serves as “Freud’s exercise in asserting and then denying the fundamental inebriety of the self” (103). Barmazel posits that the Freudian turn is “generally figured as a move away from rationality toward irrationality,” but what is left out of this description, “is the degree to which Freud (often despairingly) characterizes our irrational desires specifically as intoxicants” (103). Freud’s theories inform some of the key perspectives and debates of modernist art and literature, and his work on intoxication profoundly influenced the depiction of wine and intoxication in the works of D.H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf, writers I don’t directly consider in this project, but whom undoubtedly exerted influence on Richardson, Joyce, and Waugh, and thus should—like Freud—be addressed in any comprehensive consideration of the English modernist period.

The literature, events, and movements I have covered in this introduction provide just a taste of the various wine-related contexts that will be addressed in subsequent chapters. In each of these chapters, I attempt to approach the portrayal of wine in the fictions considered with a different perspective and theoretical framework; in doing so, I hope to demonstrate just how versatile and rewarding considerations of wine and similar materials in literature might be. The second chapter of “Modernist Vintages” looks at the presentation of wine in Oscar Wilde’s Salomé, a play that draws heavily from the French Symbolist form and aesthetic. Rather than having a fixed meaning, the Symbolists saw the physical universe as a language to decipher, “not to yield a single message so much as a superior network
of associations” (Olds 44). Wilde uses wine imagery in the play to evoke its significance in the traditions of Greek mythology and Judeo-Christian iconography and expose the more lascivious aspects of their doctrines. In doing so, he critiques the continually shifting dynamics of moral and immoral behavior in nineteenth-century English society, a method that aligns him with Verlaine, Gustave Moreau, and Joris-Karl Huysmans, Decadent writers who also use wine symbolism as a means to provoke what they saw as stagnant ideology. Like Nietzsche, Wilde turns to Schopenhauer’s theories on art as being a refuge from the chaos of the modern world as a source of philosophical inspiration; also like Nietzsche (whose writing on the Dionysus are remarkably similar to Wilde’s, though we have no proof that either read the other), Wilde found the sources and symbols nineteenth-century English society turned to for guidance sullied by institutional jargon and authoritative structures. The wine references of Salomé simultaneously reveal an alternative mythology that subsumes the self-creating and self-annihilating spirit that Wilde sees in the figures of Jesus and Dionysus; Salomé is the embodiment of this creative ontology, Wilde’s “symbol of [his] own creating” (De Profundis 915).

Wine has been a signifier of status in capital-driven societies for at least as long as humans have sought to record its trade, but the perception of the drink as a rare, prestigious, to some extent scandalous material good made it an especially privileged and exclusive commodity in late nineteenth-century England. As Marion Demossier notes, access to wine and the discourses of wine became “a question of power, as very often people who are able to describe wine position themselves in
relation to that knowledge, distinction, and social domination” (132). The third chapter of “Modernist Vintages” analyzes Dorothy Richardson’s *Honeycomb* and considers the ways in which the protagonist Miriam perceives the luxurious spaces, objects (including a wide variety of wines, wine glasses, and decanters), and rituals (which include toasts and the taking of multiple courses of wines with meals) of the Newlands home she works as a governess in. Richardson uses Miriam’s initial awe and eventual dismissal of these objects and rituals to distance both herself and her protagonist from late nineteenth-century bourgeois society and literature. Using Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of “habitus” and “field,” I argue that Richardson uses *Honeycomb*, and indeed, the *Pilgrimage* series as whole, to critique the dynamics of England’s class structure and the systems of exclusivity that define and support social stratification. Her protagonist Miriam’s unique abilities of perception and her own bourgeoisie upbringing allow her to experience the world of Newlands as both an insider and an outsider; she is thus more sensitive to the systems of exclusivity that work to support such distinctions. *Pilgrimage* provides an exemplary model for exploring how literary references to wine—a fluid that is produced, commoditized, and consumed—give readers an opportunity to better understand, or freshly reconsider, how writers from the modernist period conceptualized the nature and significance of material goods.

In the fourth chapter of “Modernist Vintages,” I examine the scene in the “Lestrygonians” episode of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* where Leopold Bloom settles into a neighborhood pub and orders a glass of Burgundy—a “cordial juice” that “soothed
his palate”—and a Gorgonzola cheese sandwich (*Ulysses* 173). During the luncheon scene, Bloom’s wine transitions from his glass to his palate, moves through his body and pervades his thoughts, inspires personal memories of communion and reflections on the nature of history and beauty, and eventually expels from his body in the pub’s outhouse. As Bloom takes the object world—represented by the wine—into his body, the sensory experiences of digestion and intoxication challenge the notion of subjectivity as being completely autonomous from the object world. Simultaneously, Bloom’s wine and the memories it inspires recurrently draw attention to the fact that his sense of history and meaning are rooted in the everyday experiences of ordinary people, rather than in a body of institutionalized texts or ideologies. Joyce presents a philosophy of human experience that rejects the supposition that food is too material, too related to the body, or too domestic to be worthy of serious contemplation. Bloom’s meditations, rich with synaesthetic metaphors, evoke prominent gastronomical writings of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, as well as dominant ideologies from much longer trajectory of aesthetic writing, particularly with regards to the concept of “taste”; however, rather than defer to any particular aesthetic tradition, Bloom’s musings on a myriad of ideologies work to challenge, revise, or re-imagine these narratives, giving way to a “Bloomian” ethics based in empathetic action. Using Dean Curtain and Lisa Heldke’s concept of personhood that “focuses on our dependence on the rest of the world,” and that is mediated through our relationship to food (xiv), I argue that
Bloom’s wine and its effects play a significant role in some of the key philosophical themes of “Lestrygonians.”

In the fifth and final chapter, I consider the treatment of wine in Evelyn Waugh’s *Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder* (1945). Though the novel focuses on different eras and events of the protagonist Charles Ryder’s life, the entire work is replete with references to alcohol, including numerous allusions to, and long passages about, wine and wine drinking. Waugh’s own passion for wine is well documented in a number of his nonfiction essays and personal diary entries; in a slim volume called *Wine in Peace and War*—published in 1947 by the London wine firm Saccone and Speed—Waugh calls wine, along with books, music, and gardens, an “essential part of the ‘Art of Life’” (12). In *Wine*, he frequently minimizes the destructive effect of alcohol and strives to present drinking as a potential link to an increasingly forgotten ancestral heritage. In *Brideshead*, the presentation of wine is somewhat more complex: through Charles and Sebastian’s Bacchic indulgences, Charles’ developing appreciation of wine, and Sebastian’s degradation into crippling addiction, Waugh offers a dynamic representation of alcohol that regards both its consequences and pleasures. *Wine*, however, maintains its status as a conduit to a fading but potentially restorative concept of the past. Using Pierre Nora’s concept of *lieux de mémoire*, I argue that both Waugh (who wrote *Brideshead* while serving in England’s Royal Marines during World War II) and Charles (who records his memories while serving as an army captain in the same war) feel threatened by what they perceive
to be the loss of a more honorable, aristocratic, masculine, and quintessentially English history, and thus consecrate their memories in objects—like wine—that provide some sense of connection to that past.

The arguments outlined in the following chapters aim to contribute to the fields of food studies, intoxication studies, and modernist studies by offering the first book-length consideration of treatment of wine in European Anglophone literature from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While there are numerous critical studies that focus on drink and drinking in literature, the work on this subject has primarily focused on the relationship between alcohol and the authors themselves. In *Equivocal Spirits: Alcoholism and Drinking in the Twentieth Century*, Thomas B. Gilmore refers to a “young and still developing field of literature and intoxication studies” (5), and as James Nicholls notes in *A Babel of Bottles: Drink, Drinking, and Drinking Places in Literature*, scholars have tended to focus on “the relationship between literary representation and alcohol as a source of addiction” (13). Thomas Gilmore, Kathleen McCormack, Marcus Boon, Jane Lilienfeld, John Crowley, Sue Vice and Thomas Dardis have all conducted important studies on the presentation of alcoholism and addiction in literature. Perhaps because of the greater influence of temperance campaigns in America, a number of studies—like those by Nicholas Warner, David Reynolds, Debra Rosenthal, Donald Goodwin and Kathleen Drowne—have taken up the subject of alcohol in the American literary tradition. James Nicholls, Iain Gately, Jon Hurley, and Patrick McGovern have contributed to the critical effort to document the legal, political, and historical
aspects of wine trade and wine drinking; volumes such as *Question of Taste: the Philosophy of Wine*, edited by Barry Smith, *Wine and Philosophy: A Symposium on Thinking and Drinking*, edited by Fritz Allhoff, and Cain Todd’s *The Philosophy of Wine: A Case of Taste, Beauty and Intoxication* approach the topic of wine from a philosophical perspective. Carolyn Korsmeyer, Denise Gigante, and Kevin Sweeney have inspired new critical work on the relationship between gustatory and aesthetic taste, an important theme of my own project. Few, if any, essays or lengthy critical works have addressed the topic of wine in literature as a focused topic of interest.

Wine as a material object is remarkable in part because it is characteristically transient: made up of microbial and living particles, wine is constantly and continually transforming. While wine is not a living organism, it is often attributed with undergoing the primary phenomena of life: it is said to grow, bloom, adapt, mature, die, and in many cultures, is even believed to have memory. While each of the writers considered in this project had a personal connection to wine—Wilde had a penchant for expensive champagnes, Richardson’s father worked in the wine trade, Joyce drank substantially and especially enjoyed urine-colored ice wines from Switzerland, and Waugh wrote prolifically on his appreciation for wine and considered it a “staple of civilization” (19)—the wines of literature do more than reveal writers’ oenophilic preferences. Alternately serving as historical symbol, fetish object, and conduit for transformation, literary wines allow us to consider the various ways the modernists understood and questioned constructions of the self and the other, as well as the relationship between words and things. These writers
use traditional symbols like wine to explore socially taboo subjects of sexuality, gender roles, class systems, bodily functions like digestion and excretion, the amorphous states of intoxication, and shifting cultural perceptions of alcohol drinkers. Representations of wine in literature thus provide a lens through which we can examine issues that are important to specific writers and entire cultures such as notions of identity, autonomy, place, space, and gender. In the following chapters, I argue that wine references in the works of Wilde, Richardson, Joyce, and Waugh allow us to freshly consider the various ways the modernists took traditional symbols and seemingly mundane objects, like wine, seriously. Their fictions, I believe, invite us to do the same.
historical context focuses on wine. The exception of considered for this project were written by Anglophone European writers and, with the exception of Salomé, were originally written in the English language. Much of the historical context focuses on wine-related events and movement in the United

---

1 See Charles Baudelaire, *Complete Poems*, ed. and trans. Walter Martin (Routledge, 2002). I refer to the following lines from “The Spirit of the Wine”: “From my glass prison-house and scarlet seal/ I’ll sing to you of brotherhood and light” (270); from “Ragpicker’s Wine”: “They reappear and spirits fill the air/ A hoary band of wine-soaked legionnaires” (273); and from “The Murderer’s Wine”: “Who would ever think or dare/ To make a winding-sheet of wine?” (275).

2 See Charles Baudelaire, *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays* (Phaidon, 1995) and Chris Otter, *The Victorian Eye: A Political History of Light and Vision in Britain 1800-1910* (U of Chicago P, 2008). In *The Flowers of Evil*, Baudelaire uses the perspective of the artist-flâneur to depict street life in the metropolis. Baudelaire describes the flâneur as a “passionate spectator” who “set[s] up house in the heart of the multitude... a kaleidoscope gifted with consciousness” (10). Chris Otter suggests that for Baudelaire and the writers he influenced, the figure of the flâneur is “aloof, anonymous, and perpetually fascinated with the spectacles of urban life. Drifting slowing through the crowd, often nocturnally, sometimes intoxicated, he possesses a form of urban intelligence that those around him lack” (6).

3 See Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, “The Name and Nature of Modernism” in *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930* (Penguin, 1978) 19-56. Defining “modernism” is a particular exigent if not indeterminate task: critics rarely agree on when the period spans, whom it encompasses, where it takes place, what it means, and why it matters. Bradbury and McFarlane suggest that despite the ambiguity of broad “tendencies and movements,” there seems to be “a discernible centre to [modernism]... a broadly symbolist aesthetic, an avant-garde view of the artists, and a notion of a relationship of crisis between art and history” (29). See also Pericles Lewis, *The Cambridge Introduction to Modernism* (Cambridge UP, 2007). Lewis, whose definition of modernism I tend to favor and will work from in the project, characterizes literary modernism as, “the literature that acknowledged and attempted to respond to a crisis of representation” that begins in the mid-nineteenth century with the publication of Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* and Baudelaire’s *The Flowers of Evil* (xvi). Lewis applauds the impulse to treat the “multiple, competing movements” of modernism as a series of “modernisms,” but maintains that a singular formation is more helpful in drawing attention to an “underlying unity” of the predicaments late-nineteenth and early twentieth century writers faced with regards to representation (xvii).

4 For pragmatic purposes, I have chosen not to address American literature as part of the English-speaking modernist literary tradition; the four primary works considered for this project were written by Anglophone European writers and, with the exception of Salomé, were originally written in the English language. Much of the historical context focuses on wine-related events and movement in the United
Kingdom, and, in some cases, England specifically. Of course, Wilde and Joyce cannot without problem be called “English” writers in the nation-based sense of the word, as both were born in Ireland and expressed an allegiance to their birth nation even after taking residence in other countries (Wilde lived primarily in England after attending Oxford, although he occasionally stayed, and eventually died, in France; Joyce left Ireland in his early twenties and lived primarily in Trieste, Paris and Zurich for the rest of his life). There are a number of multinational, multicultural, and multilingual source texts included in this project, primarily because the broadening availability of translated texts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—along with the multilingual reading abilities of the writers I consider—meant that the modernists had a diverse selection of global literary texts at their disposal.

v See Martin Jay, “Historical Explanation and the Event: Reflections on the Limits of Contextualization” in New Literary History 42.4 (2001) 557-571. While we may indeed need context to understand a text, we must also acknowledge that contexts themselves are preserved textually. As Jay argues, it is problematic to suppose that we can have a single, monolithic “text” to contextualize when we admit that the text “may itself vary according to the context(s) of its reception, which often alters its boundaries and even content” (561). Our own interpretations of a text in the present can only provide a working and inherently complicated concept of the past that can then be used, cautiously, to inform our understanding of other texts.

vi See Iain Gately, Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol (Gotham, 2008). Gately notes that anthropologists have found pottery jars in Jiahu, dating to 7000-6000 BC, that contain traces of a fermented drink made with honey, grapes, rice, and hawthorn berries. Excavations in Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan have found cultivated vines and grape pips from the Stone Age (around 8000 BC) that could be our earliest standing evidence of viticulture; clay jars excavated in Northern Iran contain vestiges of tartaric acid and calcium, and suggest that humans stored wine as early as 5000 BC (3).

vii See Hammurabi, King of Babylon, The Code of Hammurabi, trans. Robert Francis Harper (The Lawbook Exchange, 1999). Interestingly, it appears that wine-sellers in Hammurabi’s time were mostly women: article 108 states, “If a wine-seller... make the measure for drink smaller than the measure for corn, they shall call that wine-seller to account, and they shall throw her into the water” (19).

viii See Iain Gately, Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol (Gotham, 2008). Gately argues that a pivotal scene in Gilgamesh involves the act of public coitus between the king of Uruk and the high priestess Ishtar, which results in the birth of Ninkasi, the goddess of beer (5). A hymn to Ninkasi still survives from this period, and explains
how kash—a beer to which grapes and honey are added—is made and consumed (usually through straws as the drink was unfiltered) (5).


x The word “wine” derives from the Greek word “oin.” Iain Gately argues that wine “played a pivotal role in Greek culture” (11). Its consumption was considered to be a defining characteristic of Hellenic civilization; wine served “as a point of difference between its members and the population of the rest of the world, whom they termed babaroı, or barbarians” (11). See Iain Gately, Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol (Gotham, 2008).


xii See Hugh Johnson, The Story of Wine (Mitchell Beazley, 1989). Johnson argues that the playwrights also give us a new and lasting model of Dionysus as an “all-purpose god of growing things,” and a deity of wine “at a moment in history when the vine had become the economic motor of the expanding Greek empire” (32). Perhaps the most influential source for the representation of Dionysian intoxication and wine is Euripide’s The Bacchae, though, as Anya Taylor notes, wine is never drunk in the play (7). Instead, wine serves as a “transformative substance [that] functions as a metonymy for the holy drunkenness that pervades the play, spurs the women’s mountain dancing, and, obliterating or intensifying their senses, rouses them to see the lion in the boy and to commit horrified human sacrifice” (7). Thus, Dionysius comes to symbolize the destroying of rationality, will, and restraint (7). See Anya Taylor, Bacchus in Romantic England: Writers and Drink, 1780-1830 (St. Martin’s, 1999).

xiii As tends to be the case, my attempt to be comprehensive relies on many generalizations. The modernists were influenced by a wide range of religious texts and ideologies, the majority of which I do not directly address in the body of this project. Some of the religions that scholars cite as having influenced the modernist writers include nonconformism, Unitarianism, Anglicanism, Evangelicalism,

xiv See Mark Humphries, *Early Christianity* (Routledge, 2006). Many early Romans struggled to draw distinctions between the cults of Bacchus and early Nazarene followers because both sects were forced to practice in secret and partook in rituals that involved the symbolic drinking of their gods’ blood (Humphries 217). However, the Nazarenes abhorred the rites performed by the followers of Bacchus: far from being a libation and source of ecstasy, for the Jewish followers, wine was a sacred and powerful symbol that required strict rabbinic jurisdiction.

xv Even today, modern practitioners of Judaism begin each Sabbath by chanting a blessing—the Kiddush—over a cup of wine. Jewish doctrine dictates that four glasses of wine be drunk at Passover, two at weddings, and one at funerals and circumcisions. Ceremonial wines must be kosher: Jewish dietary law strictly forbids the ritual drinking of wine that has been touched by a Gentile.

xvi See The Vatican, *Catechism of the Catholic Church: Popular and Definitive Edition* (Continuum, 2000). In 1551, the Council of Trent definitively declared that with this consecration, “there takes place a change of the whole substance of the bread into
the substance of the body of Christ our Lord and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood” (Vatican 310).

xvii For a complex and comprehensive consideration of the doctrine of transubstantiation as it appears in literature, see Douglas Burnham, *The Poetics of Transubstantiation: From Theology to Metaphor* (Ashgate, 2005). Burnham notes that many modernist writers evoke the notion of transubstantiation to “the exposure of closed systems of thought and expression to what has been excluded, the poverty of reductively material accounts of human bodies or experiences” (Burnham 10). Julia Kristeva links the concept of “sacramental imagination,” which she reads in Proust and Joyce, to the an aesthetic model of transubstantiation: “music becomes world, and writing becomes a transubstantiation in those for whom it ‘creates new powers’” (251). See Julia Kristeva, *Time and Sense: Proust and the Experience of Literature*, trans. Ross Guberman (Columbia UP, 1998).

xviii See Jennifer Oldstone-Moore, “Buddhism” in *Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History*, vol. 1. eds, Jack Blocker, David Fahey, and Ian Tyrrell (CLIIO, 2003) 121. Oldstone-Moore notes that Japanese Pure Land Buddhism also has no prohibition against alcohol. Pure Land followers believe that the Amida Buddha provides salvation to those who call his name; thus, “those who were unable to follow the precepts would not suffer so long as they chanted the *nembusu*, a set phrase of supplication to Amida” (121).

xix For further reading on the intersection of modernism and religion, see Robert Alter, *Canon and Creativity: Modern Writing and the Authority of the Scripture* (Yale UP, 2000; Suzanne Hobson, *Angels of Modernism: Religion, Culture, Aesthetics 1910-1960* (Macmillan, 2011); Janet Oppenheim, *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1914* (Cambridge UP, 1985); Vincent Pecora, *Secularization and Cultural Criticism: Religion, Nation and Modernity* (U of Chicago P, 2006); and Pericles Lewis, *Religious Experience and the Modernist Novel* (Cambridge UP, 2010). Lewis contends that the early twentieth century was “a period when elite groups started to consider the spiritual possibility of life outside a church or synagogue, even as the broad culture remained largely—and traditionally—religious” (5). Further, the modernist novelists “frequently imagined their own work as competing with the churches in term of spiritual beauty and emotional power” (5). I believe this tendency can be clearly seen in the works of Wilde, Richardson, and Joyce, and to some extent, even to the doggedly religious Waugh.

For really ‘tis so fine—it fills one’s mouth with a gushing freshness—then goes down cool and feverless—then you do not feel it quarrelling with your life—no, it is rather a Peacemaker, and lies as quiet as it did in the grape; then it is as fragrant as the Queen Bee, and the more ethereal Part of it mounts into the brain, not assaulting the cerebral apartments like a bully in a bad-house looking for his truly and hurrying from door to door bouncing against the wainscot, but rather walks like Aladdin about his enchanted palace so gently that you do not feel his step. (288)

See Thomas L. Reed, The Transformative Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson, and the Victorian Alcohol Debate (McFarland, 2006). Reed notes that Stevenson’s novel documents the fate of a man who “regularly escapes from an over-burdening respectability into an addictive world of recreational excess by drinking a ‘blood-red liquor’ whose effects ‘braced and delighted [him] like wine’” (2). Reed concludes that Jekyll and Hyde is either an “allegory of alcoholism” or it is “everything but,” a dichotomy that exemplifies the temperance debates that divided England in the nineteenth century (2).

See Kathleen McCormack, George Eliot and Intoxication: Dangerous Drugs for the Condition of England (St. Martin's, 2000). McCormack argues that the while the Victorians abandon the Romantic notion of chemical escape, they hold on to the tendency to figure “dangerous, intense, possibly illicit passion and its objects, especially women, as poisonous” (2). She also notes that George Eliot’s works contain a “remarkable number” of characters that “stagger through the novels with their perceptions blurred and reason distorted by unwise consumption of brandy, wine, beer, ale, patent medicines, and opium” (2); Victorian writers like Eliot, McCormack contends, use alcohol as a metaphor for the “Condition of England” (11).

Indeed, our contemporary interest in the experience of wine tasting may be attributable to the examples set forth by thinkers like Voltaire, Kant, and Hume. While these philosophers may have chosen to use wine references because of the drink’s wide range of varietals and flavors, their personal penchant for the wine may also have had something to do with their preference for using it in their work. Barry Smith notes that Hume liked claret and Rhennish wine, while Kant declared a preference for the wine of the Canary Islands (xi). See Barry Smith, “Introduction,” in Questions of Taste: The Philosophy of Wine, ed. Barry Smith (Oxford UP, 2007).

See Pricilla Parkhurst Ferguson, “A Cultural Field in the Making: Gastronomy in 19th Century France” in American Journal of Sociology 104.3 (1998). Ferguson notes that while the culinary arts can be traced to the Greeks and Romans, “gastronomy as a modern social phenomenon was instituted in early nineteenth century France” (599). For further reading on the European gastronomic tradition, see Jean-Robert

xxv French lawyer Alexandre Grimod de la Reyniere was the first widely recognized and celebrated restaurant reviewer and public critic of cooking in France, and is consider by many gastronomic historians to be one of the founders of the gastronomic tradition. Grimod’s essays establish a connection between cuisine and the fine arts: as Jean-Claude Bonnet argues, Grimod effectively positioned the figure of the gourmand as “a scholar, a libertine, and an aesthete” (qtd. in Weiss, “Baudelaire” 158). See Allen Weiss, “Baudelaire, Artaud, and the Aesthetics of Intoxication” in High Culture: Reflections on Addiction and Modernity, eds. Anna Alexander & Mark Roberts (SUNY P, 2003) 157-173.

xxvi Henry had already inherited the French regions of Maine, Aujou, and Touraine.

xxvii Bordeaux still has a number of chateaux, streets, communes and public monuments that bear Irish names (e.g. Lynch-Bages, Phelan Segur, Dillon, Mcarthy, and Kirwan).

xxviii Many of these wine merchants were well established by the nineteenth century: Berry Bros. and Rudd was founded in 1698, and Justerini and Brooks in 1749. John Harvey and Sons and Avery’s were founded in the late 1700s. It was not until the nineteenth century, however, that these merchants accumulated a large and more diverse clientele, and began large-scale advertising campaigns in both major and local newspapers. It was common practice for these merchants to import wine in barrel, cask, or pipe and then handle the individual bottling upon import. The merchants all had reputations for being specialists within certain areas of the market: Harvey’s was famous for their sherries; Avery’s was best known for their sherry, port, and claret.

xxix While certainly not an exhaustive list, the following volumes focus on the intersection of alcoholism, addiction, and intoxication with literary studies, often employing biographical considerations of a writer’s relationship to alcohol: see Thomas Gilmore, Equivocal Spirits: Alcoholism and Drinking in Twentieth Century Literature (U of North Carolina P, 1987); Marcus Boon, The Road of Excess: A History of Writers on Drugs (Harvard UP, 2002); Jane Lilienfeld, Reading Alcoholism: Theorizing Character and Narrative in Selected Novels of Thomas Hardy, James Joyce, and Virginia Woolf (Palgrave, 1999); Sue Vice, Beyond the Pleasure Dome: Writing and Addiction from the Romantics (Sheffield, 1994); High Culture: Reflections on

For further reading on food in modernist literature, see Literary Gastronomy, ed. David Bevan (Rodopi, 1988); Gian-Paolo Biasin, The Flavors of Modernity: Food and the Novel (Princeton UP, 1993); Denise Gigante, Taste: A Literary History (Yale UP, 2005); Carolyn Korsmeyer, Making Sense of Taste: Food and Philosophy (Cornell UP, 2002); Cooking by the Book: Food in Literature and Culture, ed. Mary Anne Schofield (Popular, 1989); Sarah Sceats, Food, Consumption in the Body in Contemporary Women’s Fiction (Cambridge UP, 2000); and Susanne Skubal, Word of Mouth: Food and Fiction after Freud (Routledge, 2002).

Winemaking requires a delicate balance of natural conditions (soil, topographic, atmospheric, pest, chemical and temperature influences) and human effort (vine propagation and grafting, harvesting, crushing, adjusting pH and flavor levels, blending, and of course, the process control required to juice, bottle, and age the wine). For further reading, see Ron S. Jackson, Wine Science: Principals, Practice, Perception (Academic, 2000) 45-426.

See Gaston Roupnel, Le Vieux Garain (Charpentier, 1913). Roupnel, credited with developing the modern notion of “terroir,” describes the Burgundy region’s wine as belonging to “a world larger than us” because it embodies “the spirit of the past and is sustained by that which preceded it... it transcends time and the brief passage of human life” (20-21).
Chapter 2

SYMBOLS OF HIS OWN CREATING: WINE, MYTH, AND RELIGION IN OSCAR WILDE’S

SALOMÈ

In the opening scene of Oscar Wilde’s Salomé, a soldier of Herod’s court observes that “Herodias has filled the cup of the Tetrarch” (553). Herod, whom we learn is “very fond of wine” (553), continues to imbibe throughout the evening: “I will drink wine with my guests” (561), “Pour me forth wine” (562), “Fill thou my cup, my well-beloved” (566), “Fill with wine the great goblets of silver [...] I will drink to Caesar” (566), “Oh! oh! bring wine!” (571), and finally, after a final empty of his goblet, “Who has drunk my wine? There was wine in my cup. It was full of wine” (573). Salomé, the central figure of the play, also makes numerous references to wine, primarily in describing Jokanaan, Wilde’s re-imagined figure of John the Baptist: “Thy voice is like wine to me” (558), “Thy hair is like clusters of grapes, like the clusters of black grapes that hang from the vine-trees of Edom” (559) and “Thy mouth is redder than the feet of those who tread the wine in the wine-press” (559).

Though Salomé’s alignment with the late nineteenth-century French Symbolist tradition has attracted scholars to the play’s mirrors, moons, and eyes since its 1891 publication, the wine references—over 28 in the play’s single act—have been unduly overlooked. Wilde purportedly claimed that before he died he hoped to write the “Epic of the Cross” or the “Iliad of Christianity” (Kernahan 223); in De Profundis, he writes of his desire to found a new religion—the “Confraternity of the Fatherless”—with new symbols that “must be of my own creating” (Wilde 915).
argue that Wilde uses wine symbolism in Salomé to critique traditional orders of myth and religion and expose the more lascivious aspects of their doctrines; at the same time, the wine references reveal Wilde’s alternative mythology and ontology, which subsumes the self-creating and self-annihilating energies he sees in Jesus and Dionysus, but rejects the dogma and orthodoxy long ascribed to their images. The wine references of Salomé suggest that while we are meant to read Jokanaan as a myopic, pitiless harbinger of Christianity, and Herod as an equally degenerate representative of Judaism and Hellenic paganism, Salomé stands against these avatars as the kind of self-affirming, supremely creative being—like Christ and Dionysus—that Wilde recurrently expressed admiration for in his essays and letters.

Any consideration of the revisionism at hand in Salomé can only benefit from a working understanding of the social, political, and literary contexts Wilde worked in, from, and against. Extant manuscripts suggest that Wilde began to draft the play while residing in London in 1891; he continued writing while in Paris that fall, and finished the composition of the play after returning to London in December. He hoped to see the play go on stage in London in June 1892—renowned French stage actress Sarah Bernhardt had been cast in the title role—but two weeks into rehearsal, to Wilde’s outrage, Lord Chamberlain Examiner Edward Smyth Pigott banned the performance of Salomé in England. The Examiner publically defended the ban on the basis of Salomé’s biblical subject matter, but revealed in a private letter that he found the content to be “half Biblical, half-pornographic” (qtd. in
Stephens 112). As Katherine Brown Downey claims, the censor’s enforcement of a sixteenth-century law prohibiting the performance of biblical material reveals not only a concern that playwrights would pervert biblical narratives, but also a fear that they would expose perversities already present in the scriptures (2).vi Pigott’s claim also effectively identifies both the play’s appeal and its implications: Salomé’s conflation of sacred and erotic passion aestheticized the real and continually shifting dynamics of moral and immoral behavior in nineteenth-century English society. Wilde threatened to renounce his British citizenship over the ban, but the Examiner refused to yield.vi Wilde defiantly published an English version of the play in London in 1893; bound in deep violet wrappers, the volume provoked an immediate stir amongst his friends and critics.vii “That tragic daughter of passion,” he wrote to a friend, “appeared on Thursday and is now dancing for the head of the British public” (Complete Letters 556).

Wilde was, of course, well aware of Salomé’s scriptural heritage. An early version of the story of John the Baptist’s beheading appears in the Bible as an interpolation between the Gospels of Matthew (Authorized King James 14:3-12) and Mark (6:17-29): Brad Bucknell argues that the depiction of Salomé in the gospels serves as a kind of framed narrative, “seemingly intended to illustrate the superiority of Christ (who dies and rises) over his most dynamic Precursor, John the Baptist (who dies and does not rise)” (503).ix In the Gospel of Mark, Herod Antipas’ stepdaughter dances before the court and in doing so gives her mother—who bears a grudge against the Baptist after he declares that her marriage to Herod is
unlawful—the chance to claim the head of the prophet:

And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee; And when the daughter of the said Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod and them that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee. And he swore unto her, Whatchever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom. And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. (Mark 6:21-24)

Though there are minor differences in Mark and Matthew’s accounts (e.g. the depiction of Herod’s attitude toward John and the presence of an executioner), neither version names the princess of Judea nor provides a description of her dance. Salomé’s name first appears in Flavius Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews (93 CE), the Jewish historian’s attempt to introduce the history of Israel and the Jewish people to a Roman audience, but his version claims that the dancer who performs for Herod is a maiden of Herodias. Josephus also provides a genealogy for Herod’s family that includes the names of Salomé’s children, a fact that Wilde clearly chose to revise given that his princess is crushed to death just before the final curtain of the play.

By the time Wilde decided to take up the story of Salomé, the princess had served throughout the ages as a muse for innumerable drawings, paintings, dances, poems, and short stories. The Salomé motif entered a literary renaissance at the end of the nineteenth century, largely inspired by Heinrich Heine’s Atta Troll (1841), which portrays Herodias as the figure who kisses the Baptist’s head. Although early depictions rarely provide even minute details about the princess, the nineteenth-century interpretations of the story were unabashedly erotic and often focused on
her scantily clad dancing body.\textsuperscript{xi} French symbolist painter Gustave Moreau portrayed Salomé in some of his most sensual drawings, oil paintings, and watercolors, pieces that would later serve as the subject of Jean Des Esseintes’ observations in French novelist Joris-Karl Huysmans’ influential \textit{Against Nature} (1884).\textsuperscript{xii} Both Moreau and Huysman were prominent figures in the late nineteenth-century French artistic circles that Wilde frequented; Huysmans’ novel would later become known as the “guidebook of decadence” (Ellmann 252).\textsuperscript{xiii} Gustave Flaubert’s novella "Herodias" (1876) takes up Moreau and Huysmans’ erotic depictions of Salomé but shifts responsibility for John’s death to Herodias and the priests who fear his religious power: Salomé is portrayed as a young girl who forgets the name of the man whose head she requests.\textsuperscript{xiv} Other prominent French symbolists, including Charles Baudelaire and Stephen Mallarme, continued to revise Salomé as an exotic, sensual, modern figure. John Sloan notes that Wilde’s appreciation for the French Symbolist tradition developed out of his respect for one of their central aims: not merely to establish an alternative to French bourgeois realism but also, in many cases, to resist all systems and dogmas that held human spiritual progress as their aim (15).\textsuperscript{xv} Wilde’s attempt to align himself with the French Symbolist aesthetic seems most apparent in his decision to write the original version of \textit{Salomé} in French, but the play also adheres to another primary canon of Symbolist drama: “creating surreal and sinister atmospheres” by using “a singular type of language, based on the continuous repetition of words and images to create the impression of a sort of arcane, hypnotic music” (Strukli and Silvani 111).\textsuperscript{xvi}
Wilde’s repeated yet varied reference to specific symbols accentuates their importance and also makes it possible for the audience (and literary critics) to consider the significance of each symbol via the perspectives of multiple characters. Ellis Hanson argues that by adopting the stories and rhetoric of the King James Bible for Salomé, Wilde holds up the Bible as the “ultimate symbolist tragedy” (273).xvii That his symbols often recreate and critique some of the central symbols of mythology and religion is testament to his indebtedness to the rebellious impulse behind French Symbolist art and literature.

The Symbolists variably refashioned Salomé as an innocent virgin, an un governable temptress, and a *femme fatale*; her figure recreates various religious, familial, and political dynamics and often works to critique the political and social changes occurring in Europe during the nineteenth century.xviii The creative renewal of this ancient tale inspired Wilde; indeed, the distances he creates between Salomé’s ecclesiastical roots and his own version of the story—renaming John the Baptist, shifting the focus of the story to the named Salomé, reimagining the ending—work less to disguise the biblical parallels than to draw attention to the revisionism at work in the play. Wilde’s parents had their son baptized at Dublin’s St. Mark’s Church and were patrons of the Anglican Church of Ireland, so it is likely that he was intimately familiar with the Christian scriptures from a young age: Jason Mitchell notes that the incantatory style of *Salomé* mimics the techniques of Israel’s kingly poets and the method of parallelism so predominant in Old Testament versification (14).xix However, Wilde’s relationship to the Judeo-Christian tradition
constantly evolved, and while working as a critic for the *Pall Mall Gazette* between 1885 and 1890, he frequently encountered pieces of religious fiction and verse that he dismissed as “trite, ugly, and anachronistic” (Stevens 139). Coulson Kernahan, the English novelist and editor of Wilde’s 1891 version of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, recounts a conversation with Wilde where the artist decries the empty, uncritical jargon and principles that plagued the Christian tradition:

‘It is cant and officialdom’ (he spoke bitterly) ‘which is keeping the men and women who think out of the church to-day [sic]. It is cant which more than anything else stands between them and Christ.’ (223)

Early biographical studies and Wilde’s personal correspondence suggest that by the end of the 1880s, he became increasingly incensed by what he saw as the corrupt and self-serving doctrine promoted by official religious orders and embraced by their followers. He was repulsed by the Christian “self-righteousness” (as characterized by Matthew Arnold) that pervaded British culture in the nineteenth century, whose “source par excellence” was the Authorized Version of the Bible commissioned by King James I in 1604 (McCormick 100). It is perhaps no surprise then that by the 1890s, Wilde’s fiction and plays continually offered both veiled and overt critiques of the Christian faith and followers.

In late nineteenth-century England, questioning the doctrine of the Church of England or promoting oneself as an author of alternative scriptures would have been perceived as a serious challenge to the authority of the Church and State. Regardless of the consequence, evidence suggests that even before the 1890s, Wilde became increasingly preoccupied with the project of composing his own evangel.
Kernahan notes that Wilde professed plans to write what he called an “Epic of the Cross” and the “Iliad of Christianity”:

‘Shall I tell you what is my greatest ambition—more even than an ambition—the dream of my life? Not to be remembered hereafter as an artist, poet, thinking, or playwright, but as the man who reclothed the sublimest conception which the world has ever known—the Salvation of Humanity, the Sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross by Christ—with new and burning words, with new and illuminating symbols, with new and divine vision, free from the accretions of cant which the centuries have gathered around it, peerless and pure two thousand years ago—the pure gift of Christianity as taught by Christ.’ (223)

In the introduction to *Le Chand du cygne*, a French collection of Wilde’s oral tales, Guillot de Saix writes that Wilde claimed to be “the thirteenth disciple of Christ and I am to write the fifth Gospel” (95). While Kernahan and de Saix’ accounts were recorded years after Wilde’s death, Jennifer Stevens argues that their statements “certainly seem in accord with [Wilde’s] inclination towards iconoclasm and the merging of the sacred and the secular” (140). He would continue to dwell on his the idea of creating his own spiritual order until the end of his life. In *De Profundis*, published in 1905 but written just three years before his death in 1900, Wilde writes:

When I think about Religion at all, I feel as if I would like to found an order for those who cannot believe [...] where on an alter, on which no taper burned, a priest, in whose heart peace had no dwelling, might celebrate with unblessed bread and a chalice empty of wine. Everything to be true must be a religion. And agnosticism should have its ritual no less than faith. It has sown its martyrs, it should reap its saints, and praise God daily for having hidden Himself from man. But whether it be faith or agnosticism, it must be nothing external to me. Its symbols must be of my own creating. (915)

In this passage, Wilde’s unblessed bread and an empty chalice are stripped of the immaterial dogma endowed upon these symbols in their Christian context. In turn,
Wilde expresses a desire to create an alternative mythology that eschews this dogma and taps into the free-willed, creative energy—harnessed by the material form of man—that he sees in Christ; *Salomé* may have been the first book of his surrogate gospel.

In the following pages, I argue that Wilde’s contention with traditional religions and cultural mythologies lies greatly in the persistent effort of their orders to endow material objects and symbols, like wine, with immaterial, “transcendent” properties that disregard the inherent materiality of the object. His distaste for Christian “cant and officialdom” (qtd. in Kernahan 223), for example, exemplifies his objection to the Church’s disdain for the material, bodily, sensual, *human* aspects of its doctrine (an agenda mirrored similarly in aspects of Victorian law and society).

In *Salomé*, Wilde relies on the Symbolists’ revisionary objectives to demonstrate how ancient symbols like the sacramental wine, meant to subsume or represents the physical and spiritual body of Christ, lose their spiritual significance when their materiality is denied. Jokanaan, one of the most beloved prophets in the Christian tradition, is portrayed as pitiless—or, to borrow Wilde’s own words about Victorian Christian verse, “trite, ugly, and anachronistic”—in the play, in part because he refuses to see and acknowledge Salomé’s physical form. Jokanaan is also the first character of the play to use wine as a symbol of carnal desire, a move by Wilde to simultaneously emphasize the more prurient aspects of scriptural verse and criticize the hypocrisy of religious zealots who deny the most human parts of their doctrine. Conversely, Herod sees wine purely for its material and corporeal value.
He collects wines from foreign lands, recurrently calls for toasts to powerful political figures, and drinks himself into oblivion; furthermore, in opposition to Jokanaan, Herod is obsessed with Salomé’s body. Salomé, however, unites the realms of spiritual ecstasy and carnal desire; it is she who embodies Wilde’s assertion in De Profundis that “he who would lead a Christ-like life must be entirely and absolutely himself” (Complete 740).

The wine references in Salomé emphasize Wilde’s revisionist project. One of the earliest references to wine in the play could also be the most revealing: describing Herod’s “wine of three sorts,” the Second Soldier notes that the tetrarch’s Sicilian wines are “as red as blood” (Wilde, Salomé 553). The simile elucidates the important correlation between wine and blood in the play. Wilde’s reference to a trinity of wines—evoking the holy trinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit—emphasizes the symbol’s correlation with the Eucharist (a term derived from the Greek term “eucharistia,” the formal thanksgiving that traditionally involved the sacred act of mixing blood with wine), the rite where bread and wine are blessed, shared, and consumed by Christian followers to mark the remembrance of the death and resurrection of Christ. Catholic doctrine demands that when bread and wine are consecrated in the Eucharist, they become the body and blood of Christ. Wilde explores the concept of transubstantiation—where a material is changed into a spiritual substance—in a number of his essays and fictional works, including The Picture of Dorian Gray:

It was rumored of [Dorian] once that he was about to join the Roman Catholic communion, and certainly the Roman ritual had always a great attraction for
him. The daily sacrifice, more awful really than all the sacrifices of the antique world, stirred him as much by its superb rejection of the evidence of the senses as by the primitive simplicity of its elements and the eternal pathos of the human tragedy that it sought to symbolize. (105)

Dorian seems to share his creator's awe for the elaborate and beautiful rituals of Catholicism: as Ellis Hanson argues, Wilde felt "seduced by the beauties of Catholic ritual and art but appalled by the philistinism of the pious" (29). John Sloan further argues that Wilde felt that contemporary forms of religion (particularly Roman Catholicism) demanded that followers choose between “the sensuous life and the aesthetic sublimation” (Sloan 7). Wilde’s use of the Salomé story thus forces a pious audience to grapple with the more lascivious aspects of their sacred holy books. For example, the use of blood symbolism and Eucharistic imagery—exemplified most vividly by the presentation of Jokanaan’s head upon the silver platter, an image that evokes the sacred host on the liturgical paten—highlights the carnal implications of the Catholic rite: just as followers of Jesus consume his blood in communion, Salomé desires to consume a holy man, an impulse that culminates in her demand to kiss his blood-dripping head.xxiii Unlike Herod, who sees terrible immaterial omens in a blood-red moon and the blood-red rose petals that fall from his crown, but who fails to notice and thus slips in the blood that spills from the Page’s dead body, Salomé revels in carnal materiality by using her own body to obtain Jokanaan’s, by dancing in the blood of another dead man, and by kissing the blood-stained lips of the beheaded prophet.

In Salomé, rituals, omens, and unexplainable phenomenon are received either cynically or fantastically: Herodias fails to believe in miracles because she has
“seen too many,” while the Page is plagued by fears of an unknown “misfortune” (Wilde 559). The courtesans repeatedly question their faith: the Orthodox Jews aimlessly dispute the tenets of their doctrine, the Cappodocian accuses the Romans of chasing the gods out of his country, and the Nubian associates god-worship with feckless human sacrifice. Traditionally religious symbols and figures are stripped of their sacred qualities: for example, the presentation of Jokanaan challenges traditional portrayals of the prophet as a benevolent holy man. In the opening scene of Salomé, Jokanaan, imprisoned in the cistern that once held the Tetrarch’s older brother (Herodias’ first husband), offers the first of three proclamations about the coming of Christ—“After me shall come another mightier than I...” (Wilde 553)—the First Soldier’s response exemplifies the reaction of the court to the prophet: “It is impossible to understand what he says” (554). The disconnect goes both ways: as Guy Willoughby notes, if the coming of Christ is meant to “heal human divisions and instigate a new era founded on mutual trust and love,” Jokanaan, by contrast, “clings throughout the play to his own ‘solitary place’ below the stage, condemns his fellows in suspiciously lurid language, and refuses contact with [Salomé]” (78). Salomé’s appearance on the terrace provokes Jokanaan’s second prophecy, piquing the princess’ curiosity and culminating in her demand to have the prophet retrieved from the cistern. Standing before the princess, Jokanaan launches into an acerbic condemnation of Herod and Herodias using wine and chalice symbolism: “Where is he whose cup of abominations is now full?” (Wilde, Salomé 557) and “Thy mother hath filled the earth with the wine of her iniquities, and the cry of her sins hath come
up to the ears of God” (558). When Salomé requests to kiss his mouth, he reacts with repulsion and demands that she seek the forgiveness of Christ. His words to her, “Daughter of Sodom, come not near me [...] get thee to a desert and seek out the Son of Man” (558), recall Satan’s temptation of Christ in the wilderness but unlike Christ, who comes “to all who call on Him” (560), Jokanaan repudiates Salomé and demonstrates his lack of compassion for those who reach out to him. While Jokanaan’s language mimics (often inaccurately) biblical prose and imagery, his prophecies are vague and repeatedly unfulfilled. He ultimately chooses the isolation of his cell over the opportunity to share his message of Christ’s coming with Herod’s court.

In the same scene that Jokanaan equates wine with “abominations,” sin, and perverse sexuality, Salomé uses a series of wine-related similes that maintain their carnal significance but work towards a much different end than the prophet’s malicious accusations. Jokanaan’s indictments provoke the princess to declare that the prophet’s voice “is wine to me” (558). His hair is like “a cluster of grapes, like the clusters of black grapes that hang from the vine-trees of Edom in the land of the Demotes,” and his mouth is “redder than the feet of those who tread the wine in the wine-press” (559). In many ways, Salome’s lines in this scene resemble Jokanaan’s preceding dialogue and foreshadow Herod’s: like Jokanaan, Salomé’s language mimics passages of the Old Testament, and like Herod, she objectifies her desired love object by reducing his body to a blazon-like string of sensuous images and similes. As Christopher Greer argues, Salomé “dramatizes the clash between the
prophetic voice and the aesthetic eye, between moral injunction and sensual desire” (42). But if Herod represents material desire and imaginative impulses that border on absurd (exemplified by his idealized vision of Salomé as a pale virgin with perfect “little teeth” and “little feet like doves,” and seeing “bad omens” in every object and event); and if Jokanaan serves as an epitomical symbol of an ascetic being who refuses to see or embrace the innate sensuality of human existence; and if Herodias serves as both an unimaginative and unspiritual avatar (who claims to be wearied by "ridiculous" men (Wilde, Salomé 564), “do[es] not believe in prophets" (563), “do[es] not believe in miracles” (564), and declares to the page that he "must not dream. It is only sick people who dream" (565)); it is Salomé who emerges as the most sensual, passionate character. As Guy Willoughby notes, Wilde uses the figure of Salomé to demonstrates that “unimaginative piety is as life-denying as rampant and unchecked sensuality” (86). Thus, the “monstrous” action of Herodias’s daughter “becomes a creative assertion of identity in a corrupt and divided world that provides no scope for her unconscious aspirations for love” (86). Wilde’s portrayal of Salomé, as I will argues in the following pages, is inspired by the figures of Christ and Dionysus; his revision of the symbol of wine is thus in dialogue with the centrality of wine symbolism in the Christian and Dionysian tradition.

Working from Pigott’s claim that Salomé is “half biblical, half pornographic,” Katherine Brown Downey argues that the play is rather, “thoroughly perverse and entirely biblical” (11). But while Salomé offers an interpretation of the elements of desire and sensuality inherent in the English translation of the King James Bible, to
limit the context of the play to the New and Old Testaments is to ignore the play’s important Hellenic influences. The value of the Greek pantheon to Wilde, and its impact on his writing, cannot be overemphasized: as Stefano Evangelista argues, “Ancient Greece is the foundation on which Wilde’s identity as an aesthete, critic, and writer is built” (125). Wilde studied the classics at Trinity College in Dublin and was awarded the Berkeley Gold Medal for Greek, the school’s highest honor for classic studies. His first publication, in the November 1875 issues of the *Dublin University Magazine*, was an English translation of the chorus of the maidens in Aristophanes’ *Clouds*. As a student at Oxford, Wilde was trained to use ancient philosophy to develop modern ideas; his professors frequently encouraged their students to use classic studies as the basis for debates about issues like ethics, politics, and religion.xxiv Stephen Evangelista argues that Greek culture provided Wilde with a “discourse of authority” that served as “a marker of taste and of his ability to discern and judge in the fields of modern as well as ancient literature” (125-126). Wilde also expressed continual interest in the intersection of the Judeo-Christian and Hellenic cultures: while this fascination remains consistent throughout his oeuvre, the expression of his interest in this connection reaches its apex *De Profundis*. In the epistle, penned between January and March 1897 while Wilde served out a prison sentence for gross indecency, he records his great pleasure in learning that Christ spoke Greek and not Aramaic, and imagines Christ in conversation with Socrates, Plato, and Charmides.xxxv During his imprisonment, Wilde read the Gospels every morning in Greek rather than English, writing, “when
one returns to the Greek, it is like going into a garden of lilies out of some narrow and dark house” (De Profundis 929).

In Salomé, the intersection and critique of traditional Judeo-Christian and Hellenic mythologies culminates in the figure of Herod. In historical texts and in Wilde’s play, Herod is portrayed as a Jewish descendent with pagan tendencies, loyalties to Rome, and an acceptance of the miracles of Jesus. While early critics accused Wilde of conflating the characters of three different biblical Herods—Herod the Great, Herod Agrippa, and Herod Antipas—contemporary scholars generally agree that the Herod that we are presented with in Salomé is Antipas, Herod the Great’s youngest son, tetrarch of Galilee and Perea (Galilee’s population was mostly Jewish, while Perea was inhabited mainly by Greeks from Syria) from 4 BCE to 39 CE, and political sovereign of Jesus of Nazareth. Antipas infamously built his capital, Tiberias, on ancient burial grounds (a sacrilege for orthodox Jews) and thus had to populate the city by force. A fourth generation Jew, the historical Antipas’ adherence to the Judaic religion is a point of contention for scholars. While he seemed to make some concessions to the Jewish faith—for instance, he refused to engrave his image on official coins, an act that would have violated Jewish prescriptions against idolatry—the portrait painted by historians (including Josephus, whose Histories is included in an Aubrey Beardsley portrait of Wilde flanked by a pile of books at his writing desk) is of a ruler more personally committed to his Roman citizenship and Hellenic paganism than in obedience to the Torah. In Salomé, Wilde portrays the tetrarch as a hapless ruler with little conviction in anything other than the
immediate appease of his carnal desires. His habit of guzzling wine would have been abhorred by Jewish followers in his time: far from being a libation and source of ecstasy, in the Judaic faith, wine was (and still is) a sacred and powerful symbol requiring strict rabbinical control. Herod’s offer to give his stepdaughter the veil designed to conceal the Ark of the Covenant would also have been considered a stunning act of sacrilege. Like Jokanaan, the failed and hypocritical prophet of Christianity in Wilde’s play, both the historical Herod and Wilde’s fictional representation of the tetrarch are dismal representatives of their faiths. By portraying Herod as a myopic, pitiless, libidinous, wine-guzzling Jewish leader, the irony—and indeed, the humor—of the situation only emphasizes the absurd role spirituality plays in a court corrupt with “cant and officialdom” (Wilde qtd. in Kernahan 223).

Alan Bird argues that Herod represents the “sadistic bestiality of the man as well as the ruthless opportunism of the politician, the callous husband as well as well as the sensual stepfather” (71). After Jokanaan’s final rebuff of Salomé, Herod arrives at the terrace to look for the princess; Herodias follows and berates her husband for his unnatural interest in her daughter. Herod comments that the moon appears to be searching for lovers and “reels through the clouds like a drunken woman” (561), though it is the tetrarch who gets increasingly drunk and incoherent as the narrative progresses. By invoking the trope of intoxication, Wilde introduces the motif of bakkheia—the intoxicated frenzy induced by the Ancient Greek god Dionysus—and thus effectively builds his narrative upon Hellenic and Judeo-
Christian mythologies. Though Herod quickly becomes the most inebriated character in Wilde’s play, he hardly embodies the hallowed figure of Dionysus. Wilde’s Herod more closely resembles Pentheus, the king Dionysus leads to his demise, most famously portrayed in Euripides’s play, *The Bacchae* (405 AD). *The Bacchae* opens with Dionysus’ arrival at Thebes, where he finds that nobody believes the story of his divine and terrible birth.\textsuperscript{xxvi} Pentheus has heard of Dionysus and his orgiastic female followers, and decides to seek the god out; Dionysus then convinces the king to don women’s garb and spy on his maenads. After the two descend into the woods, a messenger enters the stage and describes how the women of Thebes, intoxicated by the spirit of Dionysus, discovered the king and tore his body to pieces: “And here was borne a severed arm, and there/ A hunter’s booted foot; white bones lay bare/ with rending; and swift hands ensanguined” (Euripides 66). When the haze lifts from the mesmerized women, despair is felt by all but Dionysus, who remains ambivalent. While there are multiple versions of the story of Dionysus, Euripides’ play set a presentence in art and theater by associating Dionysus with themes of rebirth, revelry, intoxication, madness, deviance, passionate emotion, and unrestrained sexuality.\textsuperscript{xxvii} Like Pentheus lured into the woods, Herod’s encounter with Dionysian energy in *Salomé* undermines his power and leads to his authoritative demise: as Petra Dierkes-Thrun argues, Herod is “not in control, either of himself or the complicated political and religious world around him” (40). While Herod keeps his physical head in the play, his position as head of political body of Galilee and Perea will be undermined, and indeed, symbolically
dismembered, by his loss of control to wine and Salomé’s demands.

Like the stories of Salomé and her dance, the myths of Dionysus also experienced a literary renaissance in the second half of the nineteenth century. Walter Pater takes up the figure of Dionysus in an essay entitled “A Study of Dionysus: The Spiritual Form of Fire and Dew,” first published in the *Fortnightly Review* in December 1876 and later in a collection called *Greek Studies: A Series of Essays*, posthumously arranged and published in by Pater’s friend Charles Shadwell. Wilde’s public reverence of Pater is well recorded: in a review of *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, Wilde writes, “Mr. Pater’s essays became to me ‘the golden book of spirit and sense, the holy writ of beauty’” (“Appreciations” 188), and later claims that Pater, “has no rival in his own sphere, and he has escaped disciples” (194). In “A Study of Dionysus,” Pater describes the ritual communion reenacted in Euripides’ play: the “sacred women of Dionysus ate in mystical ceremony, raw flesh, and drank blood,” a rite that serves as a symbolic offering to the god (48). He goes on to describe the rebirth, or second birth, of Dionysus, which offers his followers “the hope of a possible analogy between the resurrection of nature and something else, as yet unrealized, reserved for human souls” (49):

...and the beautiful, weeping creature, vexed by the wind, suffering, torn to pieces, and rejuvenescent again at last, like a tender shoot of living green out of the hardness and stony darkness of the earth, becomes an emblem or ideal of chastening and purification, and of final victory through suffering. It is the finer, mystical sentiment of the few, detached from the coarser and more material religion of the many, and accompanying it, through the course of its history, as its ethereal, less palpable, life-giving soul, and as always happens, seeking the quiet, and not too anxious to make itself felt by others. (49-50)
Pater argues in order to fully understand Dionysus—“his madness, the chase, his imprisonment and death”—we must take into account the darker aspect of his nature—“Dionysus Omophagus,”—the god eats raw flesh and mediates the nature of “Dionysus Meilichios,” the god of revelry, fertility, and rebirth (78).xxviii

Wilde similarly addresses a Dionysian duality in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. In a dinner party scene, Lord Henry Wotton describes the figure of Philosophy as having Dionysian attributes: “...and philosophy herself became young, and catching the mad music of pleasure, wearing... her wine-stained robe and wreath of ivy” (Wilde, *Picture* 45).xxix Philosophy then dances, “like a Bacchante over the hills of life” (45). Lapsing into Dionysian metaphors and possessed by the image, Wotton seems to experience his own moment of escape from rationality and logic. Suddenly, Wilde’s descriptions take a gothic turn: “seething grape-juice rose round her bare limbs in waves of purple bubbles, or crawled in red foam over the vat’s black, dripping, sloping sides” (45). Dorian also morphs into the figure of a charming/sinister Dionysus: “He charmed his listeners out of themselves, and they followed his pipe, laughing” (45). Like Dionysus, Dorian is hedonistic, passionate, and eternally beautiful: “Eternal youth, infinite passion, pleasure subtle and secret, wild joys and wilder sins—he was to have all these things. The portrait was to bear the burden of his shame: that was all” (113). Also like Dionysus, Dorian slips into a dark “madness” and is annihilated at the end of the narrative. The numerous parallels between Dorian Gray and the figure of Dionysus make it clear that Wilde was both familiar with the myth and expressed continual interest in adopting the
story and characters in his own work throughout his lifetime. In *Salomé*, while Herod may be drunk beyond comprehension, it is Salomé who represents Dionysian energy.

German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche also evokes the figure of the god Dionysus in his treatise *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872) to describe a Dionysian “impulse” that seeks to reveal a powerful and destructive truth: that all is an indivisible, surging will; that there are no individuated principals or identities; and that tragic drama aims to reveal these truths, attempting to make it bearable for the audience through the aesthetic consolation of the Apollonian form.

Nietzsche was a contemporary of Wilde’s, and though no firm evidence exists to prove that Wilde read Nietzsche, both men read and claimed to be significantly influenced by the works of Arthur Schopenhauer, and both seem to diverge from Schopenhauer’s ethic of pessimism by favoring a mode of human nature that emphasizes finding joy in life and the art of “becoming.” For Schopenhauer, art gives humans a glimpse of the chaos and meaninglessness of life; for Nietzsche and Wilde, art indicates the ways in which life might be embraced even in knowing the chaos. Nietzsche argues that before Greek tragedy, art was static and idealized, representing only an Apollonian view of the world: the early Greek playwrights introduce a Dionysian element most significantly in the form of music. For Nietzsche, music offers the spectators of tragedy a chance to participate in the chorus: during this participation, they experience a sort of Apollonian vision—involving sacrificial rituals and the ecstatic dismemberment of Dionysus—that reminds them of their selves and the shared
ecstasy and suffering of human existence. xxxii “With this chorus,” Nietzsche writes, “the deep minded Hellene consoles himself [...] Art saves him, and through art life saves him—for herself” (23). xxxii The Dionysian hero finds delight in himself and his own activity, rather than searching for meaning in a religious or post-religious age (Nussbaum 100). Terry Eagleton argues that Wilde’s musings in De Profundis indicate a longtime appreciation for figures of absolute self-identity: for Wilde, to live well is to live like a work of art, which requires “realizing one’s creative potential, savouring each sensation with the intensity of a poem, valuing experience as an end in itself,” and finally, “bowing to no authority by the law of one’s own being” (Eagleton 338). Perhaps no fictional character of Wilde’s so closely embodies this creative mode of being as much as Salomé. Petra Dierkes-Thrun notes that by “refusing to be bound by habitual norms and limits,” Salomé models “a fundamental assertion of the fully secular individual subject against a deadening, imprisoning sense of loneliness, stasis, and death in a universe without any transcendental direction or meaning” (42). Salomé’s actions are her creative self-realization in a world that only objectifies her. Like Nietzsche’s characterization of Dionysian tragedy, Salomé presents the audience with an affirmation of the human will.

In the final scene of Salomé, a now barely coherent Herod asks the princess to dance for him. By the time Salomé persuades Herod to give his oath to grant her any request in exchange for her dance, the tetrarch has finished off several more glasses of wine and is besotted enough to not remember how his goblet became empty or notice when Herodias later removes his “ring of death” (Wilde, Salomé 575). The
princess performs her dance for the tetrarch—though we read only through a stage note that Salomé “dances the dance of the seven veils”—and demands the head of Jokanaan. Herod protests that Jokanaan might be a holy man and asks, “the head of a man that is cut from his body is ill to look upon, is it not?” (570). Herod offers Salomé a selection of material trinkets, including a pair of amethysts, “one that is black like wine and one that is red like wine that one has coloured with water”; pearls “like moons chained with rays of silver”; topazes “like the eyes of tigers, cats, and pigeons; moonstones; and onyxes, “like the eyeballs of a dead woman” (572). He continues to run through a long list of stones, crystals, and treasures, including the “veil of the sanctuary” (572) that he is willing to provide in place of Jokanaan’s head, but Salomé will not relent. Having drained another glass of wine, Herod sinks back into his seat, and Herodias pulls the death ring from his hand to give to the First Soldier, who then passes it on to the Executioner. As the Executioner descends into the cistern, Herodias expresses her pleasure in the transaction—“My daughter has done well” (573)—and Salomé leans over the cistern, wondering why Jokanaan does not cry out or struggle. A “huge black arm, the arm of the Executioner” rises from the cistern, bearing the prophet’s head on a silver shield. Salomé seizes the head and tells it that she will kiss its mouth: Herod calls Salomé “monstrous” while Herodias calls out her approval. The tetrarch declares that he will not stay and orders the servants to put out the torches: "Put out the torches! Hide the moon! Hide the stars! Let us hide ourselves in our palace, Herodias" (574). As Herod begins to ascend the stairs, the stage goes dark and the voice of Salomé is heard declaring that she has
kissed the mouth of the prophet. She notes there is a bitter taste on Jokanaan’s “wine-like” lips, drawing yet another correlation between blood and wine. A ray of moonlight illuminates the princess, and Herod, turning around, orders the soldiers to kill her. The final stage note before the curtain reads: “The soldiers rush forward and crush beneath their shields, Salome, daughter of Herodias, Princess of Judaea” (575).

Critics frequently relegate Salomé to the role of “hedonist” or “femme fatale” in the play. However, the effect of Salomé’s actions reveal her to be a much more complex and central figure of the play than she is often granted: she is the embodiment of a will or way of living that Wilde saw and admired in Christ and Dionysus. In the powerful final scene where Salomé seizes the lifeless head of Jokanaan and declares her intent to kiss his mouth—“Ah! thou wouldst not suffer me to kiss thy mouth, Jokanaan. Well! I will kiss it now. I will bite it with my teeth as one bites a ripe fruit” (573)—Wilde offers his erotic revision of the sacrificial rituals of Judeo-Christian and pagan belief systems. The princess’ final declaration outlines Wilde’s new doctrine of self-affirmation:

If thou hadst seen me thou hadst loved me. I saw thee, and I loved thee. Oh, how I loved thee! I love thee yet, Jokanaan. I love only thee . . . I am athirst for thy beauty; I am hungry for thy body; and neither wine nor apples can appease my desire. What shall I do now, Jokanaan? Neither the floods nor the great waters can quench my passion [...] If thou hadst looked at me thou hadst loved me. Well I know that thou wouldst have loved me, and the mystery of Love is greater than the mystery of Death. (574)

Only by approaching death can Salomé become aware that love is not an end but a means to something more complete than life or even death. While Herod and
Jokanaan long for fulfillment, Salomé represents “the triumph of love over repressive forces of society” (Stevens 169). Salomé’s hungers—unfulfilled by the wine of pagan ritual and Christianity—are defined by her own desires.xxxiv The ethos of Christ and the figures of Greek myth are refocused in Salomé’s affirmation of the power of love, a model of individual integrity that serves as Wilde’s path to renewal in a skeptical and spiritually misguided world. In the final scene of the play, the meeting point for all of the characters where the tragic events unfold under the moon’s watch, Salomé gives the audience a glimpse of psychic unity—love—even if it can only be realized for one divine moment. Because the audience, representing the greater realm of society, refuses to comprehend or bear Salome’s creative, self-affirming love and her threat to established codes of authority, she—like Christ and Dionysus—must be destroyed.

Nietzsche faulted Euripides for reducing the role of the chorus in tragic drama and of making theater too realistic, effectually crippling man’s ability to experience Dionysian ecstasy in the face of a meaningless existence. Wilde also found the sources nineteenth-century English society turned to for a sense of meaning insufficient and corrupted by institutional jargon and artificial structures of authority. Frequently left out of important collections or critical considerations of Wilde’s oeuvre, Salomé exemplifies some of Wilde’s most important personal and philosophical ideas about spirituality, religion, and being. He chose to write the play using the French Symbolist aesthetic: the French language and incantatory tone create a unifying leitmotif, while the repetition of profound and vibrant images
emphasizes the significance of the individual symbol. While Salomé has garnered much less critical attention than some of Wilde’s English-language plays, the play’s treatment of mythic and religious symbols offers readers new venues to reevaluate its importance to Wilde and Wildean scholarship. Critics who see the wines of Salomé as little more than a prop to achieve verisimilitude overlook or fail to appreciate its contextual and theoretical value.
Salomé is the only play that Wilde wrote in French. Extant manuscripts of the original version of the play suggest that Wilde was competent in written French, although there are minor grammatical and structural errors. In contrast to his written French, illustrator Charles Ricketts writes of Wilde’s spoken French, “his pronunciation was hesitant but not unpleasant” (51). See Charles Ricketts, *Recollections of Oscar Wilde* (Pallas Athene, 2012).

For biographical information about the historical Herod Antipas, see Frederic Miller, et. al., *Herod Antipas* (Alphascript, 2010). Antipas ruled Galilee and Perea after the death of his father in 4 BC. His territories were client states of the Roman Empire under Caesar. Antipas divorced his first wife, Phasaelis, for Herodias, the former wife of his brother Herod II. See also William R. G. Loader, “John the Baptist and Herod Antipas” in *Sexuality and the Jesus Tradition* (Eerdmans, 2005) 108-111.


See Steven Price and William Tydeman, *Wilde: Salomé* (Cambridge UP, 1996). Tydeman and Price consult letters and early biographies and argue that Wilde began talking about his plan to craft a work featuring Salomé as early as 1890 (14). Even by Christmas 1891, it is unclear whether Wilde was committed to using
Salomé as the subject of a play, though he told the Pall Mall Budget in June 1892 that he'd written the piece “some six months ago” (14-15).

vi For further reading on theater censorship in England, see John Russell Stephens, The Censorship of English Drama 1824-1901 (Cambridge UP, 2010). Stephens studies Lord Chamberlain files in the Public Record Office against original theater manuscripts kept in the British Museum. He argues that while the impulse for censorship is somewhat indicative of Victorian values and governing bodies, decisions about whether or not to censor a play were very much driven by individual leanings. See also John Johnston, The Lord Chamberlain’s Blue Pencil (Hodder, 1990), and Dominic Shellard, Steve Nicholson and Miriam Handley, The Lord Chamberlain Regrets... A History of British Theater Censorship (British Library, 2005).

vii Wilde published the French version of Salomé in Paris and London in February 1893; the first English translation was released in August that same year. In 1896, French director Aurélien-François Lugné-Poë produced Salomé at the popular Parisian theater house, the Théâtre de l’Oeuvre. See Katherine Brown Downey, Perverse Midrash: Oscar Wilde, André Gide, and Censorship of Biblical Drama (Continuum, 2004). Brown Downey suggests that the production was intended to be a gesture of support for Wilde after his conviction and imprisonment in England (3).

viii See Joost Daalder, “Which is the Most Authoritative Early Translation of Wilde’s ‘Salomé’?” in English Studies 85.1 (2004) 47-52. Wilde’s lover, Lord Alfred “Bosie” Douglas, produced a fairly inaccurate English translation of the play in 1892 at Wilde’s behest. Wilde edited the version that was eventually published, although it included a dedication by the playwright to “my Friend Lord Alfred Bruce Douglas the Translator of My Play” (qtd. in 47).

ix See Adam Winn, The Purpose of Mark’s Gospel: An Early Christian Response to Roman Imperialism (Mohr Siebeck, 2008). Mark is said to be the earliest of the four canonical gospels, though, as Winn claims, there’s no clear consensus about when it was written (estimates range from 42-75 C.E.) and whether it should be placed before or after Jerusalem’s destruction in 70 C.E. (43).


But on Herod’s birthday, the daughter of Herodias danced before them: and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath, to give her whatsoever she would ask of him. But she being instructed before by her mother, said: Give me here in a dish the head of John the Baptist. And the king was struck
sad: yet because of his oath, and for them that sat with him at table, he commanded it to be given. And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought in a dish: and it was given to the damsel, and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came and took the body, and buried it, and came and told Jesus. (Matthew 14:6-11).

xi See Helen Grace Zagona, *The Legend of Salome and the Principle of Art for Art’s Sake* (Minard, 1960). Zagona argues that Salomé’s dance began to appear after 100 AD in the illuminated pages of sacred manuscripts and on the tympanums of medieval churches (21). By the fifteenth century, Salomé was a muse for European artists such as Albrecht Dürer, Tiziano “Titian” Vecelli, Peter Paul Rubens, and Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio. See, for example, Tiziano Vecelli’s *Salome with the Head of John the Baptist* (1511), Albrecht Dürer’s *Salome with the Head of John the Baptist* (1515), Peter Paul Rubens’ *The Head of John the Baptist Presented to Salome* (1604), and Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio’s *Salome with the Head of John the Baptist* (1607).

xii See Françoise Meltzer, *Salome and the Dance of Writing: Portraits of Mimesis in Literature* (U of Chicago P, 2010). Melzer notes that while critics claimed to be deeply offended by Moreau’s oil painting *Salome Dancing* when it went on display at the Salon Palace of the Champs Elysees in 1876, more than 500,000 people came to see the exhibit. Flaubert, Meltzer argues, was “overwhelmed by Moreau’s vision,” and began research for “Herodias” that same year (19).


With a withdrawn, solemn, almost august expression on her face, she begins the lascivious dance which is to rouse the aged Herod’s dormant senses; her breasts rise and fall, the nipples hardening at the touch of her whirling necklaces; the strings of diamonds glitter against her moist flesh; her bracelets, her belts, her rings all spit out fiery sparks; and across her triumphal robe... (64)

Des’ Esseintes finds a myriad of different religious and cultural influences in Moreau’s painting, seeing Salomé as relevant to any culture or belief system and belonging specifically to none: Wilde’s *Salomé* closely resembles this aspect of Huysmans’ version.
In 1862, a young American writer named J.C. Heywood published a dramatic poem entitled “Salome” that was reprinted and became popular in London during the 1880s. Wilde reviewed the piece in 1888 and perhaps drew from Heywood’s use of sexual innuendo and a climactic final scene depicting Herodias kissing the Baptist’s head.


Wilde’s decision to write the play in French may also have been an attempt to evade the English censorship laws that forbade the depiction of biblical characters on London’s stages.

See Jarlath Killeen, *The Fairy Tales of Oscar Wilde* (Ashgate, 2007). In a book-length analysis of Oscar Wilde’s fairly tales, Killeen argues that the writer’s Christian imagery is profoundly influenced by the folk patterns celebrated in the West of Ireland, and that were intensely studied by both of Wilde’s parents: “undercutting colonial versions of the land in favour of redemptive fertility rituals and folk-Catholic belief systems should have had a profound impact on the relationship between Ireland and England as far as Wilde was concerned” (78).

See Amy Lehman, *Victorian Women and the Theatre of Trance: Mediums, Spiritualists, and Mesmerists in Performance* (McFarland, 2009). Lehman notes that on the Victorian stage, roles for women were typically variations of widely known cultural stereotypes: at one end of the spectrum was the “pure and virtuous ‘Angel in the House,’ who sanctified the domestic sphere,” while the “seductive ‘femme fatale,’ who, in a perversion of the Angel’s role, deserted and broke up homes and families” stood at the other end (27). For further reading on the “femme fatale,” see Jennifer Hedgecock, *The Femme Fatale in Victorian Literature: The Danger and the Sexual Threat* (Cambria, 2008); Gail Finney, *Women in Modern Drama: Freud, Feminism and European Theater at the Turn of the Century* (Cornell UP, 1991); and Heather Braun, *The Rise and Fall of the Femme Fatale in British Literature 1790-1910* (Fairleigh Dickinson, 2012).

For example, the play opens with a comment from the Young Syrian: "How beautiful is the Princess Salomé tonight!" (Wilde, *Salomé* 552). This is repeated twice. After the second repetition, the same character remarks on the paleness of the princess, a clear example of parallelism: "How pale the Princess is. Never have I seen her so pale" (552).
See Jennifer Stevens, *The Historical Jesus and the Literary Imagination 1860-1920* (Liverpool UP, 2010). Stevens argues that Wilde took the notion of “fifth Gospel” from Joseph Earnest Renan, a French expert of ancient Middle Eastern languages and culture. In his 1863 *Vie de Jésus*, Renan writes that witnessing the Holy Land first-hand could reveal an “unread” testament of Jesus. Stevens notes that Wilde was a “fervent admirer” of Renan: “for [Wilde], Renan had established a doubter’s testament that liberated the Scriptures from the accretions of ecclesiastical dogma and the figure of Jesus from the supernatural trappings of divinity” (141).

See Joris-Karl Huysmans, *Against Nature: A New Translation of À rebours* (Penguin Books, 1959) and Marc Smeets, “Tastes of the Host,” in *French Food: On the Table, on the page, and in French Culture* (Routledge, 2001) 83-89. Interestingly, in *Against Nature*, Des Esseintes seems to be concerned that the communal host becoming all too material in the contemporary Church:

> But what was worse was that the two substances that were indispensible for the hold sacrifice, the two substances without which no oblation was possible, had also been adulterated: the wine by repeated diluting and the illicit addition of Pernambuco bark, elder-berries, alcohol, alum, salicylate, and litharge; the bread, that bread of the Eucharist which should be made from the finest of wheats, with bean flour, potash and pipe-clay! (344)

Des Esseintes laments that “God refused to come down to earth in the form of potato-flour” (345). Marc Smeets notes that Esseintes’ complain about the falsification of the sacramental materials marks him as “a decadent Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: the idolater of fakes and the doubting Christian” (85).


Wilde met several times with members of the clergy in the 1870s to discuss his potential conversion to Catholicism. In 1878, he arranged to be baptized by Father Sebastian Bowden, a priest in the Brompton Oratory, but on the day of the baptism, Wilde opted to forgo the ceremony and instead sent the priest a large bouquet of alter lilies.

See John F. Moffit, *Inspiration: Bacchus and the Cultural History of a Creation Myth* (Brill, 2005). Wilde was certainly not the first to conflate the figures of Christ and Dionysus. Moffit writes that Early Christian exegetes drew similar connections between Christ and Bacchus, particularly because both figures had promised “salvation in general and ‘unending felicity after death’ in particular” (121).

Later called Bacchus by the Romans, Dionysus is the god of wine and harvest in the Ancient Greek pantheon. Though there are variations of his myth, most versions agree that he is the son of a mortal, Semele, and a god, Zeus. When Hera, Zeus’ wife, finds out that Semele is pregnant, she persuades Semele to ask Zeus to reveal himself as he appears on Mount Olympus. When he does, Semele is destroyed by Zeus’ unrestrained divinity, compelling the god to rescue the unborn Dionysus by sewing the baby into his thigh. When Dionysus is born, Hera orders the Titans to eat the infant, and they proceed to render him limb from limb. The child is rescued and brought to court of Athamus; when the king goes mad, Dionysus is banished to the woods and raised by mountain nymphs who teach him how to cultivate the vine.

See Charles Segal, *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripedes’ Bacchae* (Princeton UP, 1997). Segal notes that Euripides’ play is mediated by a tension of reason and emotion that takes various forms: the “scientific and rationalists procedures associated with the Sophists, Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Thucydides” contrast with “the violence and instability [of] passion,” and “debates of logical exactitude” are set against “lyrics of wistful longing and nostalgia” (8). Other contradicting themes in the play include “delicate romanticism with unsparing realism” and “intense patriotism with bitter disillusion about contemporary politics” (8)


And as Apollo inspires and rules over all the music of strings, so Dionysus inspires and rules over all the music of the reed, the water-plant, in which the ideas of water and vegetable life are brought close together, natural property, therefore, of the spirit of life in the green sap... [Dionysus] fills for [his
worshippers] the place of Apollo; he is the inherent cause of music and
poetry; he inspires; he explains the phenomena of enthusiasm... (18)

In Pater’s aesthetics, Dionysian energy drives the creation of great art.

There are numerous Lord Henry Wotton/Walter Pater parallels in *The Picture of
Dorian Gray*, including several references to the “Conclusion” of Pater’s *Renaissance.*
Additionally, Lord Henry makes remarks to Dorian about youth’s fleetingness, "For
there is such a little time that your youth will last" (27), an echo of Pater’s line, "all
that is actual in it being a single moment, gone while we try to apprehend it" (840).
Wotton’s reflections on youth provoke Dorian to exchange his soul for eternal youth
and the ability to endlessly quest for “experience.” Dorian roams the globe for ten
years in the novel, desperate to exploit the capacity of his senses: he collects
perfumes, jewelry, and tapestries, listens to music, participates in Catholic mass,
reads Darwin’s philosophies, and even ventures into the opium dens, where “one
could buy oblivion" (197). At the novel’s end, Lord Wotton marvels at Dorian Gray’s
beauty and his continual drive to seek out sensation despite the passing of time.
Wotton notes, "You are quite flawless now" (231), an echo of Pater’s call "to burn
always with this hard, gem-like flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life"
(840).

See Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, trans. Clifton P. Fadiman (Dover,
1995). Nietzsche writes of tragedy:

> The metaphysical comfort—with which, as I have here intimated, every true
tragedy leave us—that, in spite of the flux of phenomena, life at bottom is
indestructibly powerful and pleasurable, appears with objective clarity as the
satyr chorus, the chorus of natural beings, who as it were live ineradically
behind every civilization, and who, despite the ceaseless change of
generation and the story of nations, remains the same to all eternity. (*Birth
22*)

See M.E. Humble, “Early British Interest in Nietzsche” in *German Life and Letters*
24.1 (1971) 327-335. In Germany, the publication of *The Birth of Tragedy*
immediately provoked heated debates in important academic circles; however, due
to the lack of available translations, Nietzsche was still largely unread outside of
Germany up until the beginning of the twentieth century (Humble 330). Both Pater
and Wilde read German, however, and the former would take up the same figures
that Nietzsche had—namely, Apollo and Dionysus—in a series of essays in the
of Euripides,” published in 1876, less than four years after *The Birth of Tragedy’s* publication.

xxxii See Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, trans. Clifton P. Fadiman (Dover, 1995). Of Dionysian ecstasy, Nietzsche writes:

In the Dionysiac dithyramb man is stimulated to the highest intensification of his symbolic powers; something that he has never felt before urgently demands to be expressed: the destruction of the veil of Maya, one-ness as the genius of humankind, indeed of nature itself. The essence of nature is bent on expressing itself; a new world of symbols is required, firstly the symbolism of the entire body, not just of the mouth, the face, the word, but the full gesture of dance with its rhythmical movement of every limb. (*Birth 21*)

xxxiii Of the effect of the chorus, Nietzsche writes, “...the Greek man of culture felt himself neutralized in the presence of the satiric chorus” (*Birth 22*). He continues, “and this is the most immediate effect of the Dionysian tragedy, that the state and society, and, in general, the gulfs between man and man give way to an overwhelming feeling of unity leading back to the very heart of nature” (22).

xxxiii See Jennifer Stevens, *The Historical Jesus and the Literary Imagination 1860-1920* (Liverpool UP, 2010). The reference to original sin is significant: as Jennifer Stevens notes, Wilde continually transforms the notion of sin into a means of self-knowledge unattainable to those who “keep within the bounds of society and practice self-restraint” (172).
Chapter 3

HELIOGABALUS’ REVELRY: WINE AND “HABITUS” IN DOROTHY RICHARDSON’S 

HONEYCOMB

Wine may function as a symbol of religion and myth in Wilde’s Salomé, but it also makes significant inferences about power, class, and gender relations in the play. For example, the Second Soldier’s remark that Herod possesses wines from Samothrace, Cyprus, and Sicily implies that only a man of great wealth and royal standing would and could acquire such an exotic collection. While Wilde often satirized upper class rituals and material preoccupations in his fiction, he had his own affinity for opulent furnishings, stylish clothing, fine food, and fashionable sparkling wines: he confessed a particular fondness for iced champagne during his 1895 libel trial against the Marquis de Queensbury, claiming, “[it] is a favorite drink of mine... strongly against my doctors orders” (Hyde 129). Wilde’s appreciation for a good vintage also becomes evident in his personal letters: he frequently makes reference to wine, citing “purple,” “yellow,” and “Italian” varieties, and one notable dispatch to Douglas Ainslie compels the Scottish poet to visit and drink “yellow wine from green glasses in Keats’s honour” (Complete Letters 281). Wine has been an object of desire in capital-driven systems for at least as long as humans have sought to record its trade, but the perception of the drink as a rare, prestigious, to some extent scandalous material good made it an especially privileged and exclusive commodity in late nineteenth-century England.
Published across the first half of the twentieth century, Dorothy Richardson’s thirteen-volume *Pilgrimage* series belies a wine knowledge even more extensive than Wilde’s. *Honeycomb*, the third novel in the series, is especially replete with wine imagery: in fact, while the other twelve novels make reference to the drink somewhat infrequently and often in passing, *Honeycomb* contains dozens of references to wine—including claret (Richardson 290), Burgundy (356), “hock” (356), Port (357), Moselle wines (376), sacramental wines (386), “delicate, bright wines” (386), “amber wine” (392), and champagne (462)—and drinking rituals play an important role in the development of the narrative and the shaping of its key characters. Significantly, *Honeycomb* focuses on protagonist Miriam Henderson’s arrival at, and eventual departure from, an extravagant estate in Newlands where she has been commissioned as a governess for the wealthy Corrie family’s two young children. Richardson devotes most of *Honeycomb* to Miriam’s perception of and reflection on the luxurious space and materials of Newlands, and the habits and activities of its residents and guests; wine—an emblematic luxury good—figures significantly in nearly all of the Corries’ daily meals and lavish social gatherings. Conversely, in *The Tunnel*, the novel subsequent to *Honeycomb* in the *Pilgrimage* series, Miriam secures her own apartment in London and begins professional work as a dental assistant: notably, the meals presented in this novel are meager banquets with new cosmopolitan acquaintances and austere dinners taken alone in the new Aerated Bread Company (ABC) cafés favored by London’s young urban professionals. We no longer read about “strange hot wine-clear, wine-flavored
soup[s]” and lines of wine glasses set at every plate to compliment multiple dinner course (356); the metropolitan working class Miriam—now a “guest of the city men”—dines almost exclusively on boiled eggs, butter rolls, and cups of coffee taken in the cafés. Richardson’s novels demonstrate how, beyond the biological and psychological effects food and drink have on an individual person, eating and drinking rituals establish cultural identity and define social relationships. *Honeycomb* allows us to consider the ways literary portrayals of wine have deep social and historical implications that influence our understanding of both the literary text and the context in which the text was produced. Richardson, writing the *Pilgrimage* novels in the first half of the twentieth century (1912-1946) about a character whose life parallels her own at the end of the nineteenth century (spanning the years 1891-1912), uses the communal and individual dining and drinking habits of her characters to elucidate, analyze, and eventually distance both Miriam and herself from Victorian class, gender, and literary norms.

Richardson’s background provides some context for her interest in generational, class-based, and gendered social behavior and restrictions. Her father inherited a prosperous wine and provisions company before her birth in 1873, but sold the business and supported his family with the substantial proceeds while his four daughters were still young. When Richardson was five years old, she was sent to a small private school for affluent families until her father’s successful investments allowed the family to move to London. A governess oversaw Richardson’s education until she was sent to Southborough House, a school run by a
headmistress dedicated to John Ruskin’s progressive educational methods; Richardson studied history, literature, and language, and developed a “fascination of words, of their study roots, their growth and transformation” (Richardson, “Data” 17). After her father lost his firm in 1893, the family’s destitution compelled Richardson to secure a position as a teacher at a school in Hanover, Germany. Her mother’s physical and mental decline soon brought Richardson back to England, where she took a job as a governess. In 1895, lacking the means to procure treatment for her severe depression, Richardson’s mother committed suicide by slitting her throat with a kitchen knife during a vacation with her daughter. Following her mother’s death, Richardson became a dental secretary in London; she lived in Bloomsbury and reveled in the bohemian lifestyle and activity of the city. She continued to grapple with poverty but began to fund her newfound love for society, art, and theater by publishing short stories, poems, and non-fiction articles in a variety of periodicals such as Crank, Dental Record, Adelphi and Vanity Fair. She struggled to support herself as a writer until her death, a circumstance made all the more bittersweet by the financial independence enjoyed by many of her contemporaries. While Richardson’s childhood exposed her to an affluent lifestyle and material luxuries, her adolescence was characterized by the constant threat of poverty and a struggle to obtain financial independence that persisted throughout her adult life. Her constant insecurity about her financial status and independence informs both her personal and public writing, and is particularly evident, as we shall see, in the struggles of her protagonist in Pilgrimage.
Richardson began writing *Pointed Roofs*, the first *Pilgrimage* novel, in 1912 at the age of 39; in a letter to a friend, she writes, “I remember... my astonishment when *Pointed Roofs* was greeted as a ‘Novel’” (Windows 496). Duckworth released the novel in 1915—the same year they published Woolf’s *The Voyage Out*—and *Pointed Roofs* was serialized alongside Joyce’s *Ulysses* in the *Little Review* four years later. Richardson continued to write and publish *Pilgrimage* in parts, as eleven separate novels, between 1915 and 1935; the series was reissued in 1938 in four volumes comprised of twelve “chapter novels” (Richardson’s term for the individual novels). *March Moonlight*, a thirteenth novel, was added posthumously to the 1967 edition of *Pilgrimage*. *Pilgrimage* records Miriam’s experiences, perceptions, and reflections from 1891, when she is 17, until 1915, when she is just about to begin her career as a writer. Passages in the novel reveal that Miriam has grown up with substantial material comforts provided by a father who aspires to live as a “gentleman,” but *Pointed Roofs* opens with the family near bankruptcy, forcing Miriam to leave her home in Barnes to earn money as a teacher at a girls school in Hanover. Over the course of *Pilgrimage*, Miriam will work for meager compensation as a teacher, governess, dental secretary, and journalist; after the third novel, she begins to engage with various political groups and social circles, attends lectures, reads and grapples with influential philosophical theories, spends a period of time living in a Quaker community (Richardson published two books on the Quaker community in 1914), and eventually decides to become a writer. Deborah Parsons describes *Pilgrimage* as a “fictionalized account [...] of the thwarted prospects,
trauma, depression, hard work and creative determination that characterized [Richardson’s] own life” (8). While contemporary critics resist categorizing Pilgrimage as fictional autobiography, the experiences of the writer closely parallel—and we might say, meticulously inform—her depiction of Miriam Henderson’s life and experiences.

Any consideration of Richardson’s writing and the details she chose to include in her novels must take into account her experimental writing style. She composed Pilgrimage using a myriad of narrative techniques, including free indirect discourse: in her 1918 review of Pointed Roofs published in The Egoist, writer and suffragist May Sinclair adopted the term “stream of consciousness” from philosopher and psychologist William James to describe Richardson’s narrative method (442). Unfinished sentences, unconventional punctuation and syntax, jumps from third- to first-person dialogue, and temporal incongruities comprise Miriam’s internal monologue. In the Pilgrimage novels, readers encounter events as Miriam is made conscious of them, and Richardson provides no details about Miriam’s future before they unfold. Similarly, background information is not conventionally revealed and instead comes in flashbacks contextualized by the immediate circumstance, a strategy that bothered Katherine Mansfield: “She has no memory,” Mansfield writes, “[i]t is true that Life is sometimes very swift and breathless, but not always [...] there are large pauses in which we creep away in our caves of contemplation” (12). Mansfield’s argument is accentuated by Woolf’s critique that “sensations, impressions, ideas and emotions glance off [Miriam],
unrelated and unquestioned, without shedding as much hope as we had hoped into the hidden depths” (444). Woolf and Mansfield’s comments derive in part from their contention with Richardson’s decision to convey details and events in the early *Pilgrimage* novels in a manner that Miriam, barely seventeen at the beginning of *Pointed Roofs* and not yet twenty-two at the conclusion of *Honeycomb*, would have perceived and processed them. But as Sinclair astutely notes, Richardson limits the narrative entirely to her protagonist’s experience, refusing to extend the narrative scope beyond Miriam’s “first hand, intimate and intense reality” (443). Sinclair also argues that Richardson brings readers “closer to reality than any of our novelists who are trying so desperately to get close” (443). Acknowledging Richardson’s writing style and narrative technique is imperative to developing an understanding of her treatment of “things”—such as wine, as I will argue—in the *Pilgrimage* novels: because the details the reader is given are those that impinge on Miriam’s consciousness, the objects that consistently grab her attention or that invoke profound contemplation should be considered especially significant to the progression of the narrative and/or the development of Miriam’s character.

Richardson’s portrayal of “reality,” especially in the first three novels of the series, drew substantial criticism from early reviewers, many of whom accused her of relying too heavily upon the conventions of late nineteenth-century literary realism. Richardson acknowledges her debt to the Victorian realists in an introduction originally published in Dent’s 1938 edition of *Pilgrimage* that appeared in numerous subsequent editions: she cites French writer Honoré de Balzac, whom
she calls the “father of realism,” and Arnold Bennett, whom she refers to as an equivalent realist in the English literary tradition, as writers whose novels consider human psychology and contemporary society, rather than provide superficial fictional accounts of imaginary worlds or societies of the past (9). However, as George Thompson argues, while *Pilgrimage* is a “recollecting of Richardson’s own encounter with the history and culture of her period,” it is also “more than a realistic narrative” (3-4). Richardson’s presentation of Miriam’s interiority does not attempt to disregard empirical reality, nor does it attempt to relentlessly record the sensory data Miriam’s mind receives. While she includes historical context (like the Wilde trials, the suffragette marches, and the Boer war) in her fiction, the perception and relevance of details and events are relegated to Miriam’s consciousness of them: as Richardson asserts in a correspondence, “information there must be,” but when “given directly as information, the sense of immediate experience is gone” (*Windows* 68). In *Clear Horizon*, the eleventh novel in the *Pilgrimage* series, Hypo Wilson, a young writer and intellectual modeled after H. G. Wells, makes an appeal to Miriam to record the significant events of her time:

> You have in your hands material for a novel, a dental novel, a human novel and, as to background, a complete period, a period of unprecedented expansion in all sorts of direction... [...] in your outer world you’ve seen an almost ceaseless transformation, from the beginning of the safety bicycle to the arrival of the motor car and the aeroplane. With the coming of flying, that period is ended and another begins. You ought to document your period. (397)

Miriam doesn’t reply to Hypo, a reaction that exemplifies, as Jean Radford argues, Richardson’s own ambivalence towards traditional forms of documentation (19).
Richardson’s attempt to distance herself from the nineteenth-century realists, and indeed, from Victorian fiction in general, becomes evident in Miriam’s questioning of the nature of reality and of the intrinsic value of objects, language, and even being. Jesse Matz argues that Richardson’s “singular modernity” can be seen in her portrayal of Miriam as a woman “searching for the basic identity most characters can take for granted, asking essential questions about being itself, and about the discrepancies between appearance and reality” (10). Miriam’s questioning of herself and her surroundings is what makes the presentation of wine in Honeycomb so compelling (and so compPELLingly modernist): as we will see, Richardson uses Miriam’s perception of objects like wine to reveal hidden structures of relations that determine and shape the practices, investments, and interests of the characters. In essence, Richardson uses Miriam’s fictional world to critique the social structures and hierarchies that inform our “reality.”

Because wine is such a prominently referenced object in Honeycomb, an understanding of its importance to English culture and history elucidates its function in the novel and in the Pilgrimage series as a whole. The perception of wine as a commodity with significant exchange value may be nearly as old as civilization itself, but at Jonathan Nossiter argues, the English were the first to create “a financial—and social—calculus of wine not only for the aristocracy but also, crucially, for the bourgeoisie and the nouveaux riches” (121). The roots of this development can be traced back to the Interregnum—the period after the execution of Charles I in 1649 and before the restoration of Charles II in 1660—when wine
and its representational powers became, more than ever before, explicitly tied to politics and elitism in England. As James Nicholls argues, when “the traditional wine-drinking elite” were usurped by the masses, wine ceased to be “simply part of a cultural milieu and came instead to stand for a specific set of political beliefs” (25).

The Licensing Act of 1552 made clear delineations with regards to the nature of drinking establishments: alehouses (i.e. “tippling houses,” or “public houses”) generally sold only ale; inns sold a wider range of food and drink to travelers and became an important center of activity for the social and political elite; taverns, in theory at least, sold only wine (Earnshaw 5). Lawmakers effectually enforced the exclusivity of wine by drafting statutes that set limits on the number of taverns allowed in each city and allowing licenses to be granted by those “nominated, appointed, and assigned by the head officers” (11). A limited number of taverns meant that for many patrons, alehouses were the only sort of establishment where drinking could take place. Hence, wine became associated with gentlemen of wealth or royal standing in England; beer—and the poorer populations that frequented the alehouses—represented the unsophisticated masses that had somehow managed to usurp royal control. Drink continued to be an important political symbol during the Restoration: wine, which “stood for sophistication, conviviality, wit, and good taste,” as well as loyalty to the crown, became a symbol for the Tories, and ale became a symbol for the aristocracy-disdaining Whigs (Nicholls 29). The seventeenth century also saw rapid growth in the demand for luxury goods in English trade: Linda Peck notes that by 1660 wine held the highest value of any English import, followed by
raw silk and sugar (31). Michelle O’Callaghan further argues that the growth of London as a metropolis “placed new pressures on an urban elite to distinguish itself from the commonality” (37). The luxury goods demanded in the seventeenth century prompted national demand for these products in the eighteenth century and thus informed the development of luxury good markets and consumer spending habits during this period.

By the nineteenth century, common coffeehouses and grocery establishments sold wine (and other luxury products such as tea, sugar, and exotic spices) directly out of their storefronts: this had the effect of increasing market competition and consumer demand for wine and wine paraphernalia (e.g. glasses, decanters, corkscrews, etc).xi By the mid-1800s, independent wine companies such as Berry Bros. and Rudd and John Harvey and Sons were thriving in the marketplace: in fact, the 1855 château classification of Bordeaux wines—ostensibly, a celebration of France’s prestigious terroirs—was created by English wine merchants for the purpose of having systematic method of pricing for the English-dominated “claret” market (Nossiter 105).xii English Prime Minister William Gladstone implemented the first off-premise alcohol licenses in 1861, prompting an unprecedented boom in domestic wine retailing in England. In the 1870s, wine firms attempted to capitalize on previously untapped markets by posting advertisements in local papers that appealed to working class budgets and tastes: for example, the Victorian Wine Company ran ads in national and local newspapers that promoted their wine “at prices hitherto unheard of in England, thereby placing an expensive
luxury within the reach of all classes” (qtd. in Unwin 328). However, even with unprecedented decreases on the taxes on wine and a popular belief, spurred by the temperance debates, that wine was less addictive and thus less dangerous than beer and gin, the drink continued to be “largely the preserve of the aristocracy and to some extent the bourgeoisie” (Unwin 327). Despite a temporary rise in wine consumption overall and significant increases in wine consumption by the middle classes, wine continued to be a “luxury” good—especially when a phylloxera infestation devastated European wine crops in the 1870s and 1880s—that was still unavailable to most working-class consumers. Richardson may have learned about an array of wine varietals from her father, who must have had extensive knowledge on the subject through his wine and grocery business, but it is also possible that she was encouraged to develop an appreciation for, and perhaps was even educated on, luxury goods and “elite” tastes in her youth. This may also explain why Miriam—having both lived with and lost material comforts—is able to acknowledge and reflect on the behavior and tastes of her wealthy patrons even when her own social and economic status keeps her from participating.

Richardson uses the Pilgrimage series to critique the social and economic structures that stratified English society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; she thus questions the processes of exclusivity that define and support this stratification. Her interest in the role “things” play in creating these system is emphasized by her decision to devote over a third of the novel to a minutely detailed record of the objects Miriam observes and admires on her departure from
North London and arrival at the wealthy Newlands home of Mr. and Mrs. Corrie. In a 1935 letter to novelist and poet Annie Winifred Ellerman, Richardson describes her view of Miriam’s social position:

My books, in their substance, do belong to “the workers,” the bourgeois working-class into which M. [Miriam] was pitched headlong without training or suitable preparation, & wherewith she is a sympathetic onlooker. She fails to recognize herself as ‘a worker,’ always, though quite unconsciously, assuming that life should be leisure and should be lived in perfect surroundings. (Windows 304)

Miriam’s participation in, and exclusion from, the leisured classes gives her the unique ability to experience the world of Newlands as both an insider and an outsider; she is also more sensitive to the system of exclusivity that works to support such class distinctions. Miriam’s perception of the Corries’ Newlands home as a “strange,” removed, and restricted domestic and economic space manifests in her description of its physicality:

It was so far away from everything, trams and people and noise—it was in the centre of beautiful exciting life; perfectly still and secure [...] One of the windows was hasped a few inches open. No sound came in... Soft moist air and the smell of trees. Nothing but woods all round, everywhere. (Honeycomb 360)

Elizabeth Bronfen argues that when Miriam compares this unfamiliar “self-enclosed, utopian site” to London, Newlands becomes an “idyllic island of luxury, particularly in comparison to the Henderson’s suburban existence” (16). The unfamiliarity of the space heightens Miriam’s awareness, making the most minute details impress on her attentive and analyzing mind: she makes note of the patterns of the household curtains, the subjects of the paintings on the walls, and even the number of wine glasses at each dinner setting. Miriam’s discomfort in this space is repeatedly
emphasized: when she first settles in her room, she contemplates her image in a full length mirror and immediately focuses in on her plain black dress, concluding, “this dress is a nightmare in this room” (354). The heightened awareness of her “strange” surroundings continues as she takes her first meal at Newlands: she eats the “wine-clear, wine-flavored soup” and marvels at the four wine glasses at each place setting, including one “on a high stem, curved and fluted like a shallow tulip, filled with hock” (355). Other new and unfamiliar foods arrive at the table: olives; a “tiny ready-cut saddle” of lamb; fish with “scales like mother-of-pearl and pink fins,” and more wine, this time a Burgundy that “leapt to Miriam’s brain and opened her eyes [...] spread through her limbs, a warm silky tide”; rich caramel and nuts; and finally, a glass of port that Miriam refuses with Mrs. Corrie’s approval (356-357).

The “things” of Newlands—the furniture, the stemware, the food served at dinner—aren’t merely props invoked to achieve verisimilitude: the objects and images Richardson details have impinged on Miriam’s consciousness for some significant, if not immediately understood to her, reason, and thus affect her perceptions, reflections, and the development of her identity.xiv

When Miriam arrives at Newlands, she is immediately served her first elaborate dinner in the Corries’ elegant dining room. As she eats, she rehearses the appropriate dining rituals in her head (“two things about soup besides taking it from the side of your spoon, which everybody knows—you eat soup, and you tilt your plate away, not towards you” (354)) and again makes note of the formal place settings (“four varies wine classes at each right hand” (355)). In his influential
"Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste," Pierre Bourdieu argues that the “bourgeoisie concern” with highly formulaic presentations is an “expression of a habitus of order, restraint and propriety which may not be abdicated”:

The manner of presenting and consuming the food, the organization of the meal and setting of the places, strictly differentiated according to the sequence of dishes and arranged to please the eye, the presentation of the dishes, considered as much in terms of shape and colour (like works of art) as of their consumable substance, the etiquette governing posture and gesture, was of serving oneself and others, of using the different utensils, the seating plan, strictly but discreetly hierarchical, the censorship of all bodily manifestation of the act or pleasure of eating (such as noise or haste), the very refinement of the things consumed, with quantity – this whole commitment to stylization tends to shift the emphasis from substance and function to form and manner... (196)

Bourdieu suggests that the knowledge and use of cultural artifacts—demonstrated in part by “tastes” for certain kinds of objects like food, clothing, and art—sublimate relations of subordination between classes and class fractions in modern capitalist society. Individuals understand themselves and conform their expectations to a specific “field” within a hierarchy of social, political, and economic power. As Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson explains, a field essentially constructs a “social universe,” in which participants are both producers and consumers “caught in a complex web of social, political, economic and cultural relations that they themselves have in part woven and continue to weave” (5). These dynamics frequently play out in Honeycomb in the space of the Corries’ elaborately furnished dining room: as Diana McGee argues, in the nineteenth century, the dining room served as the arena of social performance and distinction (36). “It was expected that those who had achieved wealth would flaunt it at the table” McGee notes, a spectacle
intended to “define elite society both for its inner circle and for those who were outside the dinners” (38). Observing her first dinner party at the Corrie household, an overwhelmed Miriam at first wishes she could “sit there and watch and listen but not to dine,” but when Mr. Corrie encourages Miriam to “have some Moselle” (a sweet white wine), she suddenly feels “welcome to share the ritual of the feast” (Richardson, *Honeycomb* 376). While this early scene portrays Miriam as being “intoxicated”—in both the physical and metaphorical sense—by the wealthy Newlands lifestyle, by the novel’s end, the initial charm of the ornate house and the Corrie family’s belongings and behavior is lost on Miriam. In the following pages, I argue that while Miriam arrives at Newlands longing to “belong” to the social arena of the Corrie family, she progressively embraces her position as an outsider to the institutions she increasingly identifies as masculine and elitist. Lacking the physical capital (i.e. monetary capital) of the Newland’s set—symbolized in part, I argue, by “luxury” objects like wine—Miriam relies on her “cultural capital” (i.e. her education, speech, and knowledge of books and art) to promote herself as an actor with social mobility beyond economic means.

Surveying the dining room at the first Newlands dinner party, Miriam notes that the table has been set with the “little groups of Venetian wine and finger glasses and fine silver and cutlery that had accompanied [her] first sense of dining” (376). According to Bourdieu, an individual’s “habitus” is determined by the information inscribed in the social surroundings that he/she internalizes at a very young age: the first “field” (the space in which individuals—or to use Bourdieu’s term, “social
agents”—and their positions are located) is the family (which is determined by social class and has its own physical, economic, and symbolic power relations). As John Speller argues, for Bourdieu, these earliest fields determine our sense of “who we are” and “where we belong” (20):

The process of socialization continues through various rites of initiation and institution, from the most obvious (a qualification, entrance into a profession, a promotion of marriage, etc), to the slightest (a snub or sign of appreciation), whereby, as is following a path of least resistance (which is not to say without worries and uncertainty, which form part of the process of investiture) we submit willingly to our destiny: doing, and being, what our families, institutions, society, and we ourselves, expect of us. (20)

In the opening pages of Honeycomb, Miriam dwells on her return to the upper-class lifestyle of Newlands as “natural” given the her refined upbringing: when she rides to the estate in a fancy horse-drawn carriage, she thinks, “this is me; this is right; I’m used to dainty broughams” (Richardson 351). And yet, Richardson simultaneously reminds us that Miriam no longer occupies the elite social position of her youth. Despite her hopes that “poverty and discomfort had been shut out of her life when the brougham door closed behind her” (351), when Miriam arrives at the Corries’ home, she recurrently thinks of her presence there as fraudulent: “They wanted a governess. She was not a governess […] It was a mistake” (352). As Honeycomb progresses, and as Miriam becomes increasingly aware of her subservient position in the social arena of Newlands as “a helpless dingy little governess” (396), her perception of the estate shifts from seeing it as “the centre of beautiful, exciting life” (360) to finding it to be “very remote” (431) and nothing more than “spectacle and pageant” (443). According to Bourdieu’s model of habitus and field, individuals
often reject the practices, goods, positions and groups from which they are excluded; those who do not hold dominant social positions will continually struggle to assert their dominance by subverting the capital of other social groups while simultaneously promoting their own forms of capital as superior in order to confer status and power. By the end of *Honeycomb*—and by the beginning of Richardson’s subsequent *Pilgrimage* novel, *The Tunnel*—Miriam begins to position herself (and readers begin to see her as) as an actor in a developing, modern social community of young urban professionals. However, in line with Bourdieu’s logic, the partial liberation from domestic and reproductive functions afforded to women at the turn of the century continues to be mediated—and thus dominated—by a traditional, masculine social force (hence, why Miriam is only able to procure “professional” work as a secretary after leaving Newlands and struggles to procure adequate financial capital throughout the entire *Pilgrimage* series).xviii

Bourdieu uses the term “field of power” to describe the “structure of the existing balance of forces between forms of power”: it is also a “field of struggles for power among the holders of different forms of power” (*Invitation* 76). In *Honeycomb*, the Corries are dominant actors in the field of power by means of their economic capital; the Corries have active control of Miriam’s livelihood and their wealth affords them freedom having to think about materials as necessities (a position poignantly juxtaposed in the novel against Miriam’s mother’s inability to afford proper medical care). Richardson also makes it clear that Miriam identifies men—and particularly Mr. Corrie, whose employment as a lawyer grants him a
great deal of economic and social capital—as occupying the dominant position in the social context of Newlands: reflecting on the Corries' social rituals, she thinks that “it seemed as if these things had been got together only for the ease of the men” (*Honeycomb* 376). She later asserts that all women like Mrs. Corrie must “liv[e] in a gloom where there were no thoughts,” having only to “mak[e] men smile and trot about and look silly... no room for ideas; except in smoking-rooms—and—laboratories” (404). Though Miriam at first enjoys her interaction with Mr. Corrie, by the end of her tenure at Newlands, she vehemently detests the “hard brutal laughing complacent atmosphere of men’s minds” (443). Speller argues that Bourdieuan theory sees these moments of upheaval as “extensions of the struggles between the dominant over their relative power [...] as the dominated-dominant ally themselves provisionally (and precariously) with the dominated” (48). In *Honeycomb*, this conflict is exemplified by a series of scenes ostensibly tied to yet another weekend party at Newlands. The first involves Miriam’s invitation to participate in a game of billiards with the men, which feels in the moment like the experience of “communion” with “the men with whom she was linked in the joyous forward-going strife of the game” (Richardson 435). Miriam’s growing comfort with Mr. Corrie and the men—daring, even to share a cigarette with them in the smoking room—is shattered after she contributes an opinion regarding one of Mr. Corrie’s cases that he roundly refuses: “He dropped her and took up a lead coming from a man at the other end of the table” (442).
It is during the scene where Miriam smokes a cigarette with Mr. Corrie that she first identifies herself as a “new woman” (436). Sally Ledger argues that at the turn of the twentieth century, the concept of the “New Woman” corresponded to the increasing power and visibility of professional, activist females:

She was, variously, a feminist activist, a social reformer, a popular novelist, a suffragette playwright, a woman poet; she was also often a fictional constriction, a discursive response to the activities of the late-nineteenth century women’s movement. (1)

Bourdieu argues that despite its durability, habitus “may be changed by history, that is by new experiences, education or training (which implies that aspects of what remains unconscious in habitus be made at least partially conscious and explicit)” (Habitus 45, original emphasis). Miriam’s developing conception of herself as a “new woman” (Richardson, Honeycomb 436) manifests in the context of sharing a series of ritual—billiards and cigarettes in the drawing room—with the men at Newlands. However, Bourdieu insists that a change in habitus is never a matter of exact imitation or repetition: “As a dynamic system of dispositions that interact with one another,” he argues, “it has as such, a generative capacity” (Habitus 46). The habitus “generates investigations and improvements within limits [...] there is a dialectical confrontation between habitus, as structured structure, and objective structures” (46). Honeycomb records a shift in Miriam’s habitus that occurs both within and against the context of Newlands and its patrons. Recognizing that she is not an accepted agent of the dominant social habitus, Miriam shifts the understanding of her position in society; once hopeful that she could become a permanent fixture of the “fairyland” (Richardson, Honeycomb 355) of Newlands, she
now longs to “[leave] forever” the domain of Mrs. Corrie and her companions (“bright beautiful coloured birds, fading slowly year by year in the stifling atmosphere” (443)), and Mr. Corrie and his acquaintances (with their “men’s minds, staring at things, ignorantly, knowing ‘everything’ in an irritating way and yet ignorant” (443)). Because Miriam cannot contend with the Corries’ economic capital, she attempts to establish her superiority to them via the advancement of her cultural capital (which Bourdieu locates in qualities like education, cultural knowledge, artistic competence).\textsuperscript{xx} The longer Miriam works for the Corries, the more she asserts the quality of her own sensory abilities over the Corrie family and their guests: a once-admired houseguest “hasn’t the least idea how beautiful things really are” (403), Mrs. Corrie is “dead in ignorance and living bravely on” (404), and even Mr. Corrie, by the end of Miriam’s stay at Newlands, looks to her “like a ferret [looking about] for small clever things, causes, immediate near causes that appeared to explain, and explained nothing” (443). He “understand[s] nothing,” and is, like his wife, “ignorant” (443). Even the Corrie children are condemned by Miriam to “grow up and be exactly like their parents” and thus live “in a kind of prison” (365). In effect, Miriam distinguishes herself from the Corries in part by emphasizing their lack of cultural capital.

Though Bourdieu applies his sociological theories to the “literary field” and the production of literature in \textit{Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field}, many scholars remain skeptical of the application of theories to literature: in the closing remarks of Modern Language Quarterly’s special edition on Bourdieu, Toril
Moi asserts that Bourdieuan textual analysis will cause “huge problems” for literary critics because it necessitates the acclimation of immense amount of data (497). However, I believe Bourdieu’s theories regarding social classifications and distinctions invite new and important discussions on the function of objects as they relate to economic and cultural capital in literature: as Bourdieu himself claims in Rules, literature may be able to “say more, even about the social realm, than many writings with scientific pretensions” (32). The wine references in Honeycomb, for example, can be read as symbols of both the Corries’ economic capital and Miriam’s (and Richardson’s) cultural capital, and thus work to elucidate the systems of distinction at work in the novel. Miriam includes descriptions of wine in every dining or party scene that occurs in the Corrie household (made all the more significant by Richardson’s decision to make very few, if any, references to wine in the novels that precede and follow Honeycomb). Mrs. Corrie’s first conversation with Miriam opens with an appeal to the new governess to drink the wine set out for dinner: “Oh you must have Burgundy—spin-spin and Burgundy; awful good; a thimble-full, half a glass; that’s right” (Richardson, Honeycomb 356). When Miriam eventually meets Mr. Corrie, he too is flanked by wine and wine paraphernalia in her description—“the decanters stood in a little group between him and the great bowl of flaring purple and crimson anemones that stood in the centre of the table” (376), and, like Mrs. Corrie, immediately compels her to drink wine. Given Unwin’s assertion, discussed earlier in my argument, that wine at the end of the nineteenth century had not yet become readily accessible to consumers beyond the wealthy
professional and aristocratic classes, we can deduce that Miriam’s familiarity with the wines and wine paraphernalia belie her bourgeoisie upbringing (and indeed, the Venetian wine glasses are among the list of things that Richardson writes, “accompanied Miriam’s first sense of dining” (376)). But between the Henderson family’s lost fortune and Miriam’s inability to procure work above the station of a governess, Miriam no longer has the economic capital necessary to have power in the social field occupied by the Corrie family.

However, Miriam does possess the kind of cultural capital often associated with upper-class behavior, tastes, and activities; aptly, her advancement of this type of capital can also be read in the wine references of Honeycomb. Miriam knows how to drink and appreciate wine, she has preferences in wine, and she draws upon the representation of wine in art. Though Miriam is “intoxicated” (356) by the Burgundy and creamed spinach impressed upon her by Mrs. Corrie, and feels “welcomed to share in the ritual of the feast” (376) when Mr. Corrie offers her the Moselle, the wine references become more sinister as her unhappiness and feelings of exclusion from Newlands grow: “There was to be another weekend,” Richardson writes, “people sitting easily about a table with flushed faces...someone standing drunkenly up with eyes blazing with friendliness and a raised wine glasses” (391). The wines that once warmed Miriam’s blood and made her feel as though she was a part of the social ritual now invite a menacing reaction: “women and wine” she thinks, “the roses of Heliogabalus” (391). The painting Miriam recalls, Sir Lawrence Alma Tadema’s The Roses of Heliogabalus (1888), depicts the party guests of the Syro-
Roman sun god Heliogabalus (also known as Elagabalus) being smothered by piles of rose petals that fall from the ceiling for the amusement of the emperor and his companions. Just behind the emperor is a statue of Dionysus and his lover; beside the table a maenad, one of the female followers of the wine god, plays a double pipe. The painting exemplifies Miriam’s association of the Newlands revelers with the dead or the dying: “Suppose a skeleton walked in?” she muses, “[o]ffer it a glass of wine” (391). Miriam thus uses her cultural capital as it relates to wine to undermine the value of the Corries’ wine as economic capital. By the end of Honeycomb, the shift of her habitus (e.g. her values, expectations, and tastes) can be read in the lack of wine references—save for one reference to the champagne served after her sisters wed wealthy gentlemen—and Miriam’s preference of coffee or tea taken alone in her room or with her mother.

Though Miriam attempts to assert her dominance at the Newlands residence by belittling the Corries’ lack of cultural capital, reminders of the economical capital she has no access to recurrently come up in the narrative. Bourdieu argues that changes in women’s social and economic condition are also mediated through a traditional, masculine system: “the changes to the condition of women still obey the logic of the traditional model of the division between the masculine and the feminine” (Masculine 101). Women’s emancipation, he argues, cannot flow from a “liberating prise de conscious”; only “a radical transformation in the social conditions of the production of dispositions” can pose a meaningful challenge to traditional gender roles and identities (48). After Miriam leaves Newlands to attend her sisters’
weddings at the Henderson family home, she travels to a seaside boarding house in Brighton with her mother. Her financial situation leaves Miriam unable to procure professional help for her mother’s persistent insomnia and depression: “Money. That was why nothing had been done. ‘The doctor’ had to be afforded as she was so ill, but nothing had been done [...] Some-one must pay, any one” (476). Miriam’s belief that affording a good doctor is the only thing that could help her mother is exacerbated by that fact that Mrs. Henderson’s failing mental and physical health seems to have started with the loss of her own material wealth and social status.

While Miriam and her sisters have been able to confront the family’s financial situation by procuring some sense of security through work or marriage, their mother has internalized the stress and shame of what she believes to be divine punishment for her domestic failures: because she subconsciously values her body as a form of economic capital—as Bourdieu would controversially conclude, all women in matrimonial makers are objects “whose function is to contribute to the perpetuation or expansion of the symbolic capital held by men” (Masculine 43)—her metaphorical “fall” from the field of power has crippled her sense of self-worth. Miriam takes her mother to local amusements to revitalize her, reads the Bible to her in sleepless nights, and encourages her to drink “Mrs. Meldrum’s good beef tea” in an attempt to soothe her, but *Honeycomb* closes with Mrs. Henderson’s suicide.

Richardson relays Miriam’s somatic reaction to finding the body in detail:

> It was so difficult to move. Everything was airy and transparent. Her heavy hot light impalpable body was the only solid thing in the world, weighing tons; and like a lifeless feather. There was a tray of plates of fish and fruit on the table. She looked at it, heaving with sickness and looking at it. I am
hungry. Sitting down near it she tried to pull the tray. It would not move. I must eat the food. Go on eating food, till the end of my life. Plates of food like these plates of food. (Honeycomb 490)

Miriam’s overwhelming physical and emotional response to the scene of her mother’s body is conveyed indirectly: the narrative oscillates between first person and omniscient perspectives before finding focus in Miriam’s own body and manifesting in feelings of nausea. After Honeycomb, Miriam’s gnawing sense that she will never be satiated becomes a recurrent theme in Pilgrimage: as Lois Cucullu argues, from her mother’s suicide on, “the everyday practice of eating bears an extra burden” for Miriam (47). Miriam’s response to her mother’s death stresses just how much the food objects of Pilgrimage matter: indeed, the only thing that impinges on Miriam’s consciousness in this scene is the plate of food and her own responses to that food.

While The Tunnel, the fourth novel in the Pilgrimage series, contains far fewer references to wine than Honeycomb, there are over dozens of scenes that make reference to eating and dining, several of which span multiple pages of the work. This emphasis on eating is in part influenced by Miriam’s new job as a dental secretary—a position that marks her shift from the domestic realm to the institution of urban professionalism—which brings her less than a pound a week and often forces her to choose between her beloved books and food. At the same time, this new job and salary enable Miriam to join the new and growing population of women who were able to work and live autonomously in London at the turn of the century. Miriam is thrilled with her newfound sense of independence: “[s]omeone must
know she was in London, free, earning her own living” (Richardson, *The Tunnel* 30). The beginning of the twentieth century saw middle class women in England entering the professional labor force in unprecedented numbers: Tilly and Scott note that between 1881 and 1911, the percentage of English women working in the service sector nearly doubled, while the percentage of those working in industry steadily declined (161). The twentieth century also saw a decline in family dining rituals that coincided with increased participation in dining alone: as McGee argues, this change in dining patterns developed out of an increase in the number of single professionals unattached to an extended family, increased numbers of restaurants and cafes, and “the growing acceptability, even for women, of eating out” (25). In *The Tunnel*, Miriam regularly dines at an Aerated Bread Company café, her meal of choice a sparse boiled egg with a buttered roll. The ABCs were cheap but generally respectable restaurants that aimed to serve London’s new consumers and professionals at the turn of the century: Scott McCracken posits that the cafes appealed to women “[i]n a city well known for its unsanitary and poor-quality food and the masculine culture of its pubs and eating houses” (63). Cucullu suggests that the ABCs allowed for an increase in two kinds of socially accepted public performance: the cafés gave members of the opposite sex the opportunity to dine together in public and without stigmatization, while simultaneously preserving the specter of private dining (44). Seated alone at a small table over an unshared meal among other strangers gives Miriam the freedom of anonymity. McGee argues that for women working at the beginning of the twentieth century, the restaurant meal
represented “freedom from domestic fetters and liberation from such potentially onerous tasks as organizing, cooking, and serving meals” (89). Miriam’s egg and roll represent her participation in a more diversified, democratic society, a model in stark contrast with the luxurious and exclusionary dining practices—including wine pairing, tasting, and toasting rituals—that occur in the Corrie family home. The difference in the meaning signified by these objects is essential to understanding the questions raised about gender and class throughout Pilgrimage.

Representations of wine in literature provide a lens through which we can examine themes such as identity, autonomy, community, class, and gender, and the importance of these issues to specific writers and entire cultures. In Honeycomb, like the entire Pilgrimage series, Richardson attempts to elucidate and critique the class-based behavioral norms and social workings of the nineteenth century, and in doing so, works to distinguish both herself and Miriam from strictures and ideology of that period: as Anita Levy argues, Richardson deals a “decisive blow to the domestic model” (65). For Richardson, part of this process involves using a unique narrative style to emphasize material goods that represent the values of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century society: in this function, wine represents the sensibility and exclusivity of upwardly-mobile Victorian individuals and groups. Richardson’s personal wine knowledge belies her participation in this privileged social class, but it is her experience with the struggle to survive as an urban working woman at the turn of the century that allowed her to be sensitive to the consequences of this exclusivity. Pilgrimage serves as an exemplary model for understanding how
literary references to wine give readers an opportunity to better understand, or freshly reconsider, how writers from the modernist period conceptualized wine as it functions in the object world and its cultural significance as a material good: while the material of fiction is often delegated strictly to the imaginary, literature’s ability to both shape and respond to culture can help us better understand how the objects of literature, like wine, do more than establish the setting of a work.
“Claret” is the English term for any red wine from Bordeaux. Port is a sweet, red, brandy-fortified wine from Portugal, especially favored by English aristocracy in the eighteenth century. The term “hock” refers to any white wine from Germany.

The bulk of the critical scholarship on Dorothy Richardson is biographical in nature (and the term “bulk” is a relative, given that there is much work to be done here, too). This biographical reading is, of course, fruitful for any scholar of Richardson, especially given that the Pilgrimage series so closely parallels the events of Richardson’s life. For further biographical reading on Dorothy Richardson, see Jean Radford, Dorothy Richardson (Harvester, 1991); Carol Watts, Dorothy Richardson (Northcote, 1995); Joanne Winning, The Pilgrimage of Dorothy Richardson, (U of Wisconsin P, 2000); and George Thomson, A Reader’s Guide to Dorothy Richardson (ELT, 1996).

The twelve complete Pilgrimage novels and their dates of publication are Pointed Roofs (1915), Backwater (1916), Honeycomb (1917), The Tunnel (1919), Interim (1919), Deadlock (1921), Revolving Lights (1923), The Trap (1925), Oberland (1927), Dawn’s Left Hand (1931), and Clear Horizon (1935). Dimple Hill was published in the four-volume 1938 Dent edition of Pilgrimage. March Moonlight, an incomplete thirteenth novel, was included in Dent’s 1967 republication of the collection.

Richardson’s fascination with spiritual health and nourishment may have been influenced by her experience with the Quaker community. She lived with and wrote two books about the Quakers in 1914, and the Pilgrimage novels Dimple Hill and March Moonlight relay Miriam’s experience of living in a Quaker community. Richardson was fascinated by the Quaker’s belief in the concepts of inner light (i.e. the interpenetration of the body with the spirit) and vocation. For further reading, see Elizabeth Bronfen, “World-Making as a Cognitive Process” in Dorothy Richardson’s Art of Memory: Space, Identity, Text (Manchester UP, 1999) 112-172; Howard Finn, “‘In the Quicksands of Disintegrating Faiths’: Dorothy Richardson and the Quakers,” Literature and Theology 19.1 (2005): 34-46; and Dorothy Richardson, The Quakers: Past and Present (Constable, 1914).

See Gloria Fromm, Dorothy Richardson: A Biography (U of Illinois P, 1977) and Kristin Bluemel, Experimenting on the Borders of Modernism: Dorothy Richardson’s Pilgrimage (U of Georgia P, 1997). Early Richardson biographer Gloria Fromm argues that Pilgrimage is an autobiographical novel and that “any portrait of Dorothy Richardson (as she herself insisted) must take its fundamental lines from her own novel, because it was here that she felt she had fully revealed herself” (xiii). Katherine Bluemel suggests that while there is value in this kind of reading, the act of doing so at the exclusion of “other kinds of critical analysis” is questionable (9).
vi See William James, “The Stream of Thought” in *The Principal of Psychology*, Vol. 1 (Holt, 1890) 224-290. James, and influential psychologist trained as a physician, coins the term “stream of consciousness” to describe the flow of perceptions, sensation, thoughts and ideas that make up human consciousness.

vii Richardson frequently attempt to filter significant historical events through Miriam’s consciousness in *Honeycomb*: for example, a casual reference to Oscar Wilde made by Mrs. Corrie’s friend means little to Miriam directly, but readers are made privy to her ecstatic reaction to the sound of his name: “Miriam shook at the name. ‘You ought not to miss it. He—has—such—genius.’ Wilde... Wilde... a play in the spring—someone named Wilde. Wild Spring. That was genius” (413). The 1895 Wilde trials are also referenced indirectly, with information restricted to Miriam’s reaction to the limited bits of news and gossip she is able to collect: “...she longed to know what the mysterious thing was” (427). “If it was simply a divorce case,” she thinks, “Mrs Corrie would have told her about it, dropping out the whole story abstractedly in one of her little shocked sentences...” (427).

viii See Jean Radford, *Dorothy Richardson* (Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991). Radford also provides a list of important historical events and movements that appear in *Pilgrimage*, including the passage of the Education Act; the conclusion of the Wilde trials; the advent of horseless carriages, the invention of telephones, bicycles, and electricity; the suffragette marches; the Boer war; Irish politics; and the growing tension between England and Germany (19-20).

ix See William Harrison, *The Description of England: The Classic Contemporary Account of Tudor Social Life*, ed. Georges Edelen (Dover, 1994). In a 1587 survey, Harrison provides a substantial record of the varieties of wine regularly offered in his country, from the “small [weak] wines,” some “fifty-six sorts,” to the “thirty kinds of Italian, Grecian, Spanish [including the oft-mentioned sack, a sweet wine, rather like an unfortified sherry], Canarian, etc,” that are, “not least of all accounted, of because of their strength and value” (130).

x See Susan J. Owen, “The Politics of Drink in Restoration Drama,” in *A Babel of Bottles: Drink, Drinkers, and Drinking Places in Literature*, eds. James Nicholls and Susan Owen (Sheffield, 2000): 41-51. Owen notes that period dramatists portrayed wine as “a marker of good taste,” or, more specifically, “an upper-class good taste that can encompass bawdy badinage and bisexual antics, but not vulgarity or beer drinking” (42).

xi See Rebecca Black, *Alcohol in Popular Culture: An Encyclopedia* (Greenwood, 2010). The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries also saw an increase in the production
of decorative serving glasses such as crystal decanters, punch bowls, delicately etched wine glasses, gold rimmed champagne flutes, fancy cocktail shakers, and martini sets (13). Black argues that these glasses were status objects, displayed prominently in the home and during important ceremonies like the review of a bride’s trousseau.

xii See James Nicholls, _The Politics of Alcohol: The History of the Drink Question in England_ (Manchester UP, 2011). Nicholls argues that the increase in wine consumption was driven in part by new opportunities for foreign travel and “the desire among British drinkers to adopt seemingly sophisticated modes of consumption” (195).

xiii The idea that wine had life-extending health benefits ran well into the twentieth century (even today, every other week seems to bring news of a new study touting the health benefits of wine’s resveratrol or antioxidants). Iain Gately notes that from late 1920s onward, Parisian medical students were taught that wine drinkers lived four years longer than water drinkers (387). Gately also cites the testimony of a doctor who served on a recruiting board during World War I who claimed, “We were able to note that among the young men called for army duty, those from the wine growing regions were the most muscular, alert, and lithe, as well as the strongest, biggest, and leanest” (qtd. in 387). See Iain Gately, _Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol_ (Gotham, 2008).

xiv See also Roland Barthes, “Toward a Psychosociology of Contemporary Food Consumption” in _Food and Culture: A Reader_, eds. Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik (Routledge, 1997) 20-27; Deane Curtain, “Food/Body/Person” in _Cooking Eating Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food_, eds. Deane Curtain and Lisa Heldke (Indiana UP, 1992) 3-22; and Deborah Lupton, _Food, the Body, and the Self_ (SAGE, 1996). From an anthological standpoint, while food and drink provide the body nourishment, they also make important inferences about social rituals, class distinctions, gender roles, the organization of domestic space, sexual customs and taboos, and economic and exchange systems. Lupton argues that cultural studies rarely accept the body as being purely a product of biology: while humans to eat to survive, “from the moment of birth the ways in which individuals interact with other people and with cultural artifacts shape their responses to food” (317), a point supported by Curtain, who suggests that food “structures what counts as a person in our culture” (4). Eating and drinking are essential components of social, emotional, and psychological identity, and thus, their significance in the literary text can at read for various levels of meaning. As Barthes argues, food (and drink as a subcategory) is “not only a collection of products,” but is also a “system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of usages, situations, and behavior” (21). Thus, argues Barthes, “one could say that an entire ‘world’ (social
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environment) is present in and signified by food” (23). In effect, the products humans consume are intricately mediated by broad social and cultural contexts.

 xv See Diana McGee, Writing the Meal: Dinner in the Fiction of Early Twentieth-Century Women Writers (U of Toronto P, 2001). McGee argues that “class differences” are “crucial” to the evolution of the notion of manners, “with the ascendant class usually setting the tone” (40). Citing the presentation of manners (loosely defined as prescriptive social behavior) in the works of Edith Wharton and Virginia Woolf, McGee finds that manners at the turn of the twentieth century “are frequently linked with good taste, the latter expression—obviously based on the palate—indicating not only the ability to choose the appropriate food and other consumable items and possession, but to act with a certain self-restraint” (40).

 xvi Moselle wine refers to any wine produced along the Moselle River in France, Luxembourg and Germany.

 xvii See Pierre Bourdieu, “The Field of Cultural Production; or The Economic World Reversed” in The Field of Cultural Production, ed. Randal Johnson (Columbia UP, 1993) 29-73. Bourdieu argues that in this “field of forces,” the “network of objective relations between positions subtends and orients the strategies which the occupants of different positions implement in their struggles to defend or improve their position (i.e. position taking)” (30).

 xviii For further reading on the representation of female labor in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century English literature, see Patricia Zakreski, Representing Female Artistic Labour, 1848-1890 (Ashgate, 2006); Claudia Durst Johnson, Labor and Workplace Issues in Literature (Greenwood, 2006); Andrew August, Poor Women’s Lives: Gender, Work, and Poverty in Late-Victorian London (Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1999); Jayne E. Marek, Women Editing Modernism: “Little” Magazine and Literary History (UP Kentucky, 1995); and Women and Work Culture: Britain c.1850-1950, eds. Krista Cowman and Louise Jackson (Ashgate, 2005).

 xix See Pierre Bourdieu, “Habitus,” in Habitus: A Sense of Place, eds, Jean Hiller and Emma Rooksby (Ashgate, 2005) 43-52. Though Bourdieu is hesitant to admit to the reflexive nature of habitus in Distinction, in this later essay, he concedes that “in rapidly changing societies, habitus changes constantly, continuously,” albeit “within the limits inherent in its originary structure” (47).

“immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the forms of property rights,” cultural capital is “convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the forms of educational qualifications” (Bourdieu goes much further into the form and function of cultural capital in other essays, as I’ve discussed to some extent in the body of this chapter), and finally, social capital is “made up of social obligations (‘connections’), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the forms of a title of nobility” (281).

See Kate Huppatz and Susan Goodwin, Gender Capital at Work: Intersections of Femininity, Masculinity, Class, and Gender (Palgrave, 2012) and Terry Lovell, “Thinking Feminism with and against Bourdieu,” in Feminist Theory 1.1 (2000): 11-32. Lovell (along with other critics of Bourdieu like Beate Krais, Elizabeth Silva, and Lois McNay) argues across his oeuvre, Bourdieu positions women as “capital bearing objects” rather than capital-accumulating subjects (21). However, Happatz and Goodwin counter that Bourdieu occasionally contradicts his own opinions on women’s relationship to capital; for example, in Distinction, he mentions that petit-bourgeois women rely on the market value of their beauty and “charms” (23). Hence, Happatz and Goodwin conclude, “Bourdieu did recognize that it is in fact possible that women (like men) engage in the accumulation of capital and actively use it to their advantage” (23).

While it falls, to some extent, outside of the scope of my own project, the correlation between food and Miriam’s realizing sexuality is worthy of note. In The Flesh Made Word, Helena Michie draws a connection between female eating and female sexuality as they are represented in nineteenth-century art, theater, and literature. The Victorian novelists’ “representational taboo” against the depiction of women eating symbolizes broad popular attitudes regarding female sexuality (i.e. that a female’s sexual impulses were, at worst, vulgar, and at best, better left unacknowledged) (9). That Miriam struggles between the impulse to “go on eating,” and yet cannot bring herself to the plate only serves to emphasize her position on the edge of Victorian morality and modern license. See Helena Michie, The Flesh Made Word: Female Figures and Women’s Bodies (Oxford UP, 1990). See also Susan Bordo, Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body (U of California P, 2003); Jill Matus, Unstable Bodies: Victorian Representations of Sexuality and Maternity (Manchester UP, 1995); and Susan Moss, Spilling the Beans: Eating, Cooking, Reading, and Writing in British Women’s Fiction (Manchester UP, 2011).

Recent scholarship has examined the ways urban spaces of commerce enhanced women’s public visibility and destabilized specters of masculine dominance in the city in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. See Anne Friedberg, Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern (Berkeley: California UP, 1993); Jane Rendell,

xxiv See Michael Ball and David Sunderland, *An Economic History of London 1800-1914* (Routledge, 2002). Ball and Sunderland note that the first Aerated Bread Company opened in Camden in 1884; within ten years, an additional sixty cafes opened up throughout London (157). The success of those cafes prompted the development of Pearce’s Refreshment Rooms (restaurants that catered to low-income Londoners), over fifty Lockhart coffee room sites, and a number of tearooms run by Express Dairy. The success of these operations inspired J. Lyons to open his first “popular café,” which served light refreshments and cheap table dinners, in 1904, which then led to the establishment of hundreds of Lyons cafes throughout England (157). For further reading on the development and proliferation of ABC cafes, see Laura Mason, *Food Culture in Great Britain* (Greenwood, 2004) 169; and John K Walton, “Towns and Consumerism” in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1840-1950*, vol. 3, ed. Martin Daunton (Cambridge UP, 2000) 715-744.

Chapter 4

“I’LL TAKE A GLASS OF BURGUNDY AND... LET ME SEE”: WINE AND PHILOSOPHY IN JAMES JOYCE’S “LESTRYGONIANS”

Emile Zola’s *The Belly of Paris* (1873) opens with the protagonist Florent’s return to Paris after a daring escape from the Devil’s Island penal colony. Starving and emaciated, Florent experiences the thriving new marketplace of Les Halles largely through images of food and digestion: he perceives his native city, with its “giant markets, overflowing with food” as being “like some satiated beast, embodying Paris itself, growing enormously fat, and silently supporting the Empire” (Zola, *The Belly* 122-123). Although he reunites with his family and secures a job as a fish inspector in the markets, Florent becomes increasingly angered by the division he sees between the bourgeois class of food vendors and the vast numbers of Parisian poor, whom he respectively dubs “the Fat” and “the Thin” (189). Maintaining a thin veneer of objectivity, Zola presents “two hostile groups” (189) in his novel: an appetite for power drives a self-interested bureaucratic and merchant class, while the labor class and poor starve by their political, religious, or artistic convictions. The focus on food in *The Belly* is somewhat unsurprising given the historical context of its publication: Zola wrote the novel in the midst of a culinary renaissance in France during the nineteenth century that included a propagation of restaurant culture, the emergence of a gastronomic literary tradition, the development and codification of avant-garde cuisine, and the standardization of a domestic *cuisine bourgeoise*. But Zola does more than record a cultural shift in
attitude towards food in his novel; he also makes a sociological connection between institutional systems and the production, availability, and consumption of food, and constructs a philosophical correlation between the sustenance of the body and the nourishment of the soul. Furthermore, his presentation of food extends well beyond its more alluring qualities: vivid descriptions of the market’s fruits, meats, and cheeses are juxtaposed with accounts of the animal blood, fish guts, and human excrement that run through the streets. The novel outraged many of Zola’s contemporary critics, in part because of the writer’s deft yet controversial effort to craft a correspondence between “base” material matters and the “higher” concerns of art, philosophy, and politics. The images and metaphors of food and ingestion in *The Belly* provide an early and complex examination and celebration of what Zola calls the “banality of extraordinary facts, everyday life” (*Correspondence* 420, my translation).v

Half a century after the publication of Zola’s novel, another hungry protagonist would traverse the streets of Dublin with an empty belly and a keen sense of the literal and symbolic importance of food. In James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, references to food and drink tend to appear within the first few pages of each of the novel’s eighteen episodes, and are consistently noted in lists of important recurring elements that occur in the novel as a whole.vi “Telemachus,” the first episode, begins over a breakfast shared by Stephen Dedalus, the Englishman Haines, and Buck Mulligan at the Martello Tower at Sandycove on Dublin Bay (Joyce, *Ulysses* 12-13). The “Calypso” episode introduces Leopold Bloom—a wandering, pondering adman
and everyman—via a catalogue of his favorite organ dishes: we’re told he eats “with relish” dishes of “thick giblet soup, nutty gizzards, a stuffed roast heart, liver slices friend with crustcrumbs, friend hencod’s roes,” and appreciates grilled mutton kidneys with their “fine tang of faintly scented urine,” as he prepares breakfast for his wife Molly and pours “milk for the pussens” (55).vii “Penelope” also open with an alimentary reference to “breakfast in bed with a couple of eggs” (738).vii Bloom’s burnt kidneys, the crumbs of potted meat left by Blazes Boylan in Molly’s bed, and Molly’s eggs—called by James Maddox a “crux of interpretation” (227)—are only a sample of the food references and metaphors that abound in some of the most important passages of Ulysses, and that have inspired catalogues, cookbooks, and critical studies of the novel’s alimentary symbolism since the publication of its earliest episodes in 1918.ix As Sebastian Knowles asserts in the “Introduction” of a collection of essays that were presented at the Eighteenth International Joyce Symposium in Trieste in 2002, it is a “central truth” that “food is a crucial element in Ulysses” (4).

“Lestrygonians,” the novel’s eighth episode, is particularly replete with allusions to feasts, food, and drink, which are punctuated by expressions of Bloom’s hunger as he makes his way to his lunchtime meal: “I’m hungry” (Joyce, Ulysses 158), “Must eat” (168), and “Ah, I’m hungry” (171).x After dismissing the Burton pub with its “Spaton sawdust, sweetish warmish cigarette smoke, reek of plug, spilt beer, men’s beery piss, the stale of ferment” (169), Bloom settles into Davy Byrnes’ pub and orders a glass of Burgundy—a “cordial juice” that “soothed his palate”—and a
Gorgonzola cheese sandwich (173). While the seedcake that Bloom remembers after he finishes his lunch has been the subject of extensive analysis, critics have continually overlooked one of the most carefully treated food objects in the episode: Bloom’s Burgundy. During the luncheon scene, Bloom’s wine transitions from his glass to his palate, moves through his body and pervades his thoughts, inspires personal memories of communion and reflections on the nature of history and beauty, and eventually expels from his body in the pub’s outhouse. Bloom’s experiences of taste, digestion, and intoxication in this scene challenge ideas about the individual subject as being distinct and removed from the object world; this permeation of boundaries simultaneously emphasizes how Bloom’s understanding of history and existence involves the creative application of his own experiences to the scaffolds of grand historical narratives. Ultimately, Joyce uses the wine drinking scene of Ulysses to challenge a long tradition of philosophical thought that deems the topics of food and consumption too material, bodily, or domestic to be worthy of inquiry: while the style and context of Zola and Joyce’s novels varies significantly, the writers share what we might call a distinctly modernist interest in resurrecting the discussion of food and alimentation from the latrines of the Western philosophical tradition.

“Lestrygonians” records Bloom’s actions and observations as he strolls through the streets of Dublin at the one o’clock hour. His physical hunger pangs mingle with gloomy contemplations on the state of his marriage, exemplifying Joyce’s claim that Ulysses records “the cycle of the human body as well as a little
story of a day (life)” (Selected 271). Joyce’s desire to make “every hour, every organ, every art being interconnected and interrelated in the somatic scheme of the whole [...] not only condition but even create its own technique” (271) enforces Maud Ellman’s claim that he strove “to make the English language breathe, digest, excrete” in Ulysses (55). In “Lestrygonians,” Bloom’s redoubling course of action, his tendency to muse on a notion, let it go, and then return to it later, and the technical juxtaposition of short sentences of staccato thought against long paragraphs of tangential or contradictory musings exemplify what Joyce described as the “peristaltic” quality of the episode (Selected 187). Though the alimentary allusions demonstrate Joyce’s interest in the workings of the human body, they also reveal his concern with the relationship between bodies and the things they ingest. Nearly every sentence of the episode evokes the experience of digestion in some way; Margot Norris argues that even the prose of “Lestrygonians” is “gluttonous” and “sounds as though it is spoken with one’s mouth full when it is read out loud” (40). Bloom’s reflections are peppered with food-related colloquialisms, such as “Have a finger in the pie” (Joyce, Ulysses 154), “I was souped” (163), “Drop him like a hot potato” (163), “the next thing on the menu” (163) “Gammon and spinach” (164), “go to pot” (165), “Country bred chawbacon” (168), “Couldn't swallow it all” (169), “Born with a silver knife in his mouth” (172), and “cool as a cucumber” (172). He assigns edible traits the other people he encounters: the salesgirl in Graham’s store is described as “sugar-sticky” (151), the butter-eating Carmelite nun has a “sweet face” and may taste like “caramel” (155), and the “Flakes of pastry” stuck to Mrs.
Breen’s dress and the “daub of sugary flour stuck to her cheek” remind Bloom that she was once the unmarried Josie Powell, a “tasty dresser” and a “Rhubarb tart” (158). He even dwells on the idea that certain properties of food manifest in the eater: he thinks, “Eat pig like pig” (153), muses that the vegetarian diet produces “like waves of the brain the poetical” (166), and, making note of a policeman sweating Irish stew into his shirt, thinks, “you couldn’t squeeze a line of poetry out of him” (166).

Bloom’s reflections reveal one aspects of his understanding of food’s physiological effect on the body: given that living things rely on food for energy and nutrients essential to their ability to function and regenerate, they are, quite literally, what they eat. Martina Vike Plock notes that at the beginning of the twentieth century, advances in technology like the microscope offered scientists and scientific enthusiasts “unprecedentedly precise images of the human body and central systems, and with them new (though often still speculative) understandings of human physiology” (2). Joyce held a lifelong interest in the workings of the body that had at one point compelled him to become a physician: he studied medicine in both Dublin and Paris but ultimately dropped out of medical school. His learning and curiosity about the human body informs both the “Lestrygonians” episode and *Ulysses* as a whole: as Voyiatzaki argues, “the medical interest of the young Joyce seems not to have abandoned Joyce the artist; his scientific penchant permeates his art” (42). Voyiatzaki further points out that Joyce’s text contains detailed and professionally jargoned—though sometimes, when coming from Bloom, humorously
warbled—allusions to the processes of botanic and chemical diffusion, inflation-deflation respiration, and metabolic functions (43). But while Joyce clearly maintained an interest in the physiological necessity of eating, the images of food and consumption in “Lestrygonians” suggest that he saw food as having significance beyond mere bodily sustenance.xvii

While Bloom considers the relationship of food to the processes of basic survival and the biological life cycle—“food, chyle, blood, dung, earth, food: have to feed it like stoking an engine” (Joyce, Ulysses 176)—he also ruminates on the value of food and drink to the political and economic systems that structure the everyday lives of Dublin’s citizen. For instance, seeing the lines at a church soup kitchen, he thinks, “Suppose that communal kitchen years to come perhaps... Have rows all the same. All for number one. Children fighting for the scrapings of the pot” (170).xviii Eyeing the young Dilly Dedalus, he thinks to himself, “Good Lord, that poor child’s dress is in flitters. Underfed she looks too. Potatoes and marge, marge and potatoes. . . Undermines the constitution” (170).xix Bloom also mulls on the role of food in shaping communities and enforcing practices of social inclusion and exclusion. He identifies the men at the Burton pub as Irish based on their dining practices and food choices: eyeing the patrons carefully, he reflects, “Two stouts here/ One corned and cabbage” (169); this space, he contends, is the arena of the “Roast and mashed” (170). “Am I like that?” he wonders, “See ourselves as others see us” (170). Bloom’s decision to leave the Irish workingman’s restaurant with its beer, cabbage, and sausage fare for Davy Byrnes’ “moral pub” that serves French wine and Italian
cheeses simultaneously reveals his ostracization from masculine Irish pub culture and his own desire to belong to a more cosmopolitan community.**xx** Bloom also seems to be aware of the ways that food can obscure the “violence of colonialism” which is often “repackaged as harmlessly entertaining or deliciously familiar, even comforting” (Cozzi 7).**xxi** He thinks that the candies sold by a candy shop advertised as the “Lozenge and comfit manufacturer to His Majesty the King” are “Bad for [the] tummies” of Irish schoolchildren (Joyce, *Ulysses* 151). He describes the Royal Irish Constabulary—the police units consisting mostly of Irishmen that England organized to enforce Imperial rule in Ireland—as having “Foodheated faces [...] with a good load of fat soup under their belts” (162), a image poignantly juxtaposed against the description of the thin, ragged Dilly Dedalus. Bloom also assigns the Dubliners bovine qualities—the constables are “let out to graze,” (162) and a Burton patron is “chewing the cud” (169)—a metaphor that later plays out in his imagining the violent, systematic cattle slaughter. Though Bloom dismisses A.E. Russell’s pacifistic vegetarian diet as “windandwatery,” he subsequently refuses to dine with the meat-eaters at the Burton restaurant and orders a vegetarian meal at Davy Byrnes’ pub.**xxii**

Joyce also links food to religion in the episode. Bloom contemplates the idea that soup has the power to convert atheists into believers and Catholics into Protestants: “They say they used to give pauper children soup to change to protestants in the time of the potato blight (151).**xxiii** While sitting at the bar in Davy Byrnes’ pub, he continually dwells on the inclusionary and exclusionary practices
and rituals of religion, particularly as they relate to wine, blood, and the conflation of these two fluids in the Eucharist. When Nosey Flynn hands over the glass of Burgundy, he thinks, “The curate served” (172), correlating the barkeep with the Roman Catholic clergy. Bloom’s secular reenactment of the Eucharistic ritual is made all the more poignant when considered against his perception of Catholic communion in the “Lotus Eaters” episode:

Wine. Makes it more aristocratic than for example if he drank what they are used to Guinness’s porter or some temperance beverage Wheatley’s Dublin hop bitters or Cantrell and Cochrane’s ginger ale (aromatic). Doesn’t give them any of it: shew wine: only the other. Cold comfort. Pious fraud but quite right: otherwise they’d have one old booser worse than another coming along, cadging for a drink. Queer the whole atmosphere of the. Quite right. Perfectly right that is. (81)

In this scene, Bloom perceives the Catholic communion to be an exclusionary ritual: the elaborate ceremony is “aristocratic” and “queer” (81). Early in “Lestrygonians,” he mistakenly sees his name on a Christian pamphlet: “Bloo... Me? No. Blood of the Lamb” (151). Tossing the pamphlet into the sea, he notes that even the gulls have no interest in it: they, like Bloom, find little sustenance in the propaganda of organized Christianity. At the pub, he thinks that the Catholic priests’ willingness to fill their own bellies while their parishioners struggle to feed their large families is a sign of the clergy’s weakness: recalling the Jewish fasting rituals, he thinks, “like to see them do the black fast of Yom Kippur” (152). In previous episodes, Bloom’s flashbacks reveal that he converted to Catholicism to marry Molly; with his Semitic heritage and Irish Protestant upbringing, Bloom sits on the margins of organized religion and remains critical of the way these institutions fail
to fulfill the basic needs of their followers. At the same time, he seems to recognize and even appreciate the centrality of ritual—and the centrality of food to ritual—in the formation of individual and cultural identity.

By emphasizing both the corporeal and cultural significance of food, Joyce creates what Evi Voyiatzaki calls “a ceaseless movement from lofty to lower material, from abstraction to concreteness” (28). The scene exemplifies what Deane Curtain and Lisa Heldke call a “transformative philosophy of food”:

...the way in which the concept of personal identity has classically been approached by philosophers is by assuming the self to be a discrete, disembodied ego, and then asking for the logical conditions of its self-identity through time. By contrast, taking the production and preparation of food as an illuminating source, we might formulate a conception of the person which focuses on our connection with and dependence on the rest of the world. (xiv)

Consuming food means consuming the other in both the embodied sense (the “other” here being the object consumed) and the symbolic sense (especially when we consider, for instance, the labor or cultural value symbolized by the object consumed). Consumed food is transformed food; at the same time, food transforms the consumer. This process of transformation can influence mood, provoke contemplation, and shape expressions of identity. Food and the process of eating constantly dissolve the ideological boundary between the self and what lies beyond self. Curtain and Henke argue that recognizing our dependence on food undermines a philosophical tradition that recurrently finds topics of the body, the somatic senses, and the things the body consumes and expels as having little theoretical value, a supposition due in part to the correlation between the body and “primitive”
drives, such as appetite. In Plato’s Phaedo, Socrates claims that “ordinary” experiences and bodily needs serve as distractions from the concerns of the mind. Socrates directly broaches the matter of food by posing the rhetorical question, “Do you think that it is right for a philosopher to concern himself with the so-called pleasures connected with food and drink?” (Plato 49). A “true philosopher,” he goes on, “ignores the body and becomes as far as possible independent, avoiding all physical contacts and associations as much as it can it its search for reality” (49). Physical experiences not only distract the mind, they can impede the aims of philosophy: the body “fills us with loves and desires and fears and all sorts of fancies and a great deal of nonsense,” and hence, “we literally never get an opportunity to think at all about anything” (Plato 49-50).

Socrates’ argument relies on a dualistic construction of human experience as being divided into two realms: the physical or material realm, and the spiritual or mental one. Aristotle, another seminal thinker in the western philosophical tradition and one whose ideas are frequently brought into play throughout Ulysses, takes up the discussion of the body, its senses, and the function of food in a number of his treatises. Aristotle diverges from Socrates by complicating the latter’s rigid divide between the experiences of the body and soul: “sensation, memory, passion, appetite and desire in general, and, in addition pleasure and pain” belong “to soul and body in conjunction... for they all either imply sensation as a concomitant, or have it as their medium” (On Sense and the Sensible 3). While Aristotle contests Plato’s argument that the body imprisons the soul—the former contends that souls
need bodies—he also concedes that the more bodily senses of taste, smell, and touch distract us from objects of perception, and thereby impede the development of wisdom. The sense of seeing, "regarded as a supply for the primary wants of life," is the sense far superior to the vapid senses, and hearing is even further elevated as the best sense "for developing intelligence" (3). The scene in "Lestrygonians" where Bloom orders, consumes, transforms, and releases wine in Davy Byrnes' pub provides one of the clearest examples of Joyce’s challenge to the Western philosophical tradition’s disparagement of issues involving food and the body; Joyce uses the intoxicating drink and its effect on Bloom’s body to direct attention to the embodied, concrete, and practical experiences that have been denigrated by the Western philosophical tradition but that shape individual lives and actions.

Before Bloom arrives at the Byrnes pub, his musings appear to be guided by an Aristotelian understanding of food and eating: the schema Joyce gave to Stuart Gilbert identifies food in the episode as “the decoy,” and lists its “personae” as Antiphates (in Homer’s Odyssey, the daughter of the Lestrygonian king who leads Odysseus’ crew to father and a violent, cannibalistic feeding frenzy), who is correlated with “hunger.”xxviii Bloom continuously reflects, like Aristotle, on eating as a basic human necessity; his hunger pangs and sour mood serve as a constant reminder of his body’s nutritional requirements. He notes that “Hungry man is an angry man” (Joyce, Ulysses 169) and that ”Peace and war depend on some fellow’s digestion” (172). In line with Aristotle’s belief that “brutes” care little for the pleasure of taste—“gluttons pray not for a long tongue but for the gullet of a crane”
(Eudemian 44)—Bloom observes the Burton pub patrons and thinks, “See the animals feed./ Men, men. Men” (Joyce, Ulysses 169). But Aristotle’s argument that “food is acted upon by what is nourished by it, not the other way round, as timber is worked by a carpenter and not conversely” (De Anima 563) appears to be undermined by Bloom’s decision to leave the Burton pub with its “reek of plug, spilt beer, men’s beery piss, the stale of ferment” (Joyce, Ulysses 169) for a thoughtful lunch in solitude. Bloom’s luncheon fare provides more than the fuel his body needs to function; his meal evokes an assortment of associations, inspires contemplation, and recalls deeply significant personal memories. In contrast to Aristotle’s claim that food cannot act upon the being it nourishes, Bloom’s wine has a pronounced effect on his body: as Joyce relates, the “Mild fire of wine kindled his veins” (Ulysses 174). The tipsier Bloom becomes, the more his thoughts drift to lengthy, fluid musings on the aphrodisiac properties of oysters, the violent nature of certain food preparations, and the life of Mickey Hanlon the fishmonger: essentially, the effect of the alcohol (a consumed object) work to challenge the hypothetical divide between object world and the individual subject.

Ultimately, Bloom rejects the predatory behavior and consumptive ethics he observes in the Burton pub. Curtain argues that Platonic- and Aristotelian-based theories of personhood rely on notions of autonomy and independence, and thus, “food is understood as ‘other’” (13). When food is understood merely as a substance that refuels the body or distracts the mind, we establish an “objectified relation” to food. However, Curtain suggests that when we develop “participatory relationships”
with food, “we become persons through connecting in relations to other beings” (11). In “Lestrygonians,” Bloom constantly reflects on the source of his food. He sympathizes with the “wretched brutes there at the cattlemarket waiting for the poleaxe to split their skulls open” (Joyce, *Ulysses* 171). “Moo,” he thinks, “poor trembling calves” (171). After entering the pub, he orders his glass of Burgundy and thinks of “Christmas turkeys and geese” as the “slaughter of innocents” (172). Foie gras is dubbed “geese stuffed silly” and lobsters are “boiled alive” for indulgent consumers (175). He also acknowledges the labor involved in acts of food provision—for instance, earlier in the episode, he sympathizes with mothers who have to “give the breast year after year all hours of the night” (161)—and recognizes the significance of food in process of human labor: “Pyramids in sand. Built on bread and onions” (164). Attributing the traditional disparagement of food and cooking as occurring in part due to the association with food production and preparation as “women’s work and/or the work of slaves or lower classes” (Curtain and Henke xiii), Curtain argues that by giving serious consideration to the production of food, we begin to learn “how to value the experiences of marginalized persons, as well as the marginalized experiences of dominant persons” (4). Bloom, the “Jewish other of the Irish other of the English occupiers,” and a seemingly impotent male (Doherty 215), empathizes with the humans and animals of *Ulysses* who live in dominated states of existence; his own experience as a marginalized figure clearly informs his reflections on food. As Curtain argues, a participatory relationship with food relies on a relational understanding of the self and an acceptance that the “interests of
others should, in certain contexts, come before one’s own,” a project that requires, “empathetic projection into another’s life” (11). Bloom’s empathy for his food—and later in the episode, for his fellow man—thus serves as a model of the participatory relationship with food that Curtain outlines.

Bloom’s participatory interaction with his lunch also draws attention to the experience of taste as it pertains to questions of subjectivity and the subject’s relation to the object world. As Denise Gigante notes, “food has never been far from the concept of mental discrimination” (2). In the eighteenth century, philosophers frequently relied on the vocabulary of sensory taste to describe the concept of aesthetic taste: Kevin Sweeney cites Voltaire, Immanuel Kant, and Joseph Addison as thinkers who use the “hedonic assessment of eating and drinking” as “the metaphorical basis for all critical appreciation” (19). Like David Hume, who famously relies on a wine-tasting scene from Cervantes’ Don Quixote to illustrate his concept of delicacy, Kant provides his readers with a wine-related anecdote to distinguish between what is merely “agreeable,” as opposed to what is truly “beautiful”:

As regards to the agreeable everyone acknowledges that his judgment, which he bases on a private feeling and by which he says that he likes some object, is by the same token confined to his own person. Hence, if he says that canary wine is agreeable he is quite content if someone else corrects his terms and reminds him to say instead: It is agreeable to me.xxxi (“Analytic” 55)

For Kant, the experience of the senses may be pleasurable to the individual, but judgments of beauty require disinterested pleasure, that is, a judgment of perception divorced from private pleasure or personal value.xxxii Agreeable
sensations do not "belong to the cognitive faculty concerning objects; they are rather determinations of the subject" (Kant, *Anthropology* 142). For Kant, aesthetic judgments must be “disinterested” judgments. Because food satisfies a bodily need driven by appetite, judgments of sensory taste cannot be disinterested, and are thus, inferior to the aims of philosophical judgment. I believe that the wine-drinking scene of “Lestrygonians” challenges this Kantian deduction in part by using the nineteenth-century gastronomical treatise published by thinkers like French judge and gastronome Jean-Anthelme Brillat-Savarin, a project that enriches our understanding of Joyce’s focus on food and the body in this episode.

Given that eighteenth-century assessments of aesthetic taste frequently relied on gustatory metaphors, it is perhaps unsurprising that the nineteenth-century gastronomic literary tradition developed, at least in part, out of an effort to respond to these aesthetic treatises. Brillat-Savarin’s *Physiology of Taste; Or Meditations on Transcendental Gastronomy* (1825) is often held up by scholars and gastronomes as an epitomical celebration of food and cooking, perhaps unsurprising given the writer’s own claim that "the discovery of a new dish does more for human happiness than the discovery of a star" (15). However, Brillat-Savarin devotes a significant portion of his essay to mediation on the properties of sensory taste that seems to be in dialogue with eighteenth century aesthetic treatises: for instance, he takes us the topic of “taste,” declaring it to be “the sense which puts us in touch with sapid bodies, by means of the sensations which they excite in the organ designed to appreciate them” (44). Although Brillat-Savarin never specifically refers to Kant in
his discussion of gastronomy, there are unmistakable parallels between the thinkers’ themes and terminology. For instance, Sweeney argues that while Brillat-Savarin’s “transcendental gastronomy” resembles Kant’s notion of “transcendental deduction,” Brillat-Savarin clearly opposes Kant’s deductions on gustatory judgment by insisting that the things we taste and smell have an “equal right to be the object of a reflective contemplative hedonic experience as what we see and hear” ("Hunger" 53). For Brillat-Savarin, our common physiology allows for taste and smell to serve as the basis for the universal appreciation and evaluation of food and drink, a model that mirrors Kant’s understanding of the role of sight and hearing in aesthetic perception and judgment. While Kant argues that sensory taste can only provoke irrational judgments of object, Brillat-Savarin posits that taste has a reflective stage—the “considered sensation” (50)—that involves rational judgment.xxxiv Though Brillat-Savarin’s thesis holds canonical status in the gastronomic literary tradition, it also provides with one of the earliest assessments of sensory taste as a source useful for serious scientific and philosophical inquiry. As Michel Delville argues, this move is mirrored by avant-garde modernists like Stein, Marinetti, Duchamp, Lewis, and Joyce, who also “implicitly reject the Kantian notion that gustatory appreciation is essentially passive, that it is entirely determined by the subject, and that is has no claim to aesthetic judgment” (2).xxxv

The parallels between the gastronomic tradition and Joyce’s fiction may actually be quite direct: Joyce owned a copy of *Physiology* and even makes reference to its author—the “brilliant Savourain” (59)—in *Finnegans Wake*. While the
allusions to *Physiology* are less obvious in *Ulysses*, it seems reasonable to posit that
the food-centric “Lestrygonians” episode is in dialogue with Brillat-Savarin’s
theories. For instance, Bloom’s decision to order wine after briefly contemplating a
shadygaff (beer mixed with soda, ginger ale, or cider), recalls Brillat-Savarin’s
declaration that wine should be considered an invaluable subject of philosophical
inquiry: “Truly, this thirst for a kind of liquid round which nature wrapped so many
veils, this strange desire that assails the whole race of men, in ever zone and climate
of the world,” he argues, “is most worthy to be taken note of by philosophers” (102-
103). Furthermore, Bloom’s encounter with his wine exemplifies the progression of
taste outlined in *Physiology*. Brillat-Savarin situates sensations into three different
orders: direct, complete, and reflective. Direct sensation is “the first perception
brought about by the immediate action of the organs of the mouth, during the time
that the sapid body rests on the front of the tongue” (50). Bloom, after feeling the
effect of “warm shock of air heat of mustard” in his body, turns to his wine and
“smellsip[s] the cordial juice” (Joyce, *Ulysses* 173). Bloom’s “smellsip” is an
experience of direct sensation that corresponds with Brillat-Savarin’s theory of taste
and smell—“without the participation of the sense of smell, there would be no
complete taste,” and thus, “taste and smell form one sense” (49)—a claim that
directly refutes Kant’s supposition that smell is the “most interior” and “least
informative” of the senses. After direct sensation, Brillat-Savarin names complete
sensation as the next order of taste: “Complete sensation is composed of this first
impression together with the sensation aroused when the food abandons the first
position, passes into the back of the mouth, and impresses the entire organ with both its taste and its aroma” (50). Bloom exemplifies this order by “bidding his throat strongly to speed [the wine],” apparently to good effect: the “sips of wine soothed his palate” (Joyce, Ulysses 173). Brillat-Savarin’s final order of taste is the reflective sensation, “the judgment which the mind forms of the impressions that have been transmitted to it by the mouth” (50). Bloom, again, follows Brillat-Savarin’s model by making a few notes on his impression of the wine: “Not logwood that. Tastes fuller this weather with the chill off [...] Nice wine it is” (Joyce, Ulysses 174). The reflexive sensation, for Brillat-Savarin, positions taste as a source of knowledge, a potential site of experience from which we can transcend subjective experience and absorb other “sapid bodies”; in “Lestrygonians,” Joyce similarly uses the experience of taste as a potential site of communion with the outside world (be it through material objects or other living beings). Both Brillat-Savarin and Joyce explore the potential for taste to serve not only as an instrument of knowledge, but to perhaps serve as an instrument the most complete form of knowledge we can have: the intimate knowledge of the other via the act of absorbing the not-self within the self. In effect, the very aspect of taste that had caused the eighteenth century empiricist philosophers to deem it an inferior sense—and thus, to relegate the act of tasting to a simple hedonistic response—becomes in these works one of the most important means we have to interact with the world and with each other.

As Bloom’s wine begins to digest—“Wine soaked and softened rolled pith of bread mustard a moment mawkish cheese” (Joyce, Ulysses 174)—the processes
occurring in his body become indistinguishable from the processes occurring in his
mind: as Budgen claims, Joyce once mused that if his characters “had no body they
would have no mind [...] It’s all one” (21). John Paul Riquelme notes that the
loosened cohesion of Bloom’s thoughts is mimicked in the text’s language, as
predicates, past participles, and adjectives become difficult to distinguish in the
prose (195); the literary narrator becomes increasingly ambiguous as monologues
that seem to be part of Bloom’s stream-of-thought are juxtaposed and even
combined with statements made in the third person. Long paragraphs relay
Bloom’s flickering thoughts on the aphrodisiac properties of oysters, the violent
processes of stuffing geese and boiling lobsters alive for Christmas dinner, and the
life of Mickey Hanlon the fishmonger, all images that in some way deal with the
interconnectivity between humans and their food sources. While the correlations
between Bloom’s wine drinking and Brillat-Savarin’s orders of sensation establish a
parallel between Physiology and Ulysses, the moments following Bloom’s judgment
of the wine exemplify the gastronome’s claim that our sensory experience with food
“puts us in touch with savourous or sapid bodies,” that thus invites us “to repair the
constant losses which we suffer through our continual existence” (45). This “repair”
occurs via the elements of connectivity that inform the experience of taste: as Allan
Weiss argues, taste “never exists in a vacuum” and “link[s] the work of the famer,
merchant, chef, and gourmet, vacillating between tradition and creation” (230). In a
project reminiscent of Proust’s Madeleine cookie in The Remembrance of Things Past
(published in France between 1913 and 1927) Joyce connects the acts of taste and
eating with the experience of memory. The combination of his intoxication, his reflection on his wine, and the image of two flies copulating on a windowpane prompts Bloom to recall a moment shared with Molly from his past:

Glowing wine on his palate lingered swallowed. Crushing in the winepress grapes of Burgundy. Sun’s heat it is. Seems to a secret touch telling me memory. Touched his sense moistened remembered. Hidden under wild ferns on Howth below us bay sleeping: sky. No sound. The sky. (*Ulysses* 176)

Bloom’s soundless memory of Howth relays a poignant instance of recognition and affirmation of the other through a literal act of exchange and consumption. In a moment of passion—“Ravished over her I lay, full lips full open, kissed her mouth. Yum” (176)—the Blooms exchange a masticated seedcake: “Softly she gave me in my mouth the seedcake warm and chewed” (176). Bloom’s wine both represents and inspires the relationship between the subject and the external world: it presents a challenging and ambiguous intersection of the self and of the other. Memory, as inspired by food, becomes an act of creativity that encourages the kind “participatory relationship” with the world that Curtain believes we can achieve by thinking about our food: we “become persons through connecting in relations to other beings” (3). In *Ulysses*, Bloom’s experience with his food is both thoughtful—like Brillat-Savarin, Bloom correlates food with an encyclopedic number of events, phenomena, and feelings—and artistic: Bloom’s reaction to his wine becomes inscribed in what Michel Delville calls “a circuit of description and consumption, ingestion, and *expression*” (my emphasis)(4). Brillat-Savarin formulates the experience of the gourmand as both sensual and intelligent: “animals feed themselves; men eat; but only wise men know the art of eating” (15). Bloom’s act of
creation through memory uses a process of conceptual borrowing and cross-referencing to various narratives as the means to create textured and complex alternatives to experience that recognizes a configuration of the self that is ambiguous, creative, loving, and perhaps beyond the realm of conventional narrative.

Throughout the “Lestrygonians” episode, Bloom recurrently rewrites the narratives of history on his own “Bloomian” terms. For instance, in one passage, he condenses the entire development of civilization—built of course, on food—into one brief moment of contemplation:

Cityful passing away, other cityful coming, passing away too: other coming on, passing on. Houses, lines of houses, streets, miles of pavements, piled up bricks, stones. Changing hands. This owner, that. Landlord never dies they say. Other steps into his shoes when he gets his notice to quit. They buy the place up with gold and still they have all the gold. Swindle in it somewhere. Piled up in cities, worn away age after age. Pyramids in sand. Built on bread and onions. Slaves. Chinese wall. Babylon. Big stones left. Round towers. Rest rubble, sprawling suburbs, jerrybuilt, Kerwan’s mushroom houses, built of breeze. Shelter for the night.

No one is anything. (Joyce, *Ulysses* 164)

In another passage, he similarly revises the narrative about the formation of the planets using images evoked from the day’s wandering/wondering, this time inspired in by the candies he sees at the episode’s open: “Gasballs spinning about, crossing each other, passing. Same old dingdong always. Gas, then solid, then world, then dead shell drifting around, frozen rock like that pineapple rock” (167). The memory inspired by wine in Davy Byrnes’ pub is similarly mediated through another set of deeply influential historical narratives: as Karen Lawrence argues, the
seedcake is “Molly’s Eucharist” in that “in the gift of the seedcake she offers her transubstantiated body (‘Take, this is my body’) in a sacred rite” (108). Ellmann argues that Howth symbolizes the Garden of Eden; Bloom and Molly, Adam and Eve; the seedcake “an apple from which Joyce has withdrawn the bitterness” (“Limits” 571). Bloom’s narrative mediates one of the most influential narratives of history that work to shape human experience. His memory is his “petit récit,” that is, his “little story” that parallels and challenges the grand, encompassing narratives of history. For the marginalized figures of history, narratives of origins and progress can be alienating rather than inclusive; however, Bloom’s ability to locating himself in the narrative of creation (significantly, the birth of his daughter Milly nine occurs nine month after the scene at Howth) is simultaneously self-affirming and “self”-destroying, a moment in which he feels nothing but joy: “Joy; I ate it; joy” (Joyce, Ulysses 176). This memory of communion with Molly lets Bloom uphold love against “force, hatred, history all that” (333), and thus, as Ira Nadel argues, allows Joyce to “confront the limitations of history and substitute it for something ethical, spiritual, and eternal” (41). Lest Bloom’s memory be perceived as an act of pure imagination, Joyce validates Bloom’s it by having Molly evoke the same scene in “Penelope”:

...the sun shines for you he said the day we were lying among the rhododendrons on Howth head in the grey tweed suit and straw hat I got him to propose to me yes first I gave him the bit of seedcake out of my mouth and it was leapyear like now yes... (Ulysses 782)

Molly and Leopold’s mutual recognition of their moment of mutual recognition becomes perhaps the most meaningful historical narrative that emerges from Bloom’s thoughts in “Lestrygonians.” This version of history—with Molly's
“warm, sticky gum jelly lips” and “her stretched neck, beating, womans breasts full in her blouse of nun's veiling, fat nipples upright” (176)—is meaningful and alive, especially when juxtaposed against the old, cold marble statues with no eating holes nor anuses that Bloom observes in the National Museum after he leaves the pub. “Feel better,” Bloom thinks as he leaves his luncheon spot, “Burgundy. Good pick me up. Who distilled first? Some chap in the blues” (179).

Bloom’s “participatory” interaction with his wine in Davy Byrnes’ inspires another act of empathy just after he leaves the pub. The “Lestrygonians” episode ends with Bloom escorting a “blind stripling” across the road by his elbow, the only moment in the episode where characters actually touch: indeed, most of the moments of physical intimacy in *Ulysses* are either fantasized or remembered. In the opening moments of the scene, Bloom surveys the physical landscape and attempts to feel for the blind man: "No tram in sight. Wants to cross" (180). Bloom “touched the thin elbow gently: then took the limp seeing hand to guide it forward” (181). The young man’s white cane taps the ground as Bloom contemplates the nature of the blind man’s “sight” via the sensation of touch: "Queer idea of Dublin he must have, tapping his way round by the stones. Could he walk in a beeline if he hadn't that cane?" (181). Bloom imagines the man’s "eyeless feet" walking Dublin’s streets and attempts to identify with the blind man’s sense of perception: “Smells on all sides, bunched together. Each street a different smell. Each person too. Then the spring, the summer: smells. Tastes?” (181). Bloom notes, "They say you can’t taste wines with your eyes shut or a cold in the head. Also smoke in the dark they say get no
pleasure” (182). Sian White suggests that the figure of the stripling evokes for Bloom a “conscious curiosity about perception and the senses, as well as pity and empathy” (505). Bloom, whose own senses have been loosened by the effects of the wine has yet another transcendent recognition of the other: as Curtain finds in his food-centered philosophy, in the “Lestrygonians” episode, Bloom finds meaning in “ordinary everydayness; in an empathetic conversation, in willingness to travel to other worlds, and in being mindful about relations to what we count as food” (20).

Joyce had a vexed relationship with food: from a young age, he suffered from severe bouts of epigastric hunger pain and intestinal inflammation that culminated in his death from a perforated ulcer in 1941 (Baron 1700-1701).xliiv And yet, by most accounts, he enjoyed the experience of dining, drank heartily, and loved wine: Andrew Gibson notes that Joyce was a regular “drinking man” when he lived in Trieste, and claims the writer was a “late-night regular” in Zurich’s café’s and restaurants when his family moved there.xlv When he returned to Paris with his wife Nora, Joyce continued the patterns he established in Zurich: “He got up late, worked after lunch, never drank during the day, but liked wine every evening, when he went out for dinner with family and friends” (McCourt 106). Hugh Baron even describes Joyce’s pleasure at learning, while on his deathbed, that a potential blood donor hailed from Neuchatel, because he loved the wine from that area of the country and had “drunk a considerable amount of it before the ulcer perforated” (1701).xlvii As the “Lestrygonians” episode demonstrates, Joyce clearly put a great deal of thought (and a good deal of practice) into the matters of drink, an interest that clearly
informs the narrative of *Ulysses*, and, as I have argued, invites new and insightful readings of the importance of wine in the novel. The scene where Bloom drinks his Burgundy in “Lestrygonians” offers a thoughtful response to Curtain’s supposition that, “Had western philosophers begun their educations in the kitchen, perhaps it would not have seemed so important to escape the ordinariness of Plato's Cave to attain a glimpse of the meaning of life” (20). Bloom’s drinking of his Burgundy, an ordinary interaction with a seemingly mundane object, leads us to some profound conclusions about the nature of the self and the interconnectivity of the living and object worlds.
The French government ran the Devil’s Island penal colony from 1852 to 1953 in French Guiana; Captain Alfred Dreyfus, whom Zola defended in the published letter “J’Accuse,” spent five years in solitary confinement on the island. Zola’s politics were never far from his fiction: in The Belly, Florent is sentenced to the island after being falsely accused of participating in the uprisings against the first Napoleon—led by his nephew Napoleon III, who declared himself Emperor after overthrowing his uncle’s government—in 1851. Joyce would have likely read about the Dreyfus affair—and the anti-Semitic riots it provoked in Paris and Algiers—as the events were extensively covered in the European press.

Henry Vizetelly originally translated the novel, entitled The Fat and the Thin, into English in 1888.

The roots of the gastronomic tradition can be linked, at least in part, to the French Revolution’s effectual release of highly trained chefs from aristocratic households into the public sphere, spurring the development of a restaurant culture, a rise in popular interest in haute and international cuisines, and an increased production of literature focused on food. For further reading, see Amy B. Trubek, How the French Invented the Culinary Profession (U of Pennsylvania P, 2000); Rebecca Spang, The Invention of the Restaurant: Paris and Modern Gastronomic Culture (Harvard UP, 2001); and Lisa Civitello, “Hutsepot, Stove Potatoes, and Haute Cuisine: Seventeenth- to Eighteenth-Century Dutch, Russian, and French Cuisine” in Cuisine and Culture: The History of Food and People (Wiley, 2011) 182-215.


vii See Jaye Berman Montresor, “Joyce’s Jewish Stew: Alimentary Lists in Ulysses” in *Colby Quarterly* 31.3 (1995) 194-203. Montresor notes that Joyce’s decision to conclude this early list with a mention of urine emphasizes the novel’s focus on the entire digestive process—consumption to elimination—as later echoed in Bloom’s musings: “And we stuffing food in one hole and out behind: food, chyle, blood, dung, earth, food” (197).

viii For an excellent review of the scholarship on Molly’s eggs, see Austin Briggs’ “Breakfast at 7 Eccles Street” in *Joyce in Trieste; An Album of Risky Readings*, Eds. Sebastian D.G. Knowles, Geert Lernout, and John McCourt (U Florida P, 2002).

ix See, for example, Catherine Ryan, “Leopold Bloom’s Fine Eats: A Good Square Meal” in *James Joyce Quarterly* 25 (1988) 378-83. Ryan catalogues Bloom’s “visual, physical, psychological, and imaginative repast[s],” arranging her research under menu headings like Appetizers, Entrees, Combination Platters, Cheapest Lunch in Town, Delicacies (or Specialty Food), Seasonal Beverages, and Desserts.

x “Lestrygonians” was first serialized in 1919 in *The Little Review’s* January and February-March issue, before *Ulysses* was published in its entirety in 1922.

xi Perhaps no cheese in literature has garnered as much attention as the “bloomy” Gorgonzola that comprises Bloom’s lunch. An impressive array of Joyce scholars have offered interpretations on the cheese’s significance: oft cited is Richard Ellmann’s consideration of the “main decision” of Bloom’s meal as an existential choice because “it is formed from mammal’s milk without slaughter, and enclosed in bread which is vegetable in origin but reconstructed by man” (*Ulysses* 78). See Richard Ellmann, *Ulysses on the Liffey* (Oxford UP, 1972). See also Lindsey Tucker, *Stephen and Bloom at Life’s Feast: Alimentary Symbolism and the Creative Process in James Joyce’s “Ulysses”* (Ohio State UP, 1984). Tucker sees the reference as an invocation of the custom of eating cheese to honor Jewish law, suggesting a close identification with food and spiritual sustenance (115).

xii Joyce penned two schemas—one for Carlo Linati and another for Stuart Gilbert—for *Ulysses*, both assigning corresponding organs of the body to all but the first three episodes, the Telemachiad, which focuses on Stephen. “Teleaco non soffre ancora il corpo,” he noted in the Linati scheme: the Telemachus, or Stephen as Telemachus, “does not yet bear a body.”
See Maud Ellmann, “Ulysses: The Epic of the Human Body” in *A Companion to James Joyce* (Blackwell, 2008) 54-70. Ellmann points out that when Bloom dines on his lunch, “the language ruminates or chews its cud,” just as when he masturbates, “the languages tumesces and detumesces; when he visits the brothel, the language is convulsed with locomotor ataxia, the spastic symptoms of tertiary syphilis” (54). See also Aida Yared, “Eating and Digesting ‘Lestrygonians’: A Physiological Model of Reading” in *James Joyce Quarterly* 46.3 (2009) 469-479. Yared suggests that that “Lestrygonians” follows a Lilliputian-sized version of Bloom as he wanders through the intestinal tract of a gigantic female organism (469).

See Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford UP, 1983). Joyce enrolled in medical school at Dublin’s University College in 1902, but within a month, decided to enroll in medical school in Paris:

Having decided that medical school in Dublin did not suit him, Joyce rather illogically resolved to try medical school in Paris. Of course he wanted to go to Paris anyway, but he always presented his caprices as reasoned plans. Whether a Paris degree would be of any use to him in Ireland he did not investigate, and he did not bother his head over other questions he might have asked himself, such as how he could hope to pass chemistry in French when he could not do so in English. (106).

Joyce ultimately abandoned his medical studies altogether, though he fostered a lifelong interest in the study of life and living organisms.

See Marilyn French, *The Book as World: James Joyce’s Ulysses* (Paragon, 1993). French argues that Joyce “insists on the integrity of body and mind” (103). The metaphysical relationship between language and the human body held particular significance for Giambattista Vico: Joyce frequently consulted the Italian philosopher’s magnum opus, *The New Science*. See Giambattista Vico, “The Third New Science: Principles of a New Science Concerning the Common Nature of Nations” in *Selected Writings*, trans. Leon Pompa (Cambridge UP, 1982). Vico argues that “words are carried over from bodies and from the properties of bodies to signify the institutions of the mind and spirit” and “in all languages the greater part of the expressions relating to inanimate things are formed by metaphor from the human body and its parts and from the human senses and passions” (223).

See Jeremy Hugh Baron, “Byron’s Appetites, James Joyce’s Gut, and Melba’s Meals and Misalliances” in *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 315:7123 (1997) 1679-1702. Baron suggests that while Joyce may not have spent much time studying medicine, he often frequented the doctors’ quarters of the Dublin hospitals, “for the social life”:
he also kept close friendships with a number of medical students in Dublin, including Oliver St John Gogarty, the model for Buck Mulligan (1700).

xvii While Bloom’s remarks about the “smells of men” and the “stale of ferment” (Joyce, Ulysses 169) in the Burton restaurant are often attributed to his disgust at their cannibalistic tendencies, the comment also alludes to the inevitable process of degeneration and regeneration that reverberates throughout the novel. In the “Oxen of the Sun” episode, the transformative process of wine-making is conflated with biblical lore: "And they teach the serpents there to entwine themselves upon long sticks out of the ground and of the scales of these serpents they brew out a brewage like to mead" (387). In the “Lestrygonians” episode, Bloom’s continued reflection on science (or rather, a kind of pseudo-science) also chronicles his measured hesitance towards science’s tendency to avoid the personal in the name of “progress.” He reflects on the power of an x-ray to track a swallowed pin through a man’s body, thinking, “but the poor buffer would have to stand all the time with his insides entrails on show. Science” (Joyce, Ulysses 180). See Lindsey Tucker, Stephen and Bloom at Life’s Feast: Alimentary Symbolism and the Creative Process in James Joyce’s "Ulysses" (Ohio State UP, 1984).

xviii See Lynn Childress, “Les Pheniciens et L’Oddysee: A Source for ‘Lestrygonians.’” James Joyce Quarterly 26.2 (1989) 259-269. Childress sees French Hellenist Victor Berard’s heavily anthropomorphic translation of The Odyssey, Les Pheniciens et l’Odyssee, as having a profound impact on the theme of hunger that Joyce employs in the Lestrygonians episode (261). Berard’s translations turns the geographic descriptions in The Odyssey into a metaphor for the human body, with men symbolized as food: “Retaining the idea of ‘men as food,’ Joyce perverts the concept of anthromorphism into ‘trophomorphism,’ where non-food things acquire foodlike qualities, as a result of Bloom’s excessive hunger” (261). In Berard’s translation of Homer, Ulysses’ men enter the “mouth” of the cave travel through “du goulet, ‘a narrow straight’ into an empty hollow that resembles the pit of a stomach” (Childress 261).

xix See James Joyce, The Critical Writings, eds. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann (Faber and Faber, 1959). In his 1907 lecture “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages,” Joyce argues, “Ireland is poor because English laws ruined the industries of the country . . . because, in the years in which the potato crop failed, the negligence of the English government left the flower of the people to die of hungers” (qtd. in 167).

xx Elizabeth Malcolm, “Ireland: Drinking Patterns” in Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History, vol. 1, eds. Jack Blocker; David Fahey, and Ian Tyrrell (ABC-CLIO, 2003) 322-324. Malcolm notes that during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Irish pub was domestic, communal (rather than commercial) and
primarily male (322). She notes that drinking during this period in Irish history was common “in urban areas, among unskilled and semiskilled working class, and in rural area, among small farmers and agricultural labors” (322). Because there were no tied houses in Ireland, most publicans owned their own premises and ran their businesses out of their homes: for this reason, most pubs tended to be named after their owners (e.g. “Davy Byrnes”) (322).

xxi See Ira B. Nadel, “Molly’s Mediterranean Meals and Other Joycean Cuisines,” in Joyce in Trieste: An Album of Risky Readings, eds. Sebastian D.G. Knowles, Geert Lernout, and John McCourt (U of Florida P, 2002). Nadel argues that the food references in “Lestrygonians” become “a vehicle of cultural identity that transcends the irony of the Irish setting of Ulysses; it is another way of universalizing the text even as it maintains difference” (211).

xxii See George William (A.E.) Russell, "The Food in Ireland" in Selections from the Contributions to 'The Irish Homestead,' ed. Henry Summerfield (Colin Smythe, 1978). As Joyce may have known, Russell penned an article for The Irish Homestead in January 1906 with the thesis that the Irish people’s “lethargy, laziness, and incapacity for hard work” derived from their insufficient diet of imported goods and nutrient-deficient produce, such as “white bread, tea, American bacon, potatoes, and cabbage” (71).

xxiii See Martin Hughes, World Food: Ireland (Lonely, 2000). Hughes notes that the term “souper” or “soup-taker” is an Irish slur that refers to a person who has sold out their beliefs, often referring to the Irish Potato famine when some Catholics converted to a Protestant faith in order to gain access to a free meal (78).


xxv See Fredrick Lang, Ulysses and the Irish God (Bucknell UP, 1993). When Bloom muses, “Where is the justice being born that way? All those women and children excursion beanfest burned and drowned in New York. Holocaust. Karma they call that transmigration for sins you did in a past life the reincarnation met him pike hoses” (182), Lang suggests that he is seeing the General Slocum, a steam ship destroyed in a deadly fire after being chartered for an excursion by St. Mark’s Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a “contemporary sacrifice of Christians” that “reincarnates the ancient sacrifice of Christ” (Lang 153). The reference to Holocaust
(originally meaning “burnt offering”) and “karma” signifies the religious obsession with ritual and rites that often seem indifferent to human suffering.

xxvi The privileging of the activities of the mind over activities of the body can be traced to pre-Socratic philosophy, but Plato’s dialogues provide some of the earliest extensive considerations of the form and functions of the body in the western philosophical tradition.

xxvii See Deane Curtain, “Food/Body/Person” in Cooking, Eating Thinking: A Transformative Philosophy of Food, eds. Deane Curtain and Lisa Heldke (Indiana UP, 1992) 3-22. Curtin argues that a philosophy of food inimically complicates contrary pairs like mind/body and self/other: “taking the category of food seriously leads to a suspicion that the absolute border between self and other […] is nothing more than an arbitrary philosophical construction” (9).

xxviii The Linati schema lists as personae Antiphates, the Seductive Daughter, and Ulysses, but provides no correspondences. The Gilbert schema aligns “Antiphates” with “Hunger,” “The Decoy” with “Food,” and the “Lestrygonians” with “Teeth.” The Linati and Gilbert schemas agree on Organ (Esophagus), Art (Architecture), and Technique (Linati: Peristaltic prose; Gilbert: Peristaltic), but disagree on Color (Linati: blood red; Gilbert: none) and Symbol (Linati: Bloody sacrifice, Food, Shame; Gilbert: Constables).

xxix See Elizabeth Malcolm, “Ireland: The Temperance Movement” in Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History, vol. 1, eds. Jack Blocker, David Fahey, and Ian Tyrrell (ABC-CLIO, 2003) 322-324. Malcolm notes that while Ireland “has long supported an internationally important drinks industry, and heavy drinking has been an accepted feature of Irish culture,” Ireland, like England and the United States, has its own history of temperance resistance (322). The first organized temperance societies appeared in Ireland in 1829: Malcolm notes that while they had some success among Anglicans, Quakers, and Presbyterians in Northern Ireland, the temperance societies “made little headway among Catholics” (223). However, in 1898, a Jesuit priest established the Pioneer Total Abstinence Association of the Sacred Heart in Dublin, which quickly became the most influential temperance organization in the country throughout the twentieth century. For further reading on the temperance movement and Joyce’s fiction, see David Lloyd, “Counterparts: Dubliners, Masculinity, and Temperance Nationalism” in Semicolonial Joyce, eds. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes (Cambridge UP, 2000) 128-150.

xxx See Martin Bock, “James Joyce and Germ Theory: The Skeleton at the Feast” in James Joyce Quarterly 45.1 (Fall 2007) 23-46, and Lois Magner, A History of Medicine (CRC Press, 1992). In the 1850s and 1860s, French chemist Louis Pasteur’s research
on fermentation led him to hypothesize that the fermentation process was dependent on living ferments (or “germs”). He recognized that fermented beverages resulted from the process of the turning of glucose into ethanol by living yeast; until Pasteur’s research, the role of yeast in fermentation was believed to have been a product of fermentation, rather than the cause (Magner 310). Martin Bock asserts that Pasteur would have been legendary at the time Joyce was studying in Paris, and he is mentioned by name in Ulysses (37). Because Pasteur’s work on fermentation, putrefaction, and infectious disease prompted important developments in sterilization techniques, as a medical student, Joyce would certainly have been very familiar with Pasteur’s work. Moreover, these theories were discussed not only in the medical literature Joyce’s day but in also in gentlemen’s magazines, women’s domestic penny magazines, and two journals in which Joyce published early works, The Fortnightly Review and The Irish Homestead (Bock 23). Thus, it seems plausible that Joyce had at least a basic understanding of fermentation, and perhaps saw in it a degenerative process that modeled the breaking down of the narrative in Bloom’s wine-drinking scene.

xxxii In contrast with David Hume’s argument that men with “delicate” taste perceive and define qualities of beauty in an object, for Kant, judgments of beauty are not only generally agreed upon, but those agreements are reached via the perception of universal qualities of beauty.

xxxiii See Denise Gigante, Taste: A Literary History (Yale UP, 2005). Gigante argues that various “committees of taste” emerged the nineteenth century with the aim of “elevat[ing] food to the status of the fine arts, adopting the same juridical language and concern with philosophical principles that defined the eighteenth-century discourse of aesthetics” (1). Essentially, the nineteenth-century gastronomes used the very treatises that denigrated the taste senses in aesthetic philosophy to formulate their thesis that food can be art as much as any other artistic medium.

xxxiv See Michel Delville, Food, Poetry, and the Aesthetics of Consumption (Routledge, 2007). Delville points out that, like Kant, Hegel also dismissed taste in the process of
philosophical inquiry, believing that the close interaction between the subject and
the object of perception destroys the distance necessary for a critic to make a
judgment (1-2).

xxxv See Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, “A Cultural Field in the Marking: Gastronomy
in 19th Century France” in French Food: On the Table, on the Page, and in French
Culture, eds. Lawrence Scherhr and Allen Weiss (Routledge, 2001) 5-50. Parkhurst
Ferguson argues that one of the primary contributions of Brillat-Savarin’s works is
its “comprehensive and foundational” approach to food, drawing as it does on
physics, chemistry, physiology, cuisine, commerce, political economy, and even
medicine: “never again,” Parkhurst Ferguson concludes, “could food be confused
with either a sin or a mere bodily function” (23).

xxxvi See Samuel Beckett, “Dante... Bruno... Vico... Joyce” in Modernism: An Anthology.
his ability to produce “living language”:

Here form is content, content is form. You complain that this stuff is not
written in English. It is not written at all. It is not to be read – or rather it is
not only to be read. It is to be looked at and listened to. His writing is not
about something; it is that something itself... When the sense is dancing, the
words dance. (qtd. in Rainey 1067)

Beckett is referring to Finnegans Wake, but I believe the principle still applies to the
wine-drinking passage in Ulysses. Beckett’s review of the “tipsy” language in Wake
further supports the parallel: “Take this passage at the end of Shaun’s pastoral: ‘To
stir up love’s young fizz I tilt with this bridle’s cup champagne, dimming douce from
her peepair of hide-seeks...’ The language is drunk. The very words are tilted and
effervescent” (1067). Tellingly, these passages closely resemble the prose style of
“Penelope.”

xxxvii See Lawrence Schehr, “Savory Writing: Marcel Rouff’s Vie Et Passion de Dodin-
Bouffant,” in French Food: On the Table, on the Page, and in French Culture, eds.
Lawrence Schehr and Allen Weiss (Routledge, 2001) 124-125. Schehr argues that
for Proust, reflections on food are “part and parcel of the memories of the past”
(124). “The most atavistic ones for him (taste and smell),” Schehr notes, are “spurs
to writing, joggers of memory, culinary flying buttresses that helped to support the
massive cathedral that becomes the novel in four dimensions in which all of
Combray emerges out of a cup of tea” (124). The Madeleine I refer to comes from a
passage of The Remembrance of Things Past (1922) where Proust reflects on the
nature of involuntary memory and voluntary memory: voluntary memories, he
concludes, are retrieved by "intelligence," that is, memories that require putting conscious effort into the act of remembrance.

xxviii See also Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918: With a New Preface* (Harvard University Press, 2003) 24-26. Kern notes that at the time Joyce was writing *Ulysses*, theories about the social relativity of time were prevalent (24). In 1912, Emile Durkheim’s *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* differentiated between private time and “time in general.” General time, Durkheim asserts, is actually chronicled by “the rhythm of social life,” that the divisions of days, weeks, years, etc., “correspond to the periodical recurrence of rites, feast, and public ceremonies” (qtd. in 24).

xxxix See Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and the Making of "Ulysses" and Other Writings* (Oxford UP, 1972). Joyce’s intent to evoke human origins in the scene is enforced by a comment to Frank Budgen that “Fermented drink must have a sexual origin […] In a woman’s mouth, probably. I have made Bloom eat Molly’s chewed seed cake” (108).

x In the “Oxen of the Sun” episode, the transformative process of wine-making is conflated with biblical lore: "And they teach the serpents there to entwine themselves upon long sticks out of the ground and of the scales of these serpents they brew out a brewage like to mead" (387). Lindsey Tucker persuasively argues that this passage positions wine and bread making as “first processes of transformation of which man became conscious”: thus, the “Oxen of the Sun” episode attempts to chronicle “the development of English, the evolution of fauna, the growth of the human foetus,” but also, “the development of ritual” (98). See Lindsey Tucker, *Stephen and Bloom at Life’s Feast: Alimentary Symbolism and the Creative Process in James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’* (Ohio State UP, 1984).

xli See Fredrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, trans. and ed. Walter Kaufmann (Vintage Press, 1968). Bloom’s re-telling of history evokes Nietzsche’s formulation of the historical self that wills itself into existence through the act of self-creation; that is, the subject that resists nihilism, blind faith, and the conventions of history by interpreting and re-enacting experiences in the past.

and Stalinism to grand narratives about the triumph of the Aryan race and the proletariat (154). For Lyotard, the “petit recit,” offers a challenge to grand narratives; these localized narratives are the “quintessential form of imaginative invention” (60).


See Jeremy Hugh Baron, “Byron’s Appetites, James Joyce’s Gut, and Melba’s Meals and Misalliances” in *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 315:7123 (1997) 1679-1702. Joyce was diagnosed with intestinal inflammation in 1928 before Dr. Fontaine—who also saw expatriate writers Ernest Hemingway and Samuel Beckett—diagnosed him with colitis in 1933, recommending “absolute and complete calm” as a remedy (Baron 1701). On January 10, 1941, surgeon Heinrich Freysz was called to examine a severely distressed Joyce, finding him reclined with an extended and tender abdomen and a rapidly beating pulse. Despite receiving a blood transfusion, Joyce died at 1 a.m. on January 13th.

According to J.B. Lyons, Ernest Hemingway told Scott Fitzgerald, “You’re no more of a rummy than Joyce is, and most good writers are” (qtd. in 124). Lyons quips, “which may have consoled Fitzgerald, but, if correct, would have placed Joyce in a very advanced category of alcoholism indeed” (124). See J.B. Lyons, *James Joyce and Medicine* (Dolman, 1973) 124.

In a letter to his brother Stanislaus in 1906, Joyce provides a “full and exact list” of food he shared with his wife Nora on a trip to the Roman countryside:

- 10:30 A.M. Ham, bread and butter, coffee.
- 1:30 P.M. Soup, roast lamb and potatoes, bread and wine.
- 4.-P.M. Beef stew, bread and wine.
- 6.-P.M. Roast veal, bread, gorgonzola cheese and wine.
- 8.30 P.M. Roast veal, bread and grapes and vermouth.
- 9.40 P.M. Veal cutlets, bread, salad, grapes and wine. (*Selected Letters* 116)
Chapter 5

“AT LAST FIT FOR THE TABLE”: WINE AND MEMORY IN EVELYN WAUGH’S

BRIDESHEAD REVISITED

The World Wars radically altered the physical, social, and economic terrain of Europe in the first half of the twentieth century, and in England, also caused considerable shifts in the public perception and consumption of alcoholic beverages. During the First World War, concerns for the population’s wellbeing and productivity—along with lingering temperance efforts—prompted the British Parliament to introduce several restrictive laws on the production, purchasing, and serving of alcohol: these measures included issuing “No Treating” orders in bar, imposing reductions on the alcoholic strength of beverages, raising the age limits on the purchase of alcohol, and implementing higher tax on alcoholic beverages. In munitions factory towns, the government purchased and closed down local breweries and drinking establishments in an effort to keep workers sober and industrious. For English troops serving with the British Expeditionary Forces, daily rations of alcohol were limited 2.5 ounces of rum or, on occasion, a pint of weak porter, though even these concessions were met with fierce opposition by politicians, doctors, and public opponents of alcohol (Fear and Jones 167). King George V even promised that no alcohol would be consumed in the royal household until the war’s end. After 1918, an economically and emotionally bereft population of English citizens searched out ways to mitigate the trauma and upheaval of war: alcohol offered drinkers the opportunity to socialize and/or self-medicate.
Publicans catered to the demands of their new clientele during the interwar period: beerhouses and gin palaces gave way to open-seating drinking establishments with restaurant-quality food service. Although women had never been excluded from drinking establishments, the stigma that could taint “respectable” women mitigated, and working- and middle-class women became frequent, and commercially important, patrons of the pubs (“Patrons” 509).vi The interwar period saw the birth of cocktail culture in London’s West End, the opening of the city’s first successful night clubs, and a thriving popular interest in the antics and drinking habits of a group of bohemian aristocrats and socialites dubbed the “Bright Young Things.”vii Though fashionable drinks and upscale clubs thrived in England’s metropolises, the nation’s suffering economy and low employment rates, along with continually high taxes on alcohol, contributed to exceptionally low national averages of alcohol consumption after WWI and through the long period of economic downturn in the 1930s (D. Heath 293). At the onset of World War II, popular and parliamentary attitudes about drink and public morale meant that far fewer legislative restrictions were imposed on alcohol than in the First World War, but while drink was not officially rationed, luxury goods became limited and expensive as factories focused on the war effort.viii Rates of alcohol consumption in England would not reach pre-WWI levels until a decade after the conclusion of World War II.ix The fluctuations in alcohol consumption on a national level, however, did not stop a generation of writers from chronicling their passion for, and problems with, wine and other alcoholic beverages.x
Evelyn Waugh wrote *Brideshead Revisited: the Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder* (1945) while serving in British armed forces during the Second World War; after injuring his fibula during a parachute training, he applied for three months leave—later extended to five months—to write the novel before he returned to duty and was sent to Yugoslavia. *Brideshead* records Charles Ryder’s wartime reflections on his life before World War II, leading up to his platoon’s arrival at the former estate of the Marchmain family. The first half of the novel charts the development of Charles’ friendship with the charismatic Sebastian Flyte, as well as Charles’ introduction to Sebastian’s aristocratic family and their sprawling estate. The second half of the novel chronicles Charles’ unhappy marriage and eventual love affair with Julia Flyte, Sebastian’s descent into alcoholism, and Lord Marchmain’s life in Venice and death in his ancestral home. Though *Brideshead* focuses on different eras and events in Charles’ life, the novel is replete with references to alcohol, including numerous allusions to, and long passages about, wine and wine drinking. Waugh’s own passion for wine is well-documented in a number of his nonfiction essays and personal diary entries; in a slim volume called *Wine in Peace and War*—published in 1947 by the London wine firm Saccone and Speed—Waugh calls wine a “staple of civilization” and, along with books, music, and gardens, an “essential part of the ‘Art of Life’” (12). In *Wine*, he minimizes the destructive effect of alcohol and strived to present drinking as a symbol of England’s ancestral heritage. In *Brideshead*, the presentation of wine is somewhat more complex: through Charles and Sebastian’s Bacchic feasts, Charles’ developing
appreciation of wine, and Sebastian’s degradation into crippling addiction, Waugh offers a dynamic representation of alcohol that regards its pleasures as well as its consequences. Wine, however, maintains its status as a conduit to a forgotten but potentially restorative English history.

In both *Wine* and *Brideshead*, wine is closely associated with acts of memory and recollection. In *Wine*, Waugh declares, “Besides having a discernment of taste, a connoisseur must have memory” (42). He further asserts, “It is not enough to distinguish the particular qualities of a wine, he must remember where he met it before—put a name to it” (42). In *Brideshead*, during a dinner scene between Charles and Julia’s husband Rex, Charles’ appreciation of his wine predicts Waugh’s later insistence that memory inform the act of wine drinking:

> I rejoiced in the Burgundy. How can I describe it? The Pathetic Fallacy resounds in all our praise of wine. For centuries every language has been strained to define its beauty, and has produced only wild conceits or the stock epithets of the trade [...] By chance I met this same wine again, lunching with my wine merchant in St. James’s Street, in the first autumn of the war; it had softened and faded in the intervening years, but it still spoke in the pure, authentic accents of its prime... (175)

Charles’ appreciation for his wine extends beyond instantaneous sensory satisfaction; he finds in the wine a reminder of an ideal and distant world. Furthermore, Charles remembers another instance in which he has tasted the very same wine in a telling juxtaposition of the early days of war with a “pure, authentic” earlier time. The above passage continues as Charles dwells on the thought that each time he meets the wine, “it whispered faintly, but in the same lapidary phrase, the same words of hope” (175). It is not just the wine, but also the memories
inspired by the wine that seem to hold deep meaning to the “homeless, childless, middle-aged, loveless” (350) Charles. In both his fiction and essays, Waugh makes an argument for wine’s ability to serve as a signifier of the past and a vessel for individual and cultural memory.

In his essay “Between Memory and History: Lieux de Mémoire,” French historian Pierre Nora uses the term lieu de mémoire, or “sites of memory,” to describe the materialization or embodiment of memory in “spaces, gestures, images, and objects”: whereas history “belongs to everyone and to no one, whence its claim to universal authority,” memory is “multiplied and yet specific; collective, plural, and yet individual [...] memory takes root in the concrete” (9). Nora argues that when modern individuals feel distanced from a collective past, they often consecrate their memories in objects, ideas, or places that provide some sense of connection to a shared, “authentic” past. Sites of memory attempt “to stop time, to block the work of forgetting” and inspire a "will to remember" (19). In Brideshead, the fear of forgetting is perhaps best vocalized by Sebastian, who muses that he would like to bury “something precious” in every place that makes him happy: “when I’m old and ugly and miserable,” he reflects, “I could come back and dig it up and remember” (Waugh 24). Charles, having surveyed the modern landscape and finding it a “homogeneous territory of housing estates and cinemas,” (3) also thinks back to the days of his youth at Brideshead and yearns for it be “like this always – always summer, always alone, the fruit always ripe and Aloysius [Sebastian’s teddy bear] in a good temper...” (79). Most of the novel’s primary characters are filled with a sense
of nostalgic yearning and a fear that, as Nora writes, “...the remnants of experiences still lived in the warmth of tradition, in the silence of custom, in the repetition of the ancestral, have been displaced under the pressures of a fundamentally historical sensibility” (7). Memory evades the poverty of the present moment by re-enchanting the images of the past. As the soldier Charles drifts back to his past, he embraces memory as though it is the only thing that he has left in the world:

My theme is memory, that winged host that soared about me one grey morning of war-time. These memories, which are my life—for we possess nothing certainly except the past—were always with me. Like the pigeons of St. Mark’s, they were everywhere, under my feet, singly, in pairs, in little honey-voiced congregations, nodding, strutting, winking, rolling the tender feathers of their necks, perching sometimes, if I stood still, on my shoulder or pecking a broken biscuit from between my lips; until, suddenly, the noon gun boomed and in a moment, with a flutter and sweep of wings, the pavement was bare and the whole sky above dark with a tumult of fowl. (Waugh, Brideshead 225)

Charles’ memories on the morning of war function as a site of escape; they offer an almost dream-like sanctuary from the reality of war. Simon Joyce argues that in Brideshead’s processes of memory, “an entire ideology, rotted in the supposed continuities of ancient building and traditional tastes, can also come to be affirmed as a meaningful refuge from what Waugh saw as the horrors of modern life” (Joyce 64). These “horrors,” as I will demonstrate, are associated with the chaos of war, the threat of “femininity,” the menace of “barbarism,” and the loss of English aristocratic values, that for Waugh, belong to an ideal past.

Without making a direct biographical link between Evelyn Waugh and Charles Ryder, textual evidence supports the claim that both the writer and his fictional narrator struggled to find compassion and meaning in the midst of war and
the chaos of the modern world. Julia Jordan suggests that the geographical fragmentation that occurred in Europe during the war became “a totemic collective articulation of emotion and experience” (52). Writers like Elizabeth Bowen, Stephen Spender, George Orwell, and Waugh responded to this sentiment by working themes of fragmentation and chaos into their art (Jordan 52): for example, in Waugh's Unconditional Surrender (1961), the character Everard Spruce declares that “the human race was destined to dissolve in chaos” (41). Jerome Meckier argues that the cyclical structures of many of Waugh's novels (i.e. that the works open and close with the same setting, time frame, or narrator), including Brideshead, demonstrate his attempt to provide “a sign of the world’s loss of direction, a refutation of complacent belief in inevitable progress” (66). As early as 1937, Waugh—who would later refer to Brideshead “a souvenir of the Second World War” (“Preface” 7)—calls war “the pollution of truth, the deterioration of human character, the emergence of the bully and the cad, the obliteration of chivalry... [to] muddle and futility” (“The Soldiers Speak” 199). At the dawn of conflict in 1939, Waugh positions war as an exercise in futility plagued by irony: "In war, it is notorious, opponents soon forget the cause of their quarrel, continue the fight for the sake of fighting and in the process assume a resemblance to what they abhorred" (“Commentary” 580). Even wine drinking, according to Waugh, suffered a “sad and symptomatic decline” in the 1930s and 40s: “As the noble buildings fell one by one during that black decade at the hands of the builders, ignoble habits took root,” he decries, referring to the advice of “quack doctors” and the growing popular appeal of
“flavored and frozen spirits” (19). “Only a small and faithful company remained true to the generous habits of their ancestors,” he mourns, “It was a dark age, very properly punished by the succeeding decade of austerity” (19). Waugh laments the condition of the present moment and cites a loss of appreciation for the past as a cause for the degradation of the future.

Both *Brideshead* and *Wine* revolve around the idea that the values, rituals, and structures of an ideal past have rapidly given way to a degraded modern society. Nora argues that modern individuals frequently perceive an “acceleration of history,” or, an “increasingly rapid slippage of the present into a historical past that is gone” (7). The acceptance of this phenomenon creates what Nora calls a sense of “rupture in equilibrium” (7), an experience that seems to play out in a passage from *Brideshead*’s prologue where Charles, now a soldier, first hears the name of the estate his company has been stationed at from his second-in-command:

> He told me and, on the instant, it was as though someone had switched off the wireless, and a voice that had been bawling in my ears, incessantly, fatuously, for days beyond number, had been suddenly cut short; an immense silence followed, empty at first, but gradually, as my outraged sense regained authority, full of a multitude of sweet and natural and long-forgotten sounds – for he had spoken a name that was so familiar to me, a conjuror’s name of such ancient power, that, at its mere sound, the phantoms of those haunted late years began to take flight. (Waugh, *Brideshead* 15)

Charles’ response is triggered by the name of the Brideshead manor and the realization that the beloved country estate of his youth has been turned into a military base. For Charles, the estate serves as a quintessential representation of his own past, but as Waugh himself explains in a letter to the MGM directors who hoped to adapt the novel to film, the manor also represents “the conflicting characteristics
of the English aristocratic tradition,” as represented by the fountain and the chapel: though Lord Marchmain represents “a recent and half-hearted convert to Catholicism,” the Flytes (his wife’s family) “should be represented as one of the English noble families which retained their religion throughout the Reformation period” (qtd. in J. Heath 227-228). David Rothstein argues that Brideshead is built around “historically conscious characters (especially Charles the narrator) who are acutely aware of their break with the past” (319). Rothstein also uses Pierre Nora’s concept of memory to argue that the characters try to “anchor themselves through their active relation to sites of memory” (319). Rothstein’s primary emphasis lies in the way Brideshead is preoccupied with the issue of preserving Catholic identity and memory in objects, places, and rituals like the copper lamp, the house, and Catholic family life: “the text harkens back to a time when an aristocratic Catholic culture sustained itself and expressed an identity through a collective memory and through gradually evolving but self-enclosed, self-referential signs rituals, images, and structures” (329). I believe Rothstein may have just as easily included wine in his list of the novel’s consecrated objects of Catholicism—for reasons I will address in turn—but I also believe that the past Waugh associates with wine extends beyond a strictly Catholic context. For Waugh, wine consecrates the memory of a past that not only embodies the enclaves of Catholicism, but that is also fundamentally English and quintessentially masculine.

Of course, the Catholic context always matters when it comes to Waugh. Though his diaries and essays reveal an appreciation for wine that developed as
early as his days as a university student, his treatment of the drink in *Brideshead* and subsequent works is likely influenced by its central position in Catholic doctrine. Waugh had converted to the Catholic faith in 1930, shortly after the dissolution of his marriage to Evelyn Gardner, but in the essay he wrote shortly after, “Converted to Rome: Why It Happened to Me,” he insists that his decision to be received into the Church did not occur because he was "captivated by the ritual" (103). Rather, he insists, conversion became a decision between "Christianity and Chaos":

Today we can see it on all sides as the active negation of all that Western culture has stood for. Civilization—and by this I do not mean talking cinemas and tinned food, nor even surgery and hygienic houses, but the whole moral and artistic organization of Europe—has not in itself the power of survival. It came into being through Christianity, and without it has no significance or power to command allegiance. The loss of faith in Christianity and the consequential lack of confidence in moral and social standards have become embodied in the ideal of a materialistic, mechanized state... It is no longer possible... to accept the benefits of civilization and at the same time deny the supernatural basis upon which it rests. (103)

*Brideshead* has been called Waugh’s epitomical “novel of conversion,” and its religious overtones have been celebrated and criticized since its 1945 publication. Waugh attempted to defend the novel after American critic Edmund Wilson's published an acerbic critique of the novel's religious agenda: “Modern novelists,” he claims, "try to represent the whole human mind and soul and yet omit its determining character - that of being God's creature with a defined purpose" (“Fanfare” 304). “In my future books,” he promises, “there will be two things to make them unpopular: a preoccupation with style and the attempt to represent man more fully, which to me means only one thing, man in his relation to God” (302).
Indeed, *Brideshead* marks a turn in Waugh’s oeuvre. The witty, satiric style of his novels—where, as Christopher Hitchens argues, religious material is “treated as the raw material of farce” (107)—began to shift to the more reflective and religious tone of his biographies and essays. George McCartney argues that Waugh became “intensely religious, a bit of a snob, and unabashedly Tory in his sympathies” (59); British critic V.S. Pritchett more bluntly opines that after Brideshead “the gentleman moralist appeared, a clubbish writer assiduously polishing his malign sentences, daily persisting with the stings of mortifying circumlocution” (95). Laura Coffey argues that Waugh’s draw to Catholicism lay in its offering of a “historical orthodoxy” that “resonate[d] with his perception of the historical pedigree of the upper classes” (64). The Church also had the appeal of locating ancient practice in present-day ritual. As Jenny Hendrix notes, concepts like original sin, crucifixion, and the nativity offer believers the opportunity to exist in the past: much like the act of reading, which allows for the simultaneous unfolding of past events in the present moment of our reading, religion allows the past to “stream ceaselessly into the present” (par. 8). Likewise, participation in the Eucharist provides believers with the opportunity to not only remember Christ’s sacrifice, but also to receive and celebrate his body in a transhistorical context.

Waugh’s essays also reveal a profound appreciation for the Church’s ability to endure: in the 1949 essay “Come Inside,” he emphasizes that “England was Catholic for nine hundred years,” and though it became then “protestant for three hundred, then agnostic for a century,” the structures of Catholicism “still [lie] lightly
buried beneath every picture of English life; history, topography, law, archaeology, everywhere reveal Catholic origins” (366).xiv Waugh saw in the Church the capacity to withstand even the most perilous schisms and attacks against its orthodoxy. In Wine, Waugh makes a similar correlation between wine and the endurance of the Church:

The Patriarch Noah, we are credibly informed, appalled by the prospect of water covering the face of the earth, celebrated the survival of the species by planting the grape in the newly liberated soil. It was the symbol of the endurance of human civilization. So we can now joyfully welcome the return of the vine after the years of desolation. It is at once the symbol of hope and the reward of victory. On the occasion of the first pressing, it will be remembered, Noah rather overdid things, but the curse fell, not on him for his drunkenness, but on his son Canaan for looking on it askance. Canaan, the teetotaler, was driven out from the family circle and Noah lived to enjoy his wine to the ripe age of 350. (38)

Although he calls wine grapes a “symbol of the endurance of human civilization,” the reference to the “return of the vine” (we may also note that Jesus refers to himself as “the vine” in the New Testament) reiterates Waugh’s belief in a past that society has lost or forgotten. Wine is written with a tone of apprehension that previously established reference points for England, like a cultural appreciation for wine, were slipping beyond the realm of lived memory: what had once been a deeply significant ritual and object of daily life could become an unappreciated historical object. In both Wine and Brideshead, Waugh upholds wine to his readers as a vestige of historical consciousness that can link the past and the present: “With regard to wine, man is like a soldier returning home and a family which have grown strange to him,” he argues in Wine, “He cannot plunge into intimacy at once. He has forgotten much which must be relearned with patience and delicacy” (37). Accepting Nora’s
definition of sites of memory as “the rituals of a ritual-less society; fleeting incursions of he sacred into a disenchanted world: vestiges of parochial loyalties in a society that is busily effacing all parochialisms,” wine, for Waugh, symbolizes an “authentic,” sacred (and, we might add, thoroughly constructed) identity that modern man can seek even in the midst of modern chaos.

Though critics like Rothstein and Coffey have persuasively used the places, people, and objects of *Brideshead* to discuss the ways the novel works to celebrate and preserve memory in a Catholic context, I believe the almost sacrosanct presentation of masculine bonding that Waugh believes occurs over wine drinking is integral to the project of preservation at work in the novel. The first part of the novel primarily follows Charles’ university years at Oxford and his introduction to Sebastian. Though there are no references to wine in the novel’s introduction—where a much older Charles reflect as a soldier in the midst of war—the novel's shift into his past provokes an abundance of wine references and wine-related terminology. The reader's introduction to Sebastian comes by way of an invitation to Charles to join him for a picnic: “I've got a basket of strawberries and a bottle of Chateau Peyraguey—which isn't a wine you've ever tasted, so don’t pretend” (Waugh, *Brideshead* 23). A prevailing theme of the scene that follows, along with a number of other early scenes from the novel, is the euphoric experience of companionship between men. After sharing the bottle of wine, Charles and Sebastian lie on their backs smoking Turkish cigarettes while “the fumes of the sweet, golden wine seemed to lift us a finger's breadth above the turf and hold us
suspended” (24). Furthermore, though Waugh had crafted a somewhat acerbic parody of the exuberant, reckless youth of the early 1920s in *Vile Bodies*—which originally bore the title “Beautiful Young Things”—his presentation of the Oxford boys is more heavily imbued with a sense of nostaligc fondness. The Oxford boys’ brackishness is more droll than arrogant: when Charles’ cousin Jasper laments the odd fashions and drinking habits of his kin, Charles sheepishly, if not sincerely, apologizes: “I know it must be terribly embarrassing for you, but I happen to like this bad set [...] I usually have a glass of champagne about this time. Will you join me?” (43). Though the boys’ habits will eventually lead to a more careless and troublesome series of events, one gets the sense that Waugh wants us to see these wine-soaked early years as an integral, and honorable, part of Charles’ bildungsroman.

One of the more famous wine passages in the novel—involving Sebastian and Charles’ shared discovery and education of the wines in Brideshead’s cellars—is unabashedly sensual:

We warmed the glass slightly at a candle, filled a third of it, swirled the wine round, nursed it in our hands, held it to the light, breathed it, sipped it, filled our mouths with it and rolled it over the tongue, ringing it on the palate like a coin on a counter, tilted our heads back and let it trick down the throat. Then we talked of it and nibbled Bath Olive biscuits, and passed on to another wine; then back to the first, then on to another, until all three were in circulation and the order of glasses got confused and we fell out over which was which, and we passed the glasses to and fro between us until there were six classes, some of them with mixed wines in them which we had filled from the wrong bottle, til we were obliged to start again with three clean classes each, and the bottles were empty and our praise of them wilder and more exotic. (84)
And so the men continue to drink and drunkenly discuss the qualities of the wine, the passage concluding with Sebastian wondering if every night should present an opportunity to get drunk. “Yes,” concludes Charles, “I think so” (84). Wine and wine drinking have been associated with homo-social, and frequently homosexual, relationships between men for thousand of years. As Wayne Dynes notes, drinking wine was a central activity of the Greek symposium and served to symbolize the bond between men: the present of a drinking-cup to a young man meant the “admission as a qualified member to the world of adult men” (56). In Wine, Waugh compels young men to cultivate an interest in wine by seeking out their elders: “God forbid that you should lay down the law to them. Be reverent and enquiring [...] most elderly men rejoice in instructing a younger generation who they find eager to enjoy” (75). Paula Byrne notes that the men Waugh shared relationships with at Oxford often shared his love for drinking; in a serious relationship with Alastair Graham, the men “drank deep together of both alcohol and love” (61). Waugh later recalled of his “first homosexual love,” Richard Pares, “I loved him dearly, but an excess of wine nauseated him and this made an insurmountable barrier between us” (qtd. in Byrne 61). Waugh never repudiated his homosexual affairs, even though they would have been illegal in England at the time of their happening: just as the making of wine requires the conversion of sugar to alcohol, Waugh saw the love between men as an essential element of the “Art of Life.” In Brideshead, Charles’ love for Sebastian encourages his love for the aesthetic, and eventually, the novel seems to imply, his love for God.
Part of the perceived threat to the masculine tradition of male bonding, particularly as it occurs over drink, may have been the growing participation of women in the public arenas of drinking. In an essay entitled, “Drinking,” Waugh calls the generation of his schoolmates at Oxford, “the last to preserve more or less intact the social habits of the nineteenth century” (35). Part of the idyllic preservation, it seems, was the fact that “women were not seen except in Eights Week”:

It was rare for a man to go down for a night during term. The generation after ours cherished closer links with London. Girls drove up; men drove down. Cocktail shakers rattled, gramophones discoursed jazz. The Cowley works enveloped the city. But in my day our lives were bounded by the university. For a brief Indian summer we led lives very much like our fathers. (35)

Though Waugh may be referring to his experience at Oxford, the phenomenon of public drinking being limited to the realm of men certainly extended beyond the context of his university. It was not until the Second World War that women began to join their male counterparts at the public houses in noticeable numbers. Using data obtained by social research organization Mass Observation during the war and interwar periods, Claire Langhamer persuasively argues that, in fact, the context of war “play[ed] a crucial role in opening up the leisure space of the public house to different categories of women patrons” (437). Langhamer attributes this shift to employment patterns, wage increases, shifting opportunities and attitudes towards leisure and types of leisure by women, and “a limited shift in attitudes which saw women war-workers as deserving of a particular type of leisure reward” (437). Overall, women’s roles and public perception of those roles shifted dramatically leading up to and during the war period: as Penny Summerfield asserts, “Feminist
work on the Second World War has established that 1939-45 was a period when assumptions about and perceptions of gender roles and boundaries were profoundly disturbed” (35). Waugh’s novels, essays, and diary entries reveal how troublesome he found the influence of England’s daughters on the world of “our fathers.”

In *Brideshead*, the perceived threat of feminine power and energy plays out in a scene between Charles and Lady Marchmain. Having discussed Sebastian’s latest drinking binge, Charles turns to leave her chambers. In closing the door behind himself, he experiences great relief in having shut out “the bondieuserie, the low ceiling, the chintz, the lambskin bindings, the views of Florence, the bowls of hyacinth and pot-pourri, the petit point,” and, most importantly, “the intimate feminine, modern world” (Waugh, *Brideshead* 138). These representations of modernity—and its apparently “feminine” trappings—are contrasted with the rest of the manor with its “covered and coffered roof, the columns and entablature of the central hall, in the august, masculine of a better age” (138). In Charles’ narrative, Waugh presents us with an almost explicit expression of longing for an idealized construction of a masculine, aristocratic, passing (or passed) era. Waugh does not let the presentation of wine and women go unaddressed, either, though the lives and activities of the female characters rarely get treated in *Brideshead*. At one point Sebastian’s sister Cordelia expresses her enjoyment of wine at a party. Sebastian’s immediate reaction is to inform Charles that Cordelia’s last school report “said that she was not only the worse girl in the school, but the worse there had ever been in
the memory of the oldest nun” (91). Even though she becomes one of the most insightful and loving characters in the novel, she remains largely unredeemed to Charles: "I thought her an ugly woman. [...] When she said, ‘It’s wonderful to be home,’ it sounded to my ears like the grunt of an animal returning to its basket” (301). His lover, the beautiful Julia with her antiquated Catholic morality, “hate[s] champagne” (77). The Earl of Brideshead doesn’t like wine, but laments his distaste: “I wish I were. It is such a bond with other men” (91). The potential for wine to evoke the “promotion of sympathy between man and man” (93) is lost to Bridey, who struggles to connect with other characters throughout the novel; he eventually abandons his aspirations of priesthood to become a matchbox collector. Perhaps even more revealing, Waugh’s non-fiction essays on wine and wine drinking are always addressed to men: in Wine, his finest words of advice on learning to appreciate wine are meant strictly for “very young men” (75). Fine and nuanced vintage port should only be consumed “in the masculine calm which follows the retirement of women” (66); “Intelligent women,” he further declares, “are the sworn enemies of a good port; so are women servants” (67). In “Drinking,” women serve as the lure towards an unfortunate trend in drinking habits: “Nowadays, I am told, men privately drink milk and, when they entertain, do so to entice girls” (32). The effect of such degraded habits is clear: “It is tedious for the young to be constantly reminded what much finer fellows their fathers were and what a much more enjoyable time we had” (32).xvii

Though Waugh continually associates “modernity” with the degradation of a
once-great society of aristocratic principals, and “femininity” with the dispossessio
of masculine rituals and values, his underlying concern with all these influences
seems to lie in their challenge to an aggrandized conception of what it means to be
English. His attitudes toward wine play deeply into these concerns: his works
continually reflect an appreciation for what he sees as being England’s long-
standing and vastly important relationship to wine. In Wine, citing references from
the “English classics, from Chaucer onwards,” Waugh argues that “through every
stage of history, in the most diverse surroundings, wine has been the inseparable
companion of the Englishman and an inmate of his home” (12). In Brideshead, the
superiority of a sophisticated Englishman’s good taste over his foreign or
fashionable companions is represented most clearly the dinner scene between
Charles and Rex. Rex, whom Julia later describes as being as “absolutely modern and
up-to-date that only this ghastly age could produce” (200), eats caviar with chopped
onion because “a chap-who-knew told me it brought out the flavour,” and ends his
meal with a glass of expensive cognac, a “vast and mouldy bottle they kept for
people of Rex’s sort” (177). In contrast, Charles opts to drink a Burgundy he
describes as “serene and triumphant, a reminder that the world was an older and
better place than Rex knew” (175). As Simon Joyce argues, Charles appears to
become Rex’s cultural superior “on the grounds that his suitability for the role is
simply unquestioned, depending (as it seems to) on a occulted knowledge that he
posses by right on account of his English upbringing and cultural heritage” (61). The
scene epitomizes just how closely Waugh associates wine with a rare and precious
form of English aristocracy.

In *Wine*, Waugh gives nod to other nations who refine the craft and quality of their wines: France’s clarets “command the most element slopes, the best soil, the most skilled culture” (56); Burgundy is a “rare ware and it has found rude imitators in every quarter of the globe” (57). He devotes a considerable portion of *Wine* to a celebration of the virtues of port, “essentially a British invention” (63). His appreciation for *terroir*, appellations, and nationally distinctive wines is only matched by a lamentation that his interests may “apply to an Arcadian age which can never return” (76). Waugh had firm beliefs on the nature of a nation, and as Alan Munton argues, in the years leading up to World War II, Waugh’s works reflect a belief in the inevitable nature of inequality, particularly as it pertained to class division, war, conquest, and nationality (233). In his 1939 travelogue *Robbery Under Law: The Mexican Object-Lesson*, Waugh affirms, “I believe in nationality” (17). “Mankind inevitably organizes itself into communities according to its geographical distribution,” he argues, “these communities by sharing a common history develop common characteristics and inspire a local loyalty” (17). Changes to this model of geographical unity represent a challenge to the purity of the national model. Bernard Schweizer notes that works like *Brideshead* and the travelogue *Waugh in Abyssinia* (1936) demonstrate how, by Waugh’s logic, “non-white races parallel the role of English women as the symptoms and the instruments of this creeping degradation” (256). In *Brideshead*, Waugh frequently uses the metaphor of the jungle to represent the encroaching threat of “barbarism” (Schweizer 256).
“Modernity,” for Waugh, represented a “Dark Age” defined by the slow end of colonial rule, the development of the welfare state, and the proliferation of a working-class culture that increasingly included women into realms of life—like drinking practices—once deemed safely aristocratic. For Waugh, this turn marked a decisive end of an English era he once knew and still loved, and he made no qualms about how much he resented it.

Pierre Nora wrote his theories of memory in part to justify a project that brought 120 scholars and historians together to capture the meaning of “France” in 128 entries on the key symbols and figures of the nation, collected in the three-volume *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. Nora believes since the French no longer *lived* their national memory, all that is left are places of memory, that made collective memory tangible. The project gained international prominence as a standard work in the field of memory studies, but critics note the heroic recovery and documentation of objects, sites, ideas, and rituals integral to the “French” identify was driven purely by nostalgic pride for a very limited construction of French history (for instance, *Lieux* makes no mention of Napoleon). Rather than see these aspects of Nora’s work as a limitation to their application to Waugh’s works, I see them as elucidating parallels. As Nora argues in “Between Memory,” the consecration of sites of memory occurs when “an immense and intimate fund of memory disappears, surviving only as a reconstituted object beneath the gaze of critical history” (12). Nora distinguishes between a primordial world before the French Revolution in which *milieux de mémoire* had still been able to function, and a modern world of historical
remembrance in which only *lieux de mémoire* were left; similarly, *Brideshead* represents, as Waugh biographer Salina Hastings argues, “both a panegyric and valediction, inspired by a yearning for a lost arcadia; inspired also by Evelyn’s romantic veneration of the aristocracy of the past and of English Catholicism” (482). Sebastian verbalizes this tensions in *Brideshead* when he admits, “Sometimes, I feel the past and the future pressing so hard on either side that there’s no room for the present at all.” Waugh’s personal correspondences reflect these tensions as well: in a letter to Nancy Mitford in 1952, Waugh laments the loss of an aristocratic heritage after WWII: “I am afraid you are right when you say that there are no ladies and gentlemen now. It was a most important distinction basic to English health and happiness.” Both Nora and Waugh attempt to fix a set of national traditions that they believe are slipping beyond the realm of lived memory.

In *Brideshead*’s introduction, Charles reflects on the events of his youth and concludes:

> Looking back, now, after twenty years, there is little I would have left undone or done otherwise. I could match my cousin Jasper’s game-cock maturity with a studier fowl. I could tell him that all the wickedness of that time was like the spirit they mix with the pure grape of the Douro, heady stuff full of dark ingredients; it at once enriched and retarded the whole process of adolescence as the spirit check the fermentation of the wine, renders it undrinkable, so that it must lie in the dark, year in, year out, until it is brought up at last fit for the table.”

Waugh again evokes the Douro grapes in *Wine*, where he associates their vines with the earliest evidence of viticulture and extols their importance to the development of port (61). The correlation between the “wickedness of that time” and the “spirit they mix with the pure grape” in *Brideshead* responds to the Waugh’s description of
the brandy added to port “in order to keep the wine from turning to vinegar during the long sea voyage” in *Wine* (62). In both passages, Waugh emphasizes the importance of preservation and discovery. Though wine, and all it represents, may seem to be gone for a time, skeins of the earth’s finest vintages lie in wait for the determined connoisseur. Near the conclusion of *Brideshead*, Charles thinks of the English country house, “I loved buildings that grew silent with the centuries, catching and keeping the best of each generation [...] In such buildings England abounded” (Waugh 226). But while he once feared for their decline and ultimate demise, he now holds out hope for a revival in the appreciation for the country house: “...in the last decade of their grandeur, Englishmen seemed for the first time to become conscious of what before was taken for granted, and to salute their achievements at the moment of extinction” (226-227). In a new introduction for the 1959 edition of *Brideshead*, Waugh similarly concedes that the inevitable “decay and spoliation” of the old, aristocratic country houses had been redeemed by a postwar “cult of the English country house” (3). The themes of imminent decline of the individual, of the family, and of cultural enclaves like the Catholic and English traditions that run throughout the novel seem, as Simon Joyce argues, to be “deliberately overblown, presumable to incite the public conscious” (62). By 1959, Waugh himself seems embarrassed by the intensity of the nostalgia in *Brideshead*, writing off the novel as having been written during “a bleak period of present privation and threatening disaster—the period of soya beans and basic English” (“Author’s” 7). “[I]n consequence,” he concludes, “the book is infused with a kind of
gluttony, for food and wine, for the splendours of the recent past [...] which now, with a full stomach, I find distasteful” (7).

When Waugh wrote *Brideshead* and *Wine*, he could not have predicted how enthusiastically English drinkers would return to wine by the end of the twentieth century. After the Second World War, men like Ray Barrington Brock, a research chemist, and Edward Hymans, a horticulture writer with interests in viticulture, took up the challenge of discovering which grape varietals could grow and thrive in Britain. Their research inspired growers like the Major General Sir Guy Salisbury-Jones and his wife Hilda, who planted 4,000 vines on a 1.5 acre site in Hambledon in 1952; less than three years later, their vines produced the first English wine to be made and sold commercially since the First World War. Wine production again took root—and perhaps for the first time, flourished—on English soil. Wine buying and drinking increased as well: by the end of the 1950s, drinkers in the United Kingdom consumed around 14 million gallons of wine annually; by the 1960s, the number doubled to 28 million gallons; and by the 1970s it doubled again to over 51 million gallons (British 27). At the turn of the twenty-first century, wine consumption in England rose higher than ever; in 2000, the Great Britain Parliament House of Commons Health Committee estimated that English citizens consumed 26.8 liters of wine per person per annum, more than ten times the amount drunk in 1876, the year when wine-drinking was its highest in the nineteenth century (225). Though it appears Waugh was in some ways granted his hope that “we shall one day see the return of days of plenty” with regards to wine, we can only speculate that he would
have found the mass-produced wines consumed by a diverse selection
contemporary drinkers suitable for his image of a world where wine is once again
“fully honoured in all its spendour” (*Wine 77*).
On August 8, 1915, just weeks after Britain entered the war, parliament passed the Defense of the Realm Act (DORA), legislation that gave the government wide-ranging powers over domestic activity: though widely associated with its censorship efforts, DORA also allowed the government to enact regulations on alcohol distribution and food supplies to both the public and to servicemen. For further reading on DORA, see Malcolm Chandler, *Home Front 1914-1918* (Heinemann, 2001) 9-10 and John Hutcheson, “Defense of Realm Act” in *World War I: A-D* (ABC-CLIO, 2005) 341-342.

See James Nicholls, *The Politics of Alcohol* (Manchester UP, 2009). In 1915, Chancellor of the Exchequer David Lloyd George established the Central Control Board (CCB) through a Liquor Control Regulation enacted by parliament. Over the course of the war, the CCB created hundreds of industrial canteens (intended to keep factory laborers for spending their lunch break at the pub), bought up and shut down the drinking establishments in many of England’s primary manufacturing cities, and essentially, as Nicholls argues, came to symbolize the “nationalization of the drinks trade as a whole” (158).


See Great Britain Parliament House of Commons Health Committee, “The Twentieth Century,” in *Alcohol*, vol. 2 (The Stationary Office, 2011): 225. The Health Committee finds that per capita consumption of beer consumed in 1918 was nearly half of pre-war totals despite a rise in per person income; arrests for drunkenness in England and Wales fell from 190,000 to 29,000 between 1913 and 1919 (225).

See Kym Anderson, *The World’s Wine Markets: Globalization at Work* (Edward Elgar, 2004). Supplies of wine from France were critically affected by the First World War, a phenomenon that Anderson notes, resulted in a temporary resurgence in buying more readily available supplies of Port (126). There was also a great deal of wine made in Great Britain from imported materials; these wines produced on home soil evaded customs duties and were subject to far lower domestic duties than finished imported wine (126).
See Claire Langhammer, “‘A public house is for all classes, men and women alike’: Women, Leisure, and Drink in Second World War England,” in Women’s History Review 12:3 (2003) 423-43. In 1940, the Minister for Food, Lord Woolton declares that “it is the business of the government not only to maintain the life but the moral of the country. If we are to keep up anything like approaching normal life, beer should continue to be in supply” (436).


See Iain Gately, Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol (Gotham 2008). Gately notes that when the Allied forces were preparing to invade Nazi-occupied France in 1944, they were given a guidebook that warned that there would be no spoils of wine: “The Germans have [...] drunk the wine or distilled it into engine fuel. So there are only empty barrels to roll” (qtd. in 408). Furthermore, the guide notes, “the idea of the French living in a glorious orgy of ‘wine, women, and song’ never was true, even before the war. The French drink wine as we drink beer. It is a national drink and a very good drink, but there was far less drunkenness in peacetime France than in peacetime England” (408).

George Orwell even fretted that the English drinking laws would slow the tourism business that reconstruction depended on:

Apart from other difficulties, our licensing laws and the artificial price of drink are quite enough to keep foreigners away. Why should people who are used to paying sixpence for a bottle of wine visit a country where a pint of beer costs a shilling? But even these prices are less dismaying to foreigners than the lunatic laws which permit you to buy a glass of beer at half past ten while forbidding you to buy it at twenty-five past... (208)

* For further reading on the modernist writers’ relationships alcohol, see Thomas Gilmore, *Equivocal Spirits: Alcoholism and Drinking in Twentieth-Century Literature* (U of North Carolina P, 1987). Gilmore reads the works of Evelyn Waugh, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Malcolm Lowry, John Cheever, Saul Bellow, George Orwell, and Kingsley Amis as evidence that "heavy or alcoholic drinking is important in ways or for reasons almost too numerous to mention: a drunken character, a pivotal drunk scene, a theme or subject, or something as elusive as mood. . . ." (3).

xi Of course, Ryder does have a wife and children at one point, but by the novel’s end, he has divorced Celia and has lost touch with his children.


xiii See David Rothstein, “Brideshead Revisited' and the Modern Historicization of Memory” in *Studies in the Novel* 25.3 (1993) 318-331. Rothstein persuasively positions *Brideshead* as an example of the “mutual interrelation between fiction and history”: essentially, “the novel itself becomes a site of memory” (318). “Both support each other in accomplishing a very specific and, as critics have seen it, politically charged task,” Rothstein argues, “namely the preservation and fictional reconstitution of an aristocratic Catholic heritage in England” (318). Waugh also dwells on the preservation of history in literature in *Wine*, noting that “From Horace to Hilaire Belloc wine has been the subject of poetry, second only to Love” and citing the “English classics, from Chaucer onwards,” as evidence that “through every stage of history, in the most diverse surroundings, wine has been the inseparable companion of the Englishman and an inmate of his home” (12).

xiv The vineyard can also represent judgment upon the nation in the Hebrew Bible. Isaiah’s “Song of the Vineyard” portrays Israel’s vines as being planted by the Lord, but which yields sour fruit because of Israel’s injustice and unrighteousness (Isa. 5:1-7). The books of Amos and Hosiah record Israel’s restoration after exile as symbolized by productivity of the vineyards: wine drips from the mountains as the people cultivate new vineyards and celebrate with wine (Amos 9:13-15; cf. Hos. 2:15[17]; 14:7[8]).
Perhaps the strongest evidence for the supposition that Waugh looked to a nostalgic, pre-war past can be found in the details: in *Brideshead*, he makes reference to some very specific wine varietals. Take, for instance, Sebastian’s Château Peyraguey: given Waugh’s extensive wine knowledge, it would not be a stretch to suppose that he would have known the wine’s pedigree. A Château Peyraguey would have been made before a family quarrel split the Châteaus Lafaurie-Peyraguey and Clos Haut-Peyraguey in 1879, dating the wine to the second half of the nineteenth century. Waugh’s private diaries reveal that he drank 1924 Lafaurie-Peyraguey on November 19, 1937, and proclaimed it to be a “delicious wine.”

See Thomas Hubbard, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (U of California P, 2003). As early as 405 B.C.E., Aristophanes’ *Frogs* portrays the figure of Dionysus as longing for the deceased Euripedes: “I really am in a bad way, such is the passion that’s ravaging me” (111). See also Byrne Fone, *The Columbia Anthology of Gay Literature* (Columbia UP, 1998). Fone documents a number of prose romances from the Hellenistic period that refer, often frequently, to homoerotic relationships. In the 405 C.E. Dionysiaca, Nonnus of Panopolis retells a number of homoerotic myths associated with Dionysus (Fone 46). Hubbard also notes that a black-figured Tyrrhenian amphora from c. 550 B.C.E. depicts figures dancing around wine bowl, some figures dipping from the bowl while being anally penetrated, or are penetrating, other figures: “clearly,” concludes Hubbard, “wine loosens sexual inhibitions, and in a state of intoxication one can ignored all the conventional properties and rules about who penetrates whom or where one is supposed to place one’s organs” (20).

There is little doubt that Waugh would have been chagrined by the reality of wine consumption in England today: though the amount of wine per person has increased nearly ten-fold since the end of WWII, the majority of English wine consumers are women: in 2007, 68.5 percent of women in England claimed to drink wine, while only 62 percent of men did (87). See *The Business of Wine: A Global Perspective*, eds. Per Jenster, David Smith, and Darryl Mitry (Copenhagen P, 2008).

Bernard Schweizer, *Radicals on the Road: The Politics of English Travel Writing in the 1930s* (U of Virginia P, 2001). Schweizer notes that *Brideshead* chronicles decline on three levels: the individual (represented most clearly by Sebastian, who escapes to North Africa and becomes a homeless dipsomaniac), the family (represented by the increasing debt of, and distance between, the Marchmain family), and cultural (as the novel hints at an invading “barbarism”) (41).

xx There is a good deal of truth to Waugh’s heralding of the Douro grape as having survivalist tendencies: as Karen MacNeil notes, “the vineyards [...] plated in the Douro are a testament to the human will, for this is one of the most unmerciful environments in which grapes manage to grow” (487). The hillsides of the valley consist of schist, granite, and very little soil; MacNeil notes that in many vineyards, the rock was chipped away by hand with iron hammers and poles, then mixed with organic matter in which the vines were planted; also, the summers are often hot and long (487). See Karen MacNeil, *The Wine Bible* (Workman, 2001).

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

In “Modernist Vintages,” I have examined the ways that wine—an object that is created, commoditized, consumed, absorbed, and transformed—is treated in a handful of canonical novels, plays, and essays written by modernist writers. With this project, I have aimed to demonstrate that the representation of wine in this literature allows us to freshly reconsider the ways European Anglophone writers at the turn of the twentieth century engaged with a wide variety of themes associated with wine and wine drinking. I believe that this project opens up new venues for discussion about how writers from this period conceptualized—among other issues—notions the self, the object world, the function of materials, and the experience of intoxication.1 Though traditions and traditional symbols are often used to reinforce existing patterns and practices, these writers address wine’s conventional associations in innovative, and, as I argue, distinctly modernist ways. Oscar Wilde uses wine to draw attention to late nineteenth-century England’s dangerous obsession with “cant and officialdom,” especially when it is used to as a means to persecute the same “lewd” or sensual behavior that imbues the very texts and symbols that are held up as sacred. Dorothy Richardson uses the associations of wine as an economic and social commodity to distance both herself and her protagonist from the rituals and values of nineteenth-century bourgeois society. James Joyce uses wine’s intoxicating properties to challenge a long tradition of Western philosophy that devalues the body, food, and the experience of taste as a
source of knowledge and meaning making. Evelyn Waugh, writing at the end of two
decades of combat war in Europe, embraces wine as a symbol and staple of an
idealized and ever-distancing era of England’s past; his calls for a revived
appreciation for wine thus serve to critique what he sees as the deteriorating
culture of the present. Each of these writers uses wine’s conventional associations to
new and diverse ends: as Swedish modernist playwright August Strindberg writes,
“New forms have not been found for the new content, so that the new wine has
burst the old bottles” (64).ii

With regards to my hopes for the impact and future of this project, it seems
important to note that three specific and yet intersecting personal and professional
interests inspired my topic and research. First, I simply love, and love to think about,
wine. In the 2004 film Sideways, Miles, a failed writer and amateur oenophile,
explains his deep appreciation for wine in a way I think most thoughtful lovers of
the drink, myself included, can identify with:

I like to think about the life of the wine, how it’s a living thing. I like to think
about what was going on the year the grapes were growing, how the sun was
shining that summer or if it rained... and what the weather was like. I think
about all those people who tended and picked the grapes, and if it’s an old
wine, how many of them must be dead by now. I love how wine continues to
evolve, how every time I open a bottle it’s going to taste different than if I had
opened it on any other day. Because a bottle of wine is actually alive—it’s
constantly evolving and gaining complexity—like your ’61—and begins its
steady, inevitable decline. And it tastes so fucking good. (Payne and Taylor
76-77)

I hope that “Modernist Vintages” finds others who share this passion. My second
interest in this project is professional, and involves my desire to contribute to the
emerging field of literary food studies, or, as it is increasingly being referred to,
literary “gastrocriticism.”iii Thinkers like Claude Levi-Strauss, Pierre Bourdieu, Roland Barthes, and Mary Douglas have effectively promoted the value of food studies from an anthropological and sociological standpoint, while scholars like Deane Curtain, Lisa Heldke, Denise Gigante, Allen Weiss, Kevin Sweeney, and Carolyn Korsmeyer have aptly demonstrated that the subjects of food, eating, and tasting are ideal and undervalued sites for philosophical inquiry. However, there is much critical work to be done on the topic of food and drink as it is represented in literature. In “Modernist Vintages,” I chose to focus my inquiry on the topic of alcoholic drink (and wine specifically) as a subcategory of literary food criticism. Depictions of alcohol as an integral part of social ritual, everyday meal, and even medicine appear in every era and genre of Western literature, often in conjunction with questions about the nature and consequences of intoxication. While a notable amount of critical work has been done on themes of alcoholism and temperance in literature, the symbolism of drink is far more complex than current scholarship has addressed. Running the gamut from sacred object to destructive force, depictions of drink in literature offer exciting new venues for discussion about writers and their fictions.

My final interest in writing about wine in literature involves the intersection of my professional objectives and a personal aspiration: it is my hope that this dissertation, and other projects like it, will work to bring “academic” topics and research to new, non-academic audiences. My interest in writing about food and wine for professional reasons is grounded in my profound desire to write about
topics that are of interest to both professional and non-professional audiences (e.g. students, armchair scholars, or my own mother). The wonderful thing about food is that it is inherently democratic: every living being needs to eat, and we all, I would argue, have complex relationships with food. The decisions we make (or that are made for us) about what we consume, how we consume, and when we consume are an essential component of who we are. As I have strove to demonstrate in this project, objects like food and drink can convey histories of resistance, cultural exchange, communal narratives, and deeply personal experiences; representations of these objects thus invite us to learn more about our communities and ourselves.

ii Literary depiction of wine are compelling in part because they are so abundant: for instance, within the canon of European Anglophone modernism alone, I was able to find multiple and significant reference to wine in the works of Joseph Conrad, Hilda Doolittle, D.H. Lawrence, Virginia Woolf, Ezra Pound, and William Butler Yeats, not to mention the prolific references to wine in the works of Wilde, Richardson, Joyce, Woolf, the American modernists, and the non-English speaking European modernists.

iii In November 2008, French scholar Richard Tobin introduced the term “gastro-criticism” at an influential lecture on the emerging field of literary food criticism called “Thought for Food: Literature and Gastronomy,” given at University of California, Santa Barbara.
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