

## Over-Eating: *Pilgrimage's* Food Mania and the *Flânerie* of Public Foraging

Lois Cucullu

“To walk is to lack a place. It is the indefinite process of being absent and in search of the proper.”<sup>1</sup>

“Choosing, matching, and preparing foods are city gestures for ‘when you already have enough’.”<sup>2</sup>

“The true basis of the differences found in the area of consumption, and far beyond it, is the opposition between the tastes of luxury (or freedom) and the tastes of necessity.”<sup>3</sup>

“We are perambulating Judgement Days.”<sup>4</sup>

When asked by the Miss Schlegels about his night-time trek through the suburbs of London, the clerk-cum-romantic adventurer of E. M. Forster's *Howards End*, Leonard Bast, responds with singular candour that, above all, “I was very hungry.” As he owns, “[t]hat dinner at Wimbledon – I meant it to last me all night like other dinners. [...] Why, when you're walking you want, as it were, a breakfast and luncheon and tea during the night as well, and I'd nothing but a packet of Woodbines.”<sup>5</sup> Away from his familiar workday circuit and in search of the romance of nature that his literary mentors Meredith, Stevenson, Jeffries, and Borrow had led him to expect, the pedestrian Bast discovers to his surprise everyday hunger with no recourse to the inexpensive catering to which the city had accustomed its swelling and mobile labour force. As John Burnett details in *England Eats Out*, the city eateries available to clerks like Bast at the turn of the century would have still included the street vendors of Henry Mayhew's day but far more conspicuous would have been such establishments as the fish-and-chip shops that numbered around 25,000 in Britain at the time of *Howards End's* publication or such London catering chains as Pearce and Plenty that had sprung up from the 1870s forward. Even these establishments, while patronized from necessity, constituted a luxury of time and money that many wage earners would daily forego in favour of the cheaper alternative of eating at the workplace, which in Bast's case would have meant a sandwich at his desk.<sup>6</sup>

But Bast's solo nocturnal walk also offers up a significant departure point in our approach to the modern city and the everyday that bears directly on my argument about Dorothy Richardson's equally peripatetic clerk Miriam Henderson in *Pilgrimage*, her thirteen-book novel series published between 1915 and 1967.<sup>7</sup> What Bast's suburban botanizing shows is that the object of his ramble, the one he anticipates from the authors he read as part of his cultural self-improvement program, is not the natural spectacle of an unobstructed night sky or that of the dawn viewed from a hillside. Rather the object of his ambling turns out to be his own nature, the ordinary hunger of a body in motion, so that at first light he searches out a station and returns to London on the next available train. This corporeal comeuppance of spectatorship is instructive of the *flânerie* that has become so identified with the study of modernity. Given its preoccupation with vision and spectacle, how many of us notice, for example, that the convalescent narrator of Poe's “The Man of the Crowd” (1840), who launches his dizzying pursuit from a London coffee shop, had for some time been lingering over a newspaper and cigar, quite likely fortified by other refreshments?<sup>8</sup> This visual fixation extends across the Channel to that other prince of *flânerie*, Charles Baudelaire, and his enumerated version of the observant pedestrian that has arguably become the touchstone for scholarly discussions of the modern metropolis, whether in support or reproach of the poet's masculine gaze and appetites. Tellingly, his most energetic spokesman Walter Benjamin averred in “Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century” that “Baudelaire's

genius was ‘fed on melancholy,’ and not presumably on the plat du jour of a local chop shop, to produce ‘the gaze of the *flâneur*, whose mode of life still surrounds the approaching desolation of the city life with a propitiatory luster.’<sup>9</sup> To follow Baudelaire’s footsteps and gaze in tandem with Benjamin is to accede to his images – those of the arcades, “which are both house and stars” (Benjamin, 157), and of the prostitute, “who is saleswoman and wares in one” – that make of “all of us,” in Susan Buck-Morss’s words, “prostitutes, selling ourselves to strangers”.<sup>10</sup>

To push the field of *flânerie* beyond its passive and specular predilection, let me fast forward to the more contemporary work of Michel de Certeau on the everyday. As is well known, his noteworthy approach of dignifying the mundane practices of consumers and thereby making the body more participant, present and plural has been a laudable and influential corrective to Benjamin’s emphasis on the dystopia of the consumer framed under the sign of streetwalker and sandwichman. Notwithstanding, Certeau’s work, too, manifests a short-sightedness that his collaborator Luce Girard discloses in editing the second volume of *The Practice of Everyday Life*. In the course of her brief history of the circle’s research and methodology, she recounts her comment to Certeau and the group on the strange absence of women from the study, explaining to readers almost apologetically that “it was the time of feminist awareness.” Her remark is course changing for the group, however, as her suggestion to make cooking a site of full inquiry becomes the subject of the second volume. As she puts it, “I chose cooking for its primary necessity, its ability to cross over all divisions, and its intrinsic relation to *opportunity* and *circumstance*, two notions that had become central to our understanding of those who practice” (xxviii).

Here with the necessity of alimentary practice that crosses all divisions, I propose to re-examine Richardson’s urban pilgrim Miriam Henderson in order to add to recent conversations on modern women, the everyday, and the city that have made Richardson and her writing newly relevant to our understanding of modernity. I refer in particular to Scott McCracken’s recent essays on *Pilgrimage* and the problematic of modern gender performance, Deborah Parsons’s study of Richardson’s exploration of modern women’s position as a pedestrian in the metropolis, and Nadine Attewell’s refiguring of modern female desire beyond prescribed femininity in Richardson’s and Woolf’s novels.<sup>11</sup> In addition to this treatment of her fiction are Laura Marcus’s and Francesca Frigerio’s presentations on Richardson’s ethnography of film going in her essays for *Close Up*.<sup>12</sup> Taken together these studies have put Richardson’s relation to the late modern period importantly back on the literary map. In particular, they shed further light on Antia Levy’s earlier attempts to draw attention to the changed material conditions of female work as the conceptual hinge linking the phenomenon of the late Victorian New Woman to the twentieth-century female modernist.<sup>13</sup> Yet as crucial as these emphases on women’s labour and *flânerie* have been, to view Richardson’s epic novel strictly from the sensibility of her female protagonist across the successive occupations of teacher, governess, clerk and, finally, writer, is to flatten Miriam’s perspective along a horizontal axis that too easily renders her the avatar of female emancipation and her pilgrimage a modern egalitarian quest. While my essay will cover, then, some of the materials and ground as just given, it offers a different route and critical terminus. It will insist that we keep in the foreground Miriam as a reluctant and conscripted New Woman who is compelled into the work force as a teenager with the smash of her well-to-do bourgeois family, brought on by her cultivated father’s financial improvidence. Her affluent background and precipitous fall in class oblige a greater mindfulness of the full vertical spectrum of class and gender relations the novel discloses. For while this incipient New Woman may have lost her class and gender prerogatives, she does not lose her consciousness of them in this turn-of-the-century narrative, even as she searches out more modern means of self-realisation earning a pound a week. Indeed, I argue that she takes these a step further. With closer attention to these subtleties and to Miriam’s insistent independence, we will be better equipped to account for the shift from Victorian to modernist individuation that adheres in twentieth-century metropolitan culture, that which Regenia Gagnier in *The Insatiability of Human Wants* perceptively calls this “deeper contemporary narrative of Individuation,” a narrative that I suggest is the signature of modernism and a key to *Pilgrimage*.<sup>14</sup>

Although any a number of the novel's material practices, such as fashion and clothing or books and reading, could support this argument on class and gender relations of the metropolis, the alimentary protocols, as singled out by Girard, have the greater merit given the very modern cast they assume with the commercial proliferation of catering that goes hand-in-hand with urbanisation. Joanne Finkelstein's sociological account of manners in *Dining Out*, along with the aforementioned Burnett's history of England's eating establishments, demonstrate how urban space is increasingly given over to providing for a hungry metropolitan populace that, more and more, eats at a distance from home and at all hours of day and night, be it by opportunity or circumstance, to take Girard's point. Not only do new types of catering enterprise appear on the scene – everything from cookshops and department store tea rooms to West End bohemian cafés and upscale restaurants – but so too do new and more efficient technologies and distribution methods. These are far more widespread, numerous, and transformative that can be treated here. Let me offer the Aerated Bread Company as one example. This bakery was able to expand across London and then transform itself into a reputable café chain because of the patented discovery of aerating dough with gas injected cylinders instead of the traditional and more time-consuming yeast fermentation. The net effect was to increase production by enabling the company to produce more loaves per sack of flour in reduced time, and thereafter to expand the number of bakeries across London, which led in turn to the sit-down teashops known as ABCs, which figure prominently in *Pilgrimage*.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to modernisation, eating out, as Burnett and Finkelstein show, leads to a transformation of social relations in the late nineteenth century. On the one hand, it comes to operate as a kind of socially accepted public performance that allows the sexes to co-mingle in new and non-traditional settings. On the other, though practiced as public display, it nevertheless preserves the aura of private function. Embedded within this public yet intimate performance resides the elementary sensory and sensual rudiments of private pleasures.<sup>16</sup> Inasmuch as eating out replaces or supplements meals taken privately, it thus takes on important social, communal, and pleasurable functions, making eating spots the savannah watering holes of the urban landscape. The public consumption of food is thus only partly concerned with out-and-out nourishment. New ways of consuming, according to Gagnier, “draw together both class and gender, for consumption and leisure, [so that] the realms of pleasure for most wage labourers are as significant in the formation of identity and subjectivity as production” (243). As such, where, when, how, and with whom one eats may say as much, if not more, than what one actually consumes or how one makes a living, a point I shall return to below.

As is the case with other modern inducements to consume, dining out is also about excess and scarcity, provoking behaviours that range from eating too much to eating too little or not at all; from being over-served and over-stimulated to being ignored or excluded, all of which reference the commonplaces of metropolitan agglomeration and seeming overabundance. The proliferation of eating establishments may be said then to go even further beyond the satiation of hunger to provoke instead the creation or excitation of public hunger.<sup>17</sup> For these reasons the mode distinctive to *flânerie* may more accurately be about public foraging, the daily scuttling about for somewhere and something to eat as need or desire dictates, than about loitering and looking.

Such foraging is clearly on display in Richardson's narrative *flânerie* in *Pilgrimage*. To locate the modern woman's urban habitation in relation to culinary practices requires one critical qualification, however. While Girard's choice of cooking rests on its universal applicability, the plain fact is that Richardson's protagonist cannot cook. Early in the first book, *Pointed Roofs* (1915), as the seventeen-year-old Miriam worries about failing in her job as a teaching assistant at a German boarding-school for girls, she weighs the possibility of working as a servant only to recollect hastily that she and her three sisters “had never been allowed into the kitchen at home except when there was jam-making” (1: 30). Their privileged upbringing effectively proscribed work, and this extended to women's work in the home, with allowance made for diversions like making jam. The other servants, Miriam quickly concludes, would despise her. Paradoxically, this insufficiency, not cooking, is part of her bourgeois capital and thus a clear marker of her female class, one whose significance she keenly appreciates in predicting the disdain of her imagined fellow servants. Yet rather than an outright disqualification in

terms of this essay on the urban quotidian, I suggest that her liability only forces a more nuanced assessment of the class-gender system that she traverses and inhabits, and not the least because Richardson's narrative of interiority exclusively focuses on her protagonist's finely honed class and gendered consciousness. What her inability does make problematic, and this is no less a consequence of metropolitan living than it is of the industrialisation of food, is an appreciation of the relation between the production of food – whether harvesting and slaughtering, distributing and marketing, preparing and serving – and its consumption at markets and eateries.<sup>18</sup>

For Miriam, kitchen illiterate and middle-class outcast, the commonplaces of hunger and eating demonstrate the palpable power of the everyday through the confounding effects of their disruption. With her passage into the workforce via successive low-paying jobs – as a teacher, governess, and then dental clerk earning a pound a week – eating away from home registers not only as a flashpoint of class and gender displacement, but also registers as a longing for autonomy and self-sufficiency, and as a striving for a livelihood and status beyond prescribed class and gender norms. Unlike nineteenth-century novels of social critique, however, the text offers no class or gender solidarity, no model community with which to strive for change. On the contrary, as such commentators as Carol Watts and Deborah Parsons observe of the protagonist's collective affiliations: "Miriam's pilgrimage is a constant process of identifying with groups that promise to expand her autonomous ego, and then of distinguishing herself from them once their demands conflict with and threaten her independence" (Parsons, 106). Whether the perceived demand is on her intellect or on her labour, Miriam privileges independence and her autonomous ego above all and for reasons we have yet to appreciate fully.

Rooted in her assertion of independence is the divide between a Victorian and a modernist sensibility. At the level of the everyday practice of eating, this divide manifests itself as a collision between identities shaped by class formations spurred by industrialism, so that one's labour informs identity, and the multiple identities spurred with the emergence of a consumerist and post-industrial metropolis in which taste and status determine identity. For the first, *pace* Wendy Brown's concept of "wounded attachments," the novel reflexively expresses the exploitation and alienation of Miriam's labour as her *ressentiment* against the gendered and classed injustice that flows from traditional class formations.<sup>19</sup> For the second, the novel conversely exempts Miriam's own discriminatory practices as matters of taste or intellect, and hence entitlement. The disparity of the two, *ressentiment* in terms of labour, and discrimination in terms of consumption, marks the turn towards the proliferative identities that Brown's essay on U.S. identity politics after the World War II is keen to explore, and that Max Weber had already begun to elucidate in his essay "Class, Status, Party". Weber distinguished between classes "stratified according to their relations to the production and acquisition of goods," and "'status groups' stratified according to the principles of their *consumption* of goods as represented by special 'styles of life'."<sup>20</sup> Richardson herself seems to have caught this difference when she explains in a 1935 letter that her fledgling protagonist "fails to recognize herself as 'a worker,' always, though quite unconsciously, assuming that life should be leisure & should be lived in perfect surroundings."<sup>21</sup> The text, I suggest, seeks this double accommodation for its artist and intellectual *in potentia*: it solicits a subjective and egalitarian response when Miriam is in need but an objective and individualist one when her intellect is engaged. Thus readers may find themselves scornful of those who disparage Miriam, at one moment, and, in the next, scornful of those whom Miriam disparages. In both instances the logic of the individual is at play: in one, the 'I' embedded within a liberal and egalitarian 'we;' in the other, the 'I' resides within status groups based on what Pierre Bourdieu has termed "distinction". More than a matter of temperament, hence of her native genius, Miriam's compulsion for independence is congruent with the move in enlightened modernity toward the modernist insistence on uniqueness and greater individuality, that which, in an earlier essay, I have called attention to with the gendered term, "the exceptional woman".<sup>22</sup> It is the brainy Miriam's claim of singularity, of her exceptionality, manifest in her precisely calibrated and discriminating intellect, that implicitly becomes the subject of the novel, and not just as content but also as a formal matter in the stream of consciousness narration.<sup>23</sup> Miriam's everyday practices paradoxically valorize exceptionality, and upon this basis emerges the novel-epic's telos of novel writing and of art.<sup>24</sup>

To argue that everyday practice paradoxically encodes Miriam's exceptionality so that her mobility actively depends, physically and psychologically, on eating out, let me recount the episode that symbolically captures Miriam's class and gender displacement – the grisly suicide of her mother. More than any event, it overshadows the whole of the novel and thematically structures the young woman's forced exile from home and into the city. Nowhere is the materiality that subtends the everyday eating rituals of *Pilgrimage* more starkly represented and nowhere are the independent and identificatory practices that come to define Miriam more detectable. Revealingly, Mrs. Henderson's suicide takes place at the very height of the tourist season at the seaside town of Brighton, known for its resort amenities and amusements – all which bespeak the economies of leisure and abundance catered by the holiday industry – though Brighton had long relinquished any claim as fashionable destination. Having vacationed there the previous year with her sisters, Miriam returns with Mrs. Henderson to the same boarding house in an attempt to relieve her worsening depression, this in lieu of medical and nursing care, which the family can no longer afford. While Miriam and her sisters have responded to the family's straightened circumstances by finding work or by marrying, in other words, by finding alternate means of supporting themselves, Miriam's mother has been unable to cope. Born of an earlier Victorian and more pious generation and having 'married up' in class in becoming Mr Henderson's wife, she internalizes the collapse of the family's wealth as a divine judgment on her domestic management and as proof of her moral abasement. The first three novel-chapters intermittently hint at the mother's decline until the conclusion of *Honeycomb* (1917), which finally, albeit elliptically, treats her demise.

Of the four daughters, the charge of Mrs. Henderson's care at the critical juncture falls to Miriam, who is then employed as a governess for a prosperous suburban family of the professional class living at the snug centre of bourgeois orthodoxy and conformity. The contrast in home life and maternal benevolence could not then be more profound as Miriam takes her mother round to the local amusements to revitalize her, reads to her at night from her Bible to relieve her insomnia, and serves her Miss Meldrum's "good beef tea" to nourish her. If the day-to-day has become unbearable for Mrs. Henderson, then Miriam attempts to revitalize with seaside entertainments and the local homespun remedies. All to no avail, for when Miriam is briefly away, her mother violently takes her life, slitting her throat with a kitchen knife, literally and radically preventing further communication or nourishment, and leaving her daughter to find her disfigured corpse.<sup>25</sup>

The text conveys Mrs. Henderson's brutal death and the distraught Miriam's shock, guilt, and despair impressionistically and falteringly, switching abruptly from omniscient to first person narration, only to narrow its focus dramatically to Miriam's own body and her somatic responses to food and eating:

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. . . . I am in eternity . . . where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. (1:489-490)

"I am hungry [...] I must eat the food. Go on eating food" – Miriam imagines parcelling out her days as so many plates of fish and fruit to be consumed. But the emphasis on eating "the food" on the plates suggests that she must now eat the food laid out for her *and* for her mother – that she must consume this double serving, her portion and her mother's in the grim moment of death and its aftermath.<sup>26</sup> Among the many possible meanings of the imperative "must eat the food," one is surely that the daughter Miriam imagines herself being pointed to the position her dead mother had occupied. The effect of this association looms later in the narrative in Miriam's involuntary bodily recoil in the course of her daily commute when she chances upon the London street and the Teetgen's Teas shop that recall her mother's visit and their shared meal in the city (2: 136; 3: 107; 4: 155). It also appears in

Miriam's disgust and awe as the indigent and consumptive Eleanor Dear, in her own way a compromised domestic, fries fish in her shabby room for herself and her visitor. From her mother's suicide forward, it is clear that the everyday practice of eating bears an extra burden. Yet, inasmuch as Richardson retrospectively composes *Pilgrimage*, this weight surely adheres from the opening of the novel and in a way that bears on my argument.

Without doubt the death of the mother brings to a head the loss of home, family, safety, social station, not to mention the leisured bourgeois life meant for Miriam and her sisters. Admitting this, we would be mistaken to conclude that Miriam would have gracefully followed Mrs. Henderson into the gender and class role awaiting her, irrespective of bankruptcy and suicide. The mother's violent death only exacerbates a fundamental rupture already apparent in the first three novel-chapters between her Victorian allegiances and Miriam's own more modern and secular ones. Is it not instructive of their differences, that, in spite of the family's financial distress and the particulars of the mother's illness and religious devotion, Miriam seeks succour at the critical moment from a community of relative strangers at a site of leisure, one associated with amusements that may well have appeared to her god-fearing mother as gratuitous and frivolous? And what is more, given the unfashionable resort town and forced familiarity of boarding-house accommodations, is it not likely that Mrs. Henderson may have, rightly or not, viewed this ill-afforded extravagance as further judgment on her domestic and moral unworthiness? That the daughters prescribe leisure to remedy a crisis of faith is telling enough, but that their mother kills herself at a holiday resort is certainly commentary on their different attachments, in particular those that Miriam adopts. My point is neither to assign blame nor to deny and diminish the tumultuous effects of Mrs. Henderson's death. Rather it is to contend that this intellectual daughter seeks a life independent of her mother's and does so early on. Her affinities lead her away from the suburbs and matrimony and into London, its commerce and culture. It is the familial and fiscal crisis compelling the change that is horrendous, not the change itself and certainly not the destination.

If, through an emphasis on everyday practice, we grant that *flâneur* and *flâneuse* alike depend on their stomachs and not exclusively on their eyes in perambulating the metropolis, then *Pilgrimage* offers up one of the most extensive treatments of public foraging to be found in novels of the modern city. Its characters, as befitting highly mobile indigenes, are forever eating or preparing to eat or just finishing eating, or going without eating, or talking about eating, and even on occasion cooking things to eat. This is especially true of the first seven novel-chapters on which this essay dwells. In *The Tunnel* alone, the chapter novel that depicts Miriam's arrival in London to take up her clerkship, there are no fewer than 25 meals referenced and consumed over the course of some 275 pages, roughly one every 11 pages, several of which run on for multiple pages, so that the text maps itself as much by this moving buffet as it does by its roving pedestrian. More than the streets traversed, many of which Miriam is dreamily unaware, is the attention given over to fuelling its pilgrim. As modern metropolitan life then marches to the cacophony of forks, plates, glasses, and scrapped chairs, all of which combine to spill over the boundary separating 'at home' from 'in public,' separating the quotidian from the extra-quotidian, eating away from home foregrounds, literally comes to embody the class and gender distinctions that Miriam, unschooled cook that she is, must navigate. In truth, Brillat-Savarin's 1825 sage comment on food and identity needs updating to reflect the newer reality at the end of the century that "you are *where* you eat." Yet even with the democratisation of eating establishments, as Burnett reminds us, that helped bring about a flattening of class and gender distinctions, levelling went only so far as the paying and mannerly customer (145). In *Pilgrimage*, these prerequisites create a tension between eating in public as a matter of choice, that moniker of bourgeois freedom, and as a matter of necessity, the practical materialism of living on a clerk's wages. For Miriam, eating out effectively registers the social contexts, strata, and relations of the city against which she asserts her own distinctive individuality. As such, the text puts in relief one underlying assumption that scholars applying Certeau's socioethnography of the ordinary to other fields fail to engage fully, and that is, all practices are not created equal or even practiced equally. For Miriam, we have to be attentive not just to opportunities and circumstances but how this pilgrim to the city perceives and experiences them.

What we may observe, as the text shows time and again in the numerous depictions of eating, is Miriam weighing the ordinary hunger and pleasures of a female clerk living on a pound a week against the social circumstances of the proffered food and the behaviours expected of a woman of her class and discernment. Thus in the welcoming privacy at the homes of those whom she perceives as equals, or near equals, or equals to be, Miriam, dispossessed bourgeois daughter and now London local, gives into her hunger as she remains ever vigilant about status. To offer one example, having rapidly devoured two helpings of the genteel Brooms' Christmas repast to their one, Miriam hungrily eyes the next course arriving at the sideboard, all the while amusing her hosts, as expected of a holiday guest, with tales of colourful London (2: 295). And, to offer another, in the flat of her lesbian London friends Jan and Mag, Miriam hungrily consumes a bowl of "desiccated" soup at their concerted urgings, but only after first observing the soup's unseemly presentation in sugar basin, pudding basin, and slop bowl (2: 87). And another, on the first visit to the suburban home of Alma and Hypo Wilson – she an old school chum and he a respected writer and intellectual (and double for H. G. Wells), who later encourages Miriam to write – the young woman checks her appetite at dinner, intimidated by the cultural savvy of the literary guests assembled, but then, feeling more at home, troops into the kitchen with them all late in the evening "starving for food, eagerly eat[ing] large biscuits" (2: 127). In each instance, the text invites sympathy for Miriam and the circumstances of her hunger, and multiplies the effect with the concerned attention that such characters as the Brooms, Mag and Jan, and the Wilsons invariably pay her, while at the same time granting Miriam's discriminating consciousness immunity to practice at will.

No less do the meals taken at work as part of her wage demonstrate her quest for individuation and distinction as they also show the complicated social network Miriam traverses. As a new assistant to the dentistry practice on Wimpole Street, a location that guarantees a well-to-do patient list, her occupation as clerk plainly marks her inferior position in the office hierarchy, even as her middle-class upbringing renders her employers, in contrast, her social and cultural inferiors: the dentist Mr Orly, his wife, and their son, Mr Leyton, also a dentist, hold sway at the office inasmuch as Orly founded the practice and operates it from his home. The exception is Miriam's supervisor, the dentist Mr Hancock, whose shares cultural interests with Miriam and a circle of acquaintances, which put the pair on common footing socially if not professionally. In fact, it was through mutual friends that Miriam obtained employment in the first place.

A midday meal that spans some six pages in *The Tunnel* (1919) makes plain Miriam's discernment and class allegiances. Indeed, Mr Orly's invitation to the meal underscores their contrastive social positions and behavioural attitudes in the note of familiarity he assumes in contracting Miriam's surname: "Come and share the remains of the banquet, Miss Hens'n" (2:55). Rather than warmth and the conviviality of a shared repast, what dominates the representation of the Orlys is their vulgarity, their want of propriety and table etiquette. Though Miriam is clearly hungry from the morning's labour assisting Hancock with his patients, she is at once put off by the Orlys' offerings of leftovers from a dinner party they had hosted the previous evening, not to mention being put off by Mr Orly's confidence of a hangover from too many whiskies. The remains of a banquet suggest a formal sociality from which Miriam has been excluded but an intimacy she is nonetheless forced to share by eating the previous night's leavings. Implicitly for Miriam, these provisions are altogether inappropriate. They are more suitable for the family alone or, better still, for the house servants. In point of fact, de Certeau and his collaborators have made clear the second-rate status of leftovers and their rapid descent – given their proneness to spoilage – in taste, value, status, and, most of all, safety.<sup>27</sup> These alone might explain Miriam's reserve at the meal were it not also for the lack of reserve by her table companions, especially in light of the fact that Hancock has not yet appeared at the table. The text pointedly shows the protagonist's vexation: "Miriam laboured with her jelly and glanced at the dish. People wolfed their food. It would seem so conspicuous to begin again when the fuss had died down; with Mr Orly watching as if feeding were a contemptible self-indulgence" (56). While Orly's surveillance is an affront, Leyton is by far the bigger offender. He shovels his food with the indelicate result of a "flushed face rose," and then proceeds to droll innuendos, no doubt out of respect for the women

present, about attending to his syphilitic patient with the unfortunate name of Buck (56-59). Just following the meal, Miriam's attempt at being sociable with Leyton ends with his imposing upon her to sterilize the very instruments he had used on the offending patient. So in addition to her distress over the questionable appropriateness of the food is the greater alarm at the questionable taste and safety of treating fellow mortals who are also promiscuous and diseased.

In light of her newness on the job and her lack of any formal training, it is quite easy to appreciate her discomfort over cleaning up after Leyton and at being suddenly thrust into sharing common meals and conversations laced with, what is generally called today, shop talk with those whom she hardly knows. But in granting her these dispensations, is there no reciprocal exemption for the Orlys? Mr Orly's invitation to their midday meal is plainly meant to be inclusive and friendly, as is the family's sharing what they themselves are having. And for his part, Hancock, Miriam's social equal and, by all accounts, a highly skilled dentist, is apparently unruffled by their starting without him, by the food, or by the conversation, thus making Miriam's refusal of food all the more marked and isolating behaviour. In comparing the office meal to those taken with her friends, the difference is clear. In Miriam's refusal at the office, discrimination trumps hunger – rather than the other way around in which hunger had won out over discrimination. She prefers not to eat in this instance in order to assert her superiority over the Orlys and over her clerkship. Not eating amounts to a corporeal exercise of her gender and status privilege, and, noticeably, in much the same way that not cooking is an exercise of her bourgeois capital.<sup>28</sup> To refuse or to restrict the intake of food is an extraordinary act of independence, but one consistent, I suggest, with Miriam's and the text's allegiances.

From this perspective, more revealing still are the places Miriam chooses to dine on her own. To make the point, let us consider her relationship to the ABC teashops she soon begins to frequent after arriving in London to begin her job. Miriam's occupation of dental assistant, which qualifies, though barely, for the modifier 'mental' worker, and her salary of a pound a week plus lunch and tea, places the twenty-one-year-old among the new group of modern women able to live just independently enough in the city. It is partly for them that the ABC cafés appeared in the mid-1880s in catering to respectable patrons of the lower middle classes and upper working classes of both sexes. ABC teashops offered moderately priced and efficiently served fare that was more "associated with a brief break from the working day or other activity rather than with recreation for its own sake" (Burnett, 125). For a clerk in Miriam's circumstances, these teashops become sought destinations.

In fact, it is on leaving work to visit her city friends, Mag and Jan, uncertain of whether they will offer her anything to eat, that she thinks of finding an ABC in the unfamiliar precinct of the Strand. Here, as a new resident of London, she registers her agency but also her gender and class displacement and disorientation. Walking along, she tellingly contrasts the Strand's gaudiness, which "repelled her," to the "cheerful commonness" of familiar Oxford Street, and then, inadvertently coming upon a street fight, hastens away unsure of her path (2: 75). It is at this moment that an ABC materializes before her. The ABC clearly evokes a refuge from the gender danger that this solitary newcomer encounters on the garish and unsafe streets, to judge by appearances, in this part of town, and strongly suggests the *flânerie* Miriam practices. The young woman, as the text records, enters the ABC with confidence, deliberately walks down the centre of the café, assertively takes a table near the fireplace, and places her order. Although economy necessitates the cheaper menu items of boiled egg, roll, butter, and coffee, she visibly shows a mastery of place, even though she observes that it is filled mostly with men. Miriam may be a stranger, but she is obviously no stranger to the ABC chain, and from past associations, we know this to be the case. Her savoir-faire, in fact, derives from her family's former patronage of the cafés on outings made to London for entertainment and education (1: 18). Its appeal then comes through the chain's association with family leisure and impromptu holiday treats. That these positive associations have continued despite the family's dissolution is evident in *Backwater* (1916) when, under her mother's escort across London to take up a teaching position, Miriam had pointed out "our A.B.C." to distract from the gloomy prospect of their destination: the teenage daughter's accepting work at a less than desirable school and at a less than desirable locale in North London (1: 199). In large measure then, Miriam's earlier attachments and the entitlements of her

middle-class upbringing inform her present-day café agency and her euphoria at having left, for a time, London's unsavoury streets.

But agency and euphoria have still broader references that give her *flânerie* its singular cast. Eating her meal in *The Tunnel*, she begins to muse about her "strange, rich, difficult day and now her untouched self here, free, unseen, and strong, the strong world of London all round her, strong free untouched people, in a dark lit wilderness, happy and miserable in their own way" (2: 76). And a moment later, she thinks: "No one who had never been alone in London was quite alive. . . . I'm free – I've got free – nothing can ever alter that, she thought, gazing wide-eyed into the fire, between fear and joy" (76). This liberatory exultation over London is one that crops up regularly over the course of *Pilgrimage*. In this instance, to be sure, it arises from the slaking of hunger, the relief of workday fatigue, the warmth of the fire – all these material satisfactions contributing to her renewed sense of well-being. In addition, the mere fact of being in London on her own – given the past hardships faced with her family, most particularly, her mother's suicide – more than justifies her pride in "I'm free – I've got free." But these alone do not entirely satisfy her equation of alone, free, vital, and London, or her sudden affiliation with its "strong free untouched people," especially in light of the street fight just avoided outside. To appreciate these identifications in line with Miriam's upsurge in confidence and her previous associations with ABCs, we need to pay attention to the compositional structure of the teashop. It, too, has a role in defining her everyday *flânerie*.

Miriam's choice of eating establishment and her identification with London and its people depend to a great extent on the design peculiar to chains of this type, their uniformity. The predictability and consistency of design are doubtless among the foremost marketing features that chains count on to attract patrons. Miriam can confidently enter and inhabit this unfamiliar ABC or any other ABC, regardless of conditions on the street or the preponderance of male diners inside, because of the foreknowledge that its layout, menu, price, product, and service conform to the chain's model and standards.<sup>29</sup> Given the teashop's structured uniformity, however, there is something naggingly discrepant in her ecstatic musing. To declare the unique vitality of London – "[n]o one who had never been alone in London was quite alive" – is more than a little incongruous seated in a teashop that serves as a haven from the streets, and that is, moreover, indistinguishable from others like it across the city, and from which, for all practical purposes, novelty is banned, evident its bulk-produced 'aerated' loaves.

Eating in this ABC exposes, I suggest, the tension between her class and gender positions (that of a female clerk earning a pound a week) and the status she desires (the leisure and entitlements that middle-class affluence formerly provided). If we grant this discrepancy, there is a greater oddity in her identificatory rhetoric. Miriam's ecstasy gestures toward a vision of a communal and uniquely vital London, so that she too counts among this "strong free untouched people." Yet the very structure of the ABC undermines any vision of community. The clientele, not to mention the wait and cook staffs on the premises, which by implication comprise part of Miriam's vital London, are fragmented and partitioned, so as to discourage, rather than encourage, interaction or even mutual recognition. In fact, the structure of the teashop actively promotes isolation. The arrangement of eating space in the ABC speaks volumes in this regard. As Bourdieu observed of a similar arrangement, "each table is a separate, appropriated territory (one asks permission to borrow a chair or the salt)" (183). The layout then restricts conduct and behaviour, and militates against a communal ideal – all of which are at odds with a spontaneous outpouring of sentiment.

What then do we make of her declaration? To be sure, the teashop provides a service that a hungry Miriam, a young, female worker alone and new to the city, finds indispensable. It provides what Finkelstein calls "sheltered anonymity" (14).<sup>30</sup> Yet here as well, there is some incongruity. The elemental need of shelter, along with Miriam's personal circumstances, may well trigger a sympathetic reaction, except that the emphasis on anonymity leads away from an affective response. By definition anonymity lays stress on individuation, isolation, and detachment, not on community, not on shared communication, and not on affectivity. And for this, the ABC is perfectly suited. According to Finkelstein, rather than promoting sociality, eating establishments actually foster the opposite. They

not only promote anonymity, but they also literally relieve diners of the responsibility of shaping sociality or community, and this attribute specifically applies to the milieu of chain restaurants. The socially prescribed norms common to ABCs are intended to supersede any individual or collective social action, Miriam's or anyone else's. Behaviour and identity then are mediated through the social context of the ABC, and not, if we take Miriam's exultation at face value, the other way around. To claim that the ABC shapes identity is not, I hasten to add, to revive the dated commonplace of homogeneous mass culture duping yet another passive female customer. Instead, it is to point out that everyday practice is by definition a mediation by a party or group of parties with objects in social spaces, such that, from this network of social interactions, identity emerges. Miriam's interaction with the ABC is no less crucial in informing identity.

Seated by herself at a small table over an unshared meal among other strangers, does, then, bespeak freedom of a sort – just not freedom *for* community. It is rather freedom *from* community. This qualification, too, makes the appeal of belonging to vital London and to its “strong free untouched people” something of a problem, particularly as the “strong free untouched people” around her are mostly male patrons, an observation she repeatedly makes in rebuke. Miriam's exultation in the ABC may be an appeal for freedom then, but it is the freedom to be anonymously private in a public place. And given the associational value ABCs hold for her, this version of privacy comes laden with the middle-class safeguards and entitlements that she once enjoyed, and comes devoid of the stigma of her current class disposition as a clerk.<sup>31</sup> Miriam's exultation lays claim to, in other words, “my privacy,” “my freedom,” “my vitality,” “my London,” as she once had claimed, more as tourist than teacher-designate, to her mother “our A.B.C.” In sum, freedom applies first and foremost to Miriam, and apparently is hers exclusively. Given that her consciousness only registers male diners, we may conclude that the servers in attendance, who are catering to male and female customers alike and who are almost certainly women like herself trying to make a life in the city, do not count. To make an argument, then, that freedom of movement and independence of thought are crucial new rights for a woman of the metropolis at the turn of the century to assert and obtain, only begs the larger question – in concert with whom? Within the context of the ABC, freedom and independence emerge as singular bourgeois claims that privilege the individual ‘I,’ meaning Miriam, over an egalitarian and abstract ‘we’ the people of London, an amorphous and generalized collective that she hails only on her own behalf. Miriam attempts to assuage her gender and class exclusion by invoking a universalist rhetoric of belonging, under the sign of metropolitan London, in the same moment she exempts her own exclusionary practices as an independent, if dispossessed, bourgeois female. In *Pilgrimage*, London comes to serve as the fetishized universalist ‘we’ whose largesse enfolds Miriam, subsidizes her access to the streets, and conceals under the cover of anonymity her class shame and status prerogatives.

Lest we marshal the mitigating factors of age and inexperience in Miriam's defence or counter that everyday practices precisely encourage the spread of private, particularized space onto the public sphere, let us consider her traverse of the city some seven years later in which class affinities and anonymity are once again clearly demarcated against the backdrop of fetishized London. In *Revolving Lights* Miriam's journey home takes her through West End toward Piccadilly Circus on a summer evening, having come from a meeting of the Lycurgans (a veiled stand-in for the Fabians), a socialist group whose ideas attract her intellectually but whose agenda leaves her personally ambivalent. Her thoughts wander but again to an exultation of the city, figuring it variously as “the true harvest of a summer's day,” “a cup held brimming to her lips,” “a mighty lover,” until her identity and the city's merge: “tingling to the spread of London all about her, herself one with it, feeling her life flow outwards, north, south, east and west, to all its margins” (3: 272). Filled with this potent identification, and then musing over her fellow passing Londoners and thinking back to reading Conrad's fiction at a crowded Lyons café over lunch that had made her late returning to work, she suddenly spies a male acquaintance from her now distant suburban past, the brother of a girl friend, Tommy Babington. The encounter arrests her reverie and, though unstated, abruptly interjects her former life into her present circumstance of walking home, an independent and solitary woman on the streets. Although the two only acknowledge one another perfunctorily, Miriam comes away rejoicing that “[t]hey had met

equally at last," and exults: "Silent acceptance had been forced upon him, by a woman of his own class. She almost danced to the opposite pavement" (277). So triumphant is she that she enters a nearby coffee shop, one of her "little" sanctuaries, to think over this blow to masculine arrogance (278).

Her privileging of privacy – her freedom afoot – is no longer just for teashop musings but is now plainly manifest on her West End walk, and blatantly so, given her outright identification with London. But in putting Tommy on equal footing, which is proof of her city entitlement, she exposes her latent class and gender resentments that more than dispel her euphoric identification of herself with London, the universalism of belonging that is embedded in 'we.' She cannot *consciously* occupy both positions at once, the 'we' of London, anonymous and free of class and gendered entanglements, stretching in all directions, and the aggrieved and triumphant 'I' on the street corner, harbouring resentments against a man of her social class and demanding acknowledgement of her new status. The inconsistency hits her in the moment of settling her bill at the coffee shop, on "being told that money [...] was her only passport into these central caverns of oblivion. For ever driven on. Passing on" (287). In the moment of paying, the reality of her class position as a clerk and her gender position as an unattached woman overwhelm the status differentials she asserted to Tommy and also overwhelm the fantasy of being an independent Londoner. Settling quickly to counter her flagging spirits and to hide her lack of purpose, she regains the street to "lose herself once more" (287).

Her restiveness over her conflicting identities is compounded, however, by the even more revealing exchange that follows. Although her spirits lift briefly, disquiet descends a moment later, this time in encountering a person of her own gender – another female passer-by, like herself, alone on the streets – but one with whom Miriam holds the advantage. This encounter, despite her recent triumph over Tommy and despite the other woman's apparent less fortunate situation, is not an occasion to salute a fellow female traveller or even another public forager, one intent, like Miriam, on her own indefatigable particularisation of London public space. It is not even an occasion to honour the woman's anonymity by simply passing her by. Instead, seeing her "bent over the gutter," Miriam thinks: "The last, hidden truth of London, spoiling the night" (288). And if this opprobrium were not enough, Miriam, repulsed at noticing the woman's balding and blemished scalp, next displaces her own abjection onto the humble woman and then responds in anguish to the objectification by identifying her own future self with the hapless elderly woman at her side: "The head turned stealthily as [Miriam] passed and she met the expected sidelong glance; naked recognition, leering from the awful face above the outstretched bare arm. It was herself, set in her path and waiting through all the years. Her beloved hated secret self, known to this old woman" (289). To be sure, given her state of mind, the encounter and the abjection it arouses are likely full of associations of Miriam's lasting horror at discovering her dead mother and her fear of coming to a similar end. But these extenuating circumstances only diminish, they do not excuse the objectification that transpires and neither do they legitimate Miriam's identification. Instead her harsh treatment offers insight into what she meant exactly by the equal footing trumpeted just earlier in her encounter with Tommy Babington. The logic of belonging equally to the city goes like this: to Tommy, she asserts that they are London equals, irrespective of gender, because of their shared class and status; and to the elderly woman, they are not London equals, irrespective of gender, because of their different class and status.

In point of fact, Miriam accomplishes this exclusion in the moment of contact, as soon as she marks the woman's social location "bent over the gutter." As Buck-Morss remarks, "[t]o inhabit the streets as one's living room [or, I suggest, as one's dining room], is quite a different thing from needing them as a bedroom, bathroom, or kitchen, where the most intimate aspects of one's life are not protected from the view of strangers and ultimately, the police" (118). The elder woman is plainly not entitled to the same public privacy in her everyday routine that Miriam asserts for herself as a woman alone on the street. For that matter, the older woman seems hardly entitled to a subjective position at all. Her objectification takes place in order that Miriam's subjective position, however abject, may proceed. Thus to the extent that the scene invites an affective response, any sympathy or empathy elicited by default flows to the younger woman. To the extent that any flows toward her senior

pedestrian, it remains strictly on her Miriam's terms. From what we have seen of Miriam's everyday politics, it is hardly unexpected that her self-constructed identification with a gendered and grotesque underside of London would come about by effacing a still more desolate woman on her own.

Miriam's equivocal position in the city that seems to necessitate this privileging of her individuality over all others, even the lowliest, is present earlier in the novel if we attend carefully. One episode that unwittingly exposes her fear of abjection in a moment of ecstasy over London liberation makes all too plain Miriam's precarious relation to the city. After a night of tending to the indigent and manipulative consumptive, Eleanor Dear, Miriam awakens in a cold room to the happy prospect that she can leave the sleeping woman and resume her own life:

*Now*, once she was free again, to be just a Londoner, who would ask nothing more of life? It would be the answer to all questions; the perfect unailing thing, guiding all one's decisions. And an ill-paid clerkship was its best possible protection; keeping one at a quiet centre, alone in a little room, untouched by human relationships, undisturbed by the necessity of being anything. [...] She would be again, soon . . . not a woman but a Londoner. (2: 266)

Ironically, in this moment of London euphoria, what makes Miriam's identification possible and what makes gender irrelevant is her modest occupation, which noticeably consigns her to a small private space and not the open public spaces of London. The erasure of gender, on one side, and its panacea, a clerk's wages, on the other side, are undermined, however, as not moments before, she reflects on the brutality of Miss Dear's poverty: "It makes you helpless and makes sick people fearful and hateful" (264). And, in the instant just prior to identifying herself a Londoner and not a woman, Miriam worries: "London's got me. It's taking my health, and eating up my youth. It may as well have what remains" (266). This counter-vision of the city as consumer of its indigenes is succeeded by a recollection of the three days and nights Miriam spent nursing her sister Eve, which had "produced only a feverish gaiety," now leading Miriam to recognize: "[i]t was London that killed you" (266). Anonymity and mobility, that fantasy of metropolitan plenitude and nostrum so well promoted by the aesthetic of interiority, belie the precarious position of the autonomous 'I' that is also isolated and marginal, and belie as well the labour and wages required to support them. Despite the momentary clarity, Miriam – a Londoner, and not a woman – will remain steadfast in her independence, ever in pursuit of distinction, and not just in her day-to-day concerns, but in choosing to become a writer – the writer in fact who ultimately composes the very pilgrimage being narrated.

To understand her single-mindedness, we might recall, as Georg Simmel explained in his essay "The Metropolis and Mental Life," that just as the city provides the individual with the greatest opportunity of independence, so too do the possibilities and the potential for individuation, for setting oneself apart, become increasingly problematic and ambiguous with the concentration of population. Hence, distinguishing oneself becomes more and more necessary "in order for the individual to preserve his most personal core."<sup>32</sup> And for an "exceptional" New Woman like Miriam, the possibilities of distinction, for even a gifted writer, are few when that core is no longer defined by a notion of a "general human being" but is defined idiosyncratically by "qualitative uniqueness and irreplaceability" (Simmel, 423). In the case of Richardson, we might say that her unwavering commitment to her protagonist's single, unique consciousness over some thirteen novel-chapters is both a means of asserting the character's exceptionality in the face of economic, social, and emotional hardships and is a way of compensating for her marginality and estrangement. Or put another way, Richardson's aesthetic practice attempts to rescue Miriam from the ignominy of an ordinary female wage earner and suburban outcast in order to restore her lost status.

But there is another reality present that Richardson's obsession with Miriam's independence and individuality disregards, and that is the social reality that an awareness of everyday practice makes obvious. As Gagnier puts it, "neither class nor status [is] a matter of individual will or capacity but rather [is] *one of broad social relations*, so that status had to be conferred *by a community*" (240; my

emphasis). Over the course of novel, the privileging of Miriam's independence and exceptionality leads only to ignoring, deserting, or effacing community, so that Richardson's artist and intellectual *in potentia* comes to function as a 'van' or an 'avant' without a guard, and in a way contrary, it seems to me, to Richardson's other writing – her essays for *Close-Up* and *The Dental Record*, her literary reviews, her poems and correspondence, to name but a handful – in which there is clear attention to the social and the communal.

Yet Richardson's magnum opus, her signature modernist work *is Pilgrimage*, and it is perhaps for this reason that she has so long remained, as Ford Madox Ford woefully observed in 1938, "abominably unknown."<sup>33</sup> Or that, in the landmark study of British women novelists of some thirty years ago, the feminist scholar Elaine Showalter would conclude of Richardson: "she was an innovator who did not attract disciples."<sup>34</sup> In the final analysis, through the everyday practices of her most exceptional city itinerant, Richardson produces a vision of London not as everyone's city, and not even as a woman's city. Rather she gives us a vision of London as *one* woman's city.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 103.

<sup>2</sup> Michel De Certeau, Luce Girard, and Pierre Mayol, *The Practice of Everyday Life* vol. 2, ed. Luce Girard and trans. Timothy J. Tomasik. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 175.

<sup>3</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 177.

<sup>4</sup> Dorothy Richardson, *Pilgrimage* vol. 1 (London: J.M. Dent, 1967), 607. The first ten 'novel-chapters' of Richardson's thirteen-book life's work were published individually by Duckworth [*Pointed Roofs* (1915); *Backwater* (1916); *Honeycomb* (1917); *The Tunnel* (Feb 1919); *Interim* (Dec 1919); *Deadlock* (1921); *Revolving Lights* (1923); *The Trap* (1925); *Oberland* (1927); *Dawn's Left Hand* (1931)], with the eleventh book, *Clear Horizon*, by J. M. Dent in 1935. A 4-volume omnibus edition, including the twelfth book, *Dimple Hill*, was published by Dent in 1938. The thirteenth novel-chapter, *March Moonlight*, which remained unfinished at Richardson's death, was published posthumously in Dent's 1967 edition, reprinted by Virago Press in 1979. All references in this essay correspond to the Dent edition: Dorothy Richardson, *Pilgrimage* vols. 1-4 (London: J. M. Dent, 1967).

<sup>5</sup> E. M. Forster, *Howards End* ([1910] New York: Norton, 1997), 88.

<sup>6</sup> See John Burnett, *England Eats Out: A Social History of Eating Out in England from 1830 to the Present* (Harlow, England and New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004), 116-124.

<sup>8</sup> Edgar Allan Poe, "The Man of the Crowd" in *Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. Philip Van Doren Stern (New York: The Viking Press, 1945), 112.

<sup>9</sup> Walter Benjamin, "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century," in *Reflections*, ed. Peter Demetz and trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Schocken Books, 1986), 156. Benjamin, of course, famously distinguished between Baudelaire's and Poe's modus operandi, contending that Poe's subject was not *flâneur* but his after image "once he was deprived of the milieu to which he belonged" – "[i]f London ever provided it for him" (1986), 172. For a relevant critique of Benjamin's 'mystification' of *flânerie* in spite of himself, see Deborah Parsons, *Streetwalking the Metropolis: Women, the City, and Modernity* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 2-16.

<sup>10</sup> Susan Buck-Morss, "The Flaneur, the Sandwichman and the Whore: The Politics of Loitering," *New German Critique* 39 (1986): 104.

<sup>11</sup> See Scott McCracken, "Embodying the New Woman: Dorothy Richardson, Work and the London Café," in *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality, Corporeality*, ed. Avril Horner and Angela Keane (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 58-71, and "From Performance to Public Sphere: The Production of Modernist Masculinities," *Textual Practice* 15: 1 (2001): 47-65; Parsons, 2000; Nadine Attewell, "A Risky Business: Going Out in the Fiction of Virginia Woolf and Dorothy Richardson," in *The Swarming Streets: Twentieth-Century Literary Representations of London*, ed. Lawrence Phillips (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2004), 7-18.

<sup>12</sup> See Laura Marcus, "Continuous Performance: Dorothy Richardson," in *Close Up: 1927-1933*, ed. James Donald, Anne Friedberg, and Laura Marcus (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 150-59; Francesca Frigerio, "'A Filmless London': *Flânerie* and Urban Culture in Dorothy Richardson's Articles for *Close Up*," in Phillips, 19-31.

<sup>13</sup> Antia Levy, "Gendered Labor, the Woman Writer, and Dorothy Richardson," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 25:1 (1991): 50-70. See also Levy's *Other Women: The Writing of Class, Race, and Gender, 1832-1898* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

<sup>14</sup> Regenia Gagnier, *The Insatiability of Human Wants: Economics and Aesthetics in Market Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). As Gagnier explains: "The culture that had not seen beyond the horizon of scarcity and struggle in the face of nature dissolved toward the end of the nineteenth century, as Western society saw surplus and excess." In its wake and throughout the twentieth century came a greater emphasis on the desires and pleasures of the individual. This insight leads her to postulate that Jean-Francois Lyotard's "postmodern emphasis on the irreconcilability of differences, its breakup of unified master narratives, may be the culmination of Individuation" (1-2).

<sup>15</sup> Joanne Finkelstein, *Dining Out: A Sociology of Modern Manners* (New York: New York University Press, 1989).

<sup>16</sup> Edouard Manet's *Dejeuner sur l'herbe* (1863) is the modern depiction of a private repast in a public setting. A more contemporary example is the restaurant scene of the popular 1989 movie *When Harry Met Sally*. Consider Meg Ryan's Mollyesque and ecstatic (though feigned) "yes" – which elicits a matronly woman's excited entreaty to the server, "I'll have what she's having" – that has since become iconic in linking the pleasures of food and sex, diner and bedroom.

<sup>17</sup> One persistent marketing ploy is offered by the example of the nineteenth-century Kardomah Café chain. These cafés, famous for their high quality coffee beans, used the aroma from their roasting machines to entice passers-by onto the premises, in a similar way that hamburger chains today use the aroma of french fried potatoes to lure customers into their fast-food restaurants. See Burnett, 120.

<sup>18</sup> That Richardson, to her credit, attempted to rectify her own deficient knowledge is clearly evident in her writings on nutrition and diet, particularly those for *The Dental Record*. I am indebted to McCracken's forthcoming study *Masculinities, Modern Fiction and the Urban Public Sphere* (Manchester University Press, 2007) for this insight, in which he traces the link between Richardson's dietary and aesthetic practice and modern subjectivities. See especially his explication of Richardson's poem "Buns for Tea."

---

<sup>19</sup> Wendy Brown, "Wounded Attachments," in *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 70-76.

<sup>20</sup> Max Weber, "Class, Status, Party," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. and trans. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 193. Gagnier succinctly captures Weber's distinction: "Whereas Weber took class to express objective relationships of production, status groups expressed the distribution of prestige through relationships, involved in specific *styles* of life. In modern market societies, these styles related to specific practices of consumption," (240).

<sup>21</sup> Gloria Fromm, ed. *Windows on Modernism: Selected Letters of Dorothy Richardson* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 304.

<sup>22</sup> See Lois Cucullu, "'Exceptional Women', Expert Culture, and the Academy," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29:1 (2003): 27-54. I use the term "exceptional woman" to parse the New Woman phenomenon at the end of the nineteenth century. Briefly I argue that one distinction between Victorian and modernist New Women is an appeal to exceptionality. This appeal argues for intellectual prowess over and above political action, such as franchise reform. Exceptional women regard themselves as the 'van' or the 'avant' of the guard or movement. This arrogation of difference works in tandem with the claim of uniqueness that is a hallmark of aesthetic modernism.

<sup>23</sup> The mimetic of interiority corroborates and heightens the protagonist's independent intellect as it also asserts its formal uniqueness as art. And, to the extent to which Miriam is Richardson's doppelganger, this identification will double back to credit its creator, the author herself, who was arguably the first English novelist to develop this manner of writing style.

<sup>24</sup> The moment of Miriam's cultural triumph as a writer transpires obliquely in Richardson's final, posthumously published novel-chapter, *March Moonlight*, when Dr. Stenhouse, a Harley Street doctor, defamer of novels, and Miriam's social superior, feigning indifference, asks her embarrassedly over coffee at Lyons to have her editor look at his manuscript. See Richardson, *Pilgrimage* vol. 4, 615.

<sup>25</sup> See Richardson, *Pilgrimage*, vol. 1. We may partly gauge the effect of the event on Richardson from her difficulty in writing about it, even two decades later. Indeed the final scene of *Honeycomb*, in which Miriam returns from a walk to find that her mother has cut her throat, was written only at the insistence of Richardson's publisher Gerard Duckworth, who on reading the original manuscript complained that something seemed missing and asked that a final chapter be added. See Gloria Fromm, *Dorothy Richardson, A Biography* (Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1977), 95-96.

<sup>26</sup> For an astute reading of the Biblical allusions in this excerpt, see Susan Gervitz's explication, *Narrative's Journey: The Fiction and Film Writing of Dorothy Richardson* (New York: Peter Lang 1996), 153-185. Gervitz's linking of hunger to writing is one that I attempt to unpack in this essay.

<sup>27</sup> *The Practice of Everyday Life* describes the descent of leftovers. Referencing the caterers to the Parisian bourgeoisie of the nineteenth century, the editors explain that "leftovers followed an entire circuit trickling down (as their freshness decreased) through the city neighborhoods: every marketplace included stalls reserved for the commerce of "jewels", as they were called at that time. Becoming more and more rotten, having lost their identity, refined taste, and specificity, these scraps still ended up finding a taker at the lowest price." "Bad fever" and "divine will" were the names that locals gave to the illnesses caused by eating these rotting castoffs: de Certeau et al, 173.

<sup>28</sup> On “the aesthetics of defiance” latent in Miriam’s preferring not to eat, see Phillips 2000, 286.

<sup>29</sup> On the growth of the ABC and Lyons chains, see McCracken 2001, 55. On the relation of eating, London café-culture, and the new female subjectivities these foster, see McCracken 2000, 60-66. For an account of Richardson’s female protagonist as writer-*flâneuse*, see Parsons 2000, 99-116.

<sup>30</sup> Joanne Finkelstein, *Dining Out: A Sociology of Modern Manners* (New York: New York University Press, 1989), 14.

<sup>31</sup> That Miriam experiences this stigma is evident in her exchange at Slater’s restaurant with Mag and Jan. When they ask why she is so partial to ABCs, she responds: “The food is honest; not showy, and they are so blissfully dowdy” (2: 150). The chain’s dowdiness is in fact cover for her own self-consciousness about her worn and unstylish clothing, brought on by the combination of meager wages and fall in class. This admission is notably made to female friends who are better off and more stylish. More than a little defensively, Miriam admits to them: “I have come to the conclusion I like dowdiness. I’m not smart. You are”.

<sup>32</sup> Georg Simmel, “The Metropolis and Mental Life,” in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. and trans. Kurt H. Wolff (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1950), 422.

<sup>33</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *The March of Literature: From Confucius’ Day to Our Own* (New York: Dial Press, 1938), 848.

<sup>34</sup> Elaine Showalter, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1977), 258.