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Abstract

What does it mean in Spain to talk about national cuisine? This dissertation examines how three of Spain’s most prominent intellectuals of the early twentieth century—Emilia Pardo Bazán, Carmen de Burgos, and Gregorio Marañón—confronted that question in their writing in cookbooks at a pivotal moment in Spain’s history. Pardo Bazán, a feminist writer and novelist, authored two cookbooks, *La cocina española antigua* (1913) and *La cocina española moderna* (1914). Burgos, a teacher, newspaper columnist, and novelist, authored *La cocina moderna* (1906), *¿Quiere usted comer bien?* (1916), and *Nueva cocina práctica* (1925). Marañón, a physician and statesman as well as a writer, penned the prologue to Basque chef and restaurant-owner Nicolasa Pradera’s 1933 cookbook *La cocina de Nicolasa*. These authors were active during a period that saw enormous changes in Spain’s political structure and demographics, and in social and gender roles, and each of them engaged with the debates about Spain and the modern nation that consumed intellectual thinkers of the time. And yet each of these authors chose to write about cooking and food in a genre intended for the use of middle-class women in their homes.

Their writing in cookbooks, I posit, offered Pardo Bazán, Burgos, and Marañón the opportunity to address directly the middle-class female readers who stood at the nexus of their anxieties regarding Spain’s modernization. These anxieties were generated by shifting social structures as women gained access to education and to paid employment outside of the home, and as a newly mobilizing working class threatened the social order through political and labor organization, as well as with violence and unrest. By teasing out the
contradictions in their cookbook prologues, I show how these intellectuals use Spanish
cuisine to promote a vision of Spain’s modernization that corrects for the instabilities
generated by those same modernization processes.

In Chapter One, I demonstrate how Pardo Bazán uses Spain’s cocina antigua,
catalogued in La cocina española antigua (1913), to “write the nation into existence” (Labanyi).
By positioning cooking and cuisine in parallel to the dominant masculine nation-building
discourses of the period, Pardo Bazán maps a role for her women readers, and for herself as
a woman writer, in the task of building a modern Spanish nation. In Chapter Two, I focus
on Pardo Bazán’s second cookbook, La cocina española moderna (1914), and show how she uses
Spain’s modern cuisine to inculcate her female readers with the middle-class values that she
believes will serve as a bulwark against the increasing unrest of the working class. In contrast
to Pardo Bazán, who designates a conventional role for middle-class women in return for
protection against the working class, Carmen de Burgos argues that there is no contradiction
between women’s domestic roles and having a public role and an intellectual life. Chapter
Three analyzes how she uses a strategy of “double writing” (Zubiaurre) to show the
importance of cuisine to the public sphere and to criticize the still extant obstacles to
women’s public activity. Chapter Four focuses on Gregorio Marañón’s construction of
Basque chef and restaurateur Nicolasa Pradera in his prologue to her cookbook. Marañón
uses the prologue to promote a palatable version of Spain and its modernity to outsiders. Yet
his version of Spain’s modernity depends on reinscribing figures like Pradera into traditional,
anti-modern gender and class roles.
At a moment in which the international media identify in Spanish cuisine “the new source of Europe’s most exciting wine and food” (Lubow 1), this project historicizes the notion of “Spanish cuisine” at the center of Spanish haute cuisine. It also represents a foundational study in food cultural studies in Spain, offering a critical examination of cookbooks as a genre and as crucial texts in the *œuvres* of Emilia Pardo Bazán, Carmen de Burgos, and Gregorio Marañón.
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Introduction: Putting Spain on the Table: National Cuisine and Cookbook Prologues

As Manuel Vázquez Montalbán notes in Contra los gourmets, the existence of a Spanish cuisine has been a topic of debate for more than one hundred years (101). In response to the perennial question “¿Existe una cocina española?” Vázquez Montalbán responds, “La pregunta se la han planteado desde hace más de un siglo [. . .] y en líneas generales, tales esfuerzos reflexivos han permitido llegar a la conclusión de que es más legítimo hablar de las cocinas de España que de una cocina española” (101). The conclusion that it is more accurate to talk about Spain’s cuisines, plural, than to speak of a singular cuisine raises a foundational question: What does it mean in Spain to talk about national cuisine?

In the early twentieth century, three of Spain’s most prominent intellectuals confronted that question as they put Spain on the table in cookbooks and writing about cookbooks that sought to define a national cuisine for Spain. Emilia Pardo Bazán authored two cookbooks, La cocina española antigua (1913) and La cocina española moderna (1914); Carmen de Burgos authored La cocina moderna (1906), ¿Quiere usted comer bien? (1916), and Nueva cocina práctica (1925); and Gregorio Marañón penned the prologue to Basque chef and restaurant-owner Nicolasa Pradera’s cookbook La cocina de Nicolasa in 1933. All of these authors were actively engaged in debates about Spain and the modern nation during a period that saw enormous changes in Spain’s political structure and demographics, and in social and gender roles.
Context for change

Although scholars trace the notion of Spain’s decadence back to the late eighteenth century (Angel Loureiro in “Spanish nationalism and the ghost of empire” dates it to Cadalso’s *Cartas Marruecas* [1793] [66]), the loss of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Cuba as colonies in 1898 fostered perceptions of an economic crisis and sparked a political crisis that resulted in the development of what historian Raymond Carr describes as a “complex of pessimism and optimism” as political elites and intellectuals struggled to understand why Spain had lost its empire when other Western European nations were building them (Carr, “Liberalism. . .” 224). Regenerationists directed their energies toward resolving the crisis, naming the political system as one target of reform.

The Restoration monarchy, with its corrupt and inefficient *turno pacífico* system, had not been able to enact the liberal reforms that would generate the indivisible national sovereignty that politicians had imagined for Spain in the nineteenth century. The lack of infrastructure outside of the large cities, the poor transportation characteristic of rural Spain, and the absence of internal markets isolated rural Spaniards from ideas fomented in urban areas at the same time that it kept class-based unrest contained. Yet, political leaders and elites alike feared the threat of the “revolution from below,” anxious that the political and social unrest that had been contained to isolated uprisings would, under the influence of the workers’ groups that had begun to organize in the 1840s (Carr 229), evolve into a full-blown revolution (233). Conservative politicians like Antonio Maura attempted to engineer a “revolution from above,” an overhaul of the political system that would bring the peasantry

---

1 Angel Loureiro notes that this was largely a misperception; the first decades of the twentieth century were prosperous ones (66).
and working class into the political system by doing away with the power of local *caciques*. These plans were given urgency by the massive emigration of laborers from rural Spain to the cities.²

This migration added to the anxieties of the politically ineffectual Restoration monarchy. The government operated under the constant fear that the increasing numbers of working-class members in the concentrated space of the cities would become uncontrollable. According to Carr, the regime survived the 1909 Semana Trágica only by severely repressing those thought to be responsible, and the general strikes of 1917 only because of divisions among protesters (Carr, “Liberalism . . .” 233-234). After the 1921 massacre of thousands of Spanish soldiers in Morocco (Spain’s remaining colonial interest), the spectacle of defeated Spanish soldiers instigated a call for “responsibility” (521). This impulse to name the military leaders responsible for the massacre morphed into an instrument of reform for the Restoration monarchy; if successful it would signal a “‘new constitutional period’ of ‘serious government’” (Alcalá Zamora qtd. in Carr *Spain* 522). With both the military and king facing a public tribunal in the Fall of 1923 about the outcome of the Leftist-led investigation to establish responsibility for the 1921 massacre, General Primo de Rivera called *pronunciamiento* on September 23rd, and Alfonso XIII abdicated and named Primo de Rivera as the prime minister. This move ended the Restoration monarchy and established a dictatorship led by an “iron surgeon” in the figure of Primo de Rivera (521-523).³

---

² According to historian José Álvarez Junco, in 1900, 65% of the population was involved in agriculture, compared to 46% by 1930 (Álvarez Junco 82).

³ Carr describes the defeat of Spanish troops by Abd el Krim’s leadership of the Rif tribes as an outcome resulting from politicians’ miscalculations and desire for a “peaceful penetration” that would bring the territory separating Melilla and Ceuta under Spanish control (*Spain* 519). The military’s “culture of conquest” turned
Although Carr characterizes Primo as a failed politician, because the party he attempted to organize, the National Political Union, never attracted a following beyond the extreme right wing, Primo was successful at implementing a series of modernizing reforms, including a roads network and dams and irrigation projects (241). Primo de Rivera’s reforms made possible increases in productivity and income, and the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture decreased during his rule, from 57% to 45% (242). When the members of the Agrupación para la República, Gregorio Marañón among them, ushered in the Second Republic in 1931, enthusiasm for the arrival of democracy and the prospect that all of Spain’s citizens might become participants in the nation’s political life signaled the first steps in a radical social revolution, even as social and cultural reforms were perceived as a threat to Spain’s traditional identity.

This period also ushered in a fundamental shift in thinking about the roles of women in Spanish society. As Bridget Aldaraca, Catherine Jagoe, and Cristina Enríquez de Salamanca show, intellectuals had been obsessed with the category of woman since the 1840s (Johnson 15), and this interest did not wane in the tumultuous decades of the early twentieth century. Even while those at the margins of the middle class, and middle-class Morocco into a preserve for their interests with the compromise being that politicians demanded that “the army must satisfy its vanity on the cheap” (519). In the aftermath of the 1921 defeat, rumors of military corruption became part of the public record when debates in the Cortes exposed the fact that some military officers earned two times their official income and never served at the front, while conscripts under their control routinely starved. The investigation into this corruption resulted in a planned public tribunal in which diputados would question the king and the army (521-523).
women themselves, still functioned largely under the ideology of domesticity, the period ushered in a series of debates about women’s suitability for greater roles in the public sphere and greater access to education. The discussion was eagerly engaged by women intellectuals working “to find their own place in the national order through feminist discourse and activity” (Johnson 13). Margarita Nelken, in La condición social de la mujer (1919), exposed the consequences of the pervasive domestic ideology that made women’s labor in the public sphere shameful, forcing women to accept exploitatively poor salaries or to depend on marriage or male family members for financial support. Although the debates about the possibilities of women’s greater roles as workers in the public sphere were complicated by concerns about how their roles as mothers should or would limit their contributions as workers (Nash Mujer 16-18), this period fostered the development of a new model of femininity that challenged traditional thinking about women’s roles. In contrast to the traditional model of the woman whose work in the home nurtures the future citizens of the nation-state, the model of the nueva mujer moderna, a model that “redefines women in terms of modernity,” offered women a framework for adapting to new social, economic, and demographic contexts and facilitated access to education and the labor market (Nash “Uncontested. . .” 31-32).

Greater access to education made possible an astounding expansion in literacy rates, especially among women; Jean-Francois Botrel shows that female illiteracy decreased from 71.4% in 1900 to 43.5% in 1920 (309). Accompanying this growth in literacy, and

---

4 Indeed, according to María Jesús Matilla, even working-class women whose livelihoods depended on their labor as servants or factory workers were influenced by the notion that their wages were a supplement to those earned by their husbands (90-94).
intertwined with it, was explosive growth in the market for books and other print materials. Just as the *novela por entregas*, which came into existence between 1850 and 1870, made print texts available to readers at a low cost spread over time (Botrel, “La novela...” 112), publishing houses began during the period of this study to mass-produce books, from the novelette series for which Carmen de Burgos is most famous (Louis 7) to collections of Spain’s classic literary texts in the *Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* under the direction of Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (Marco García 91). This growth in the publishing marketplace was both part of the expanding (urban) consumer culture and an engine for its expansion, circulating images of a modernized Spain via illustrated magazines about decorating, fashion, hygiene, and cooking (Mangien 136). Francisco Sempere and Ramón Sopena, the publishers of Burgos’s series of practical manuals for women, which included included her cookbooks, also published translations of works by Kropotkin, Nietzsche, Engels, and Nordau among others (Mainer 58). The cookbooks Pardo Bazán, Burgos, and Pradera produced and for which Marañón wrote were part of this phenomenon.

**Cookbooks in Spain**

Cookbooks were by no means a new genre in Spain, although the use of these books did change during this period. The earliest cookbooks in Spain were written by aristocratic women and professional chefs for their peers. María de los Ángeles Pérez Samper, in her article “*Los recetarios de las mujeres y para mujeres. Sobre la conservacion y transmisión de los saberes domésticos en la época moderna*,” describes a series of private *recetario* manuscripts that literate, mostly aristocratic women in Spain wrote for themselves; these volumes contained recipes for medicines and beauty concoctions as well as for food. Pérez
Samper dates the oldest of these recetarios to the sixteenth century (138). Aside from these recetarios, scholars identify Rupert de Nola’s sixteenth-century Llibre de coch as the first cookbook to appear in Spain. Nola was a chef who worked in the household of Fernando de Napoles. The earliest edition of his cookbook appeared in 1520, although manuscripts of translations of the text have been dated to 1525, 1529, 1538, and 1568 (Simón Palmer, Bibliografía 212-216). Nola also created another cookbook, titled Llibre de doctrina pera ben servir: de Tallar y del Art de Coch (1520, 1568). Other cooks followed in Nola’s footsteps, including most notably Francisco Martínez Motiño (Arte de cocina, pastelería, bizcochería y conserveria [1611]), Juan de Altamiras (Nuevo arte de cocina [1745]), and Juan de la Mata (Artes de repostería en que se contiene todo género de dulces secos y en líquido, turrones, natas, bebidas heladas y de todos los géneros […] con una buena introducción para conocer las frutas y servirlas crudas [1747]).

Although Martínez Motiño’s, Altamiras’s, and Mata’s cookbooks were reissued up until the nineteenth century, they were not relevant to Spain’s growing bourgeoisie in the nineteenth century. The recipes they contained reflected the purchasing power of the aristocracy (Martínez Motiño) and the diets of the Catholic clergy (Altamiras); they did not contain recipes calling for ingredients that the middle class could afford, according to writer and culinary historian Néstor Lújan (193). Many of the cookbooks with recipes that did appeal to the growing bourgeoisie were translations of French texts, for example Mariano Rementería y Fica’s translation of the Manual del cocinero, cocinera, repostero, confitero [s.a.] (Luján 194).
Cookbooks written by Spanish authors for native readers provided recipes and instructions for servants or skilled household staff.\(^5\) The title of the 1920 *La nueva cocinera curiosa económica y su marido el repostero famoso, amigo de los golosos* identifies the cocinera as the imagined user of these recipes, as do the 1867 *Cocinero español y la perfecta cocinera instruídos en lo mejor del arte culinario en otros países*, the 1888 *La cocinera moderna*, the Catalan cookbooks *La cuynera catalana* (1837) and *El novísimo cocinero universal* (1848) by Berenguer de Montgat, and Felip Cirera’s *Avisos o sian regals sensillas a un principiant cuyner o cuynera adaptadas a la capacitat dels menos instruits* (1860).

Another type of cooking manual also emerged in the nineteenth century in the work of social hygienists like Pedro Felipe Monlau (*Elementos de higiene privada, o arte de conservar la salud del individuo* [1875]; *Nociones de higiene doméstica* [1897]), Francisco Javier Santero (*Elementos de higiene privada y pública* [1885]), and later, José García del Moral (*La alimentación de las clases proletarias* [1911]). These men detail how homes should be organized for the health of their inhabitants. Monlau prescribes a hygiene curriculum for girls encapsulated in lists of rules about how they should organize their homes and plan meals to maintain the health and happiness of their future families (Monlau, *Nociones* 108). The hygiene texts of these professional men schematize the functions of the household, including those around cooking and eating, into a series of rules that promise to create healthy homes and living conditions. The audiences for these texts were the middle-class families that might follow such rules, especially in the case of Monlau’s *Nociones*, which presents the rules of an

\(^5\) The author, “Un gastrónomo jubilado,” of the 1869 cookbook *La gran economía de las familias* describes the skills of his top-notch *cocinera*, Pepa, whose work became so expensive that the author replaced her with an unskilled servant from Alcarria whom he trained with the knowledge acquired from eating Pepa’s food for many years (ix).
organized household in simple language. But the works of these hygienists also mirrored the practices of public health bureaucrats who, according to Jo Labanyi, documented the private lives of individuals and families and thereby masked surveillance mechanisms with the cover of social improvement (Labanyi 86).

It is with Ángel Muro’s “best-selling” *El Practicón* (1884) that a new kind of cookbook emerges in Spain (Luján 194). Muro’s texts do not assume that the person in charge of cooking will be a servant. Instead, Muro, who was a friend of Emilia Pardo Bazán, Juan Valera, and literary gastronomist Mariano Pardo de Figueroa (Thebussem), is the first of a number of chef-writers who addresses cooking as a topic of interest for readers, and also for a middle-class woman who might actually do some of the cooking; a woman who, lacking a top-notch *cocinera*, must instruct the maid herself and lend a hand, and for whom using the food left over from one meal as the base for another is not unthinkable. Muro’s writing in this cookbook, as in his later *Diccionario de la cocina* (1892) and in the articles he wrote for his *Conferencias culinarias* between 1890 and 1897, uses a familiar and colloquial tone as he describes “el dueño o la dueña” who “[e]n toda casa en que se encienda la lumbre […] tiene la preocupación de guisar con esmero” and who thinks that “los libros de cocina no

---

6 A note from the publishers of Muro’s *Conferencias culinarias* indicates that the series was in its fourth edition since “las tres primeras de este tomo, con tirada total de 5,000 ejemplares, no han sido suficientes para satisfacer los pedidos […]” (2). A single volume of the series (the first volume contained 64 pages) sold for one *peseta*.

7 Author of *La mesa moderna: Cartas sobre el comedor y la cocina Cambiadas entre El Doctor Thebussem y Un Cocinero de S.M* (1888), the text scholars consider the among the first of Spain’s literary gastronomy texts, Pardo de Figueroa wrote about stamps, tauromaquia, and literature in addition to gastronomy.

8 The 1912 *Ramillete del ama de casa* by “Nieves” is also directed to middle-class women who do their own cooking: “¡Qué las señoras, amas de su casa—dices—se ocupen en cuanto se refiera a la cocina y así conseguirán mayor economía en los gastos y más sana y nutritiva alimentación para su familia” (“Baltasar” in “Nieves” viii).
sirven de nada al que no está iniciado en la culinaria” (7). He addresses his diverse reading public and assures them of the utility of his cookbook in the “Preámbulo” to the 1894 edition to *El practicón*:

Mi método en este libro, consiste en ofrecer a todo el que de cocina se ocupe el medio de comer bien, con un gasto módico en relación a los recursos de cada cual.

Dejando a un lado prácticas añejas y rutinas de arraigo, mis fórmulas, exclusivamente más, las ha de entender la cocinera más torpe, lo mismo que el sabio académico (13).

Muro is among the first in a group of men that also includes newspaper writer and editor Manuel Puga y Parga (Picadillo) and chef Teodoro Bardají whose writing about cooking in the media attracts a wide readership, and whose writing in cookbooks expands the scope of prescriptive literature to focus specifically on cooking.\(^9\) Just as Monlau and Santero prescribe the rules that structure a healthy household, Muro, Picadillo, and Bardají tell female housewives how to prepare meals for their families; Bardají even takes care to assure his readers that his recipes are not too complicated for them:

En una casa moderna cada día es más necesario un libro de cocina; pudiéramos decir que es un artículo de primera necesidad, pero es preciso

---

\(^9\) Bridget Aldaraca in *El Ángel del hogar: Galdós and the ideology of domesticity in Spain* (1991), defines prescriptive literature as that “written by self-proclaimed authorities: clergy, educators, doctors of medicine, philosophers, theologians, etc. for the purpose of teaching women what they should be and what they should do” (27). Carmen de Burgos writes in the prologue to *Nueva cocina práctica* (1925) that Muro, along with Fernanflor, Ossorio Bernard, Adolfo de Castro, and Francisco María Montero, wrote for “secciones gastronómicas en los diarios y las revistas,” among them *La Época, El Liberal, Blanco y Negro*, and *La Ilustración Española y Americana*, at the end of the nineteenth century (30).
que estos libros sean sencillos, claros, sin tecnicismos que plantean a las lectoras problemas difíciles y sin complicaciones de preparación que requieren práctica y habilidad que no son frecuentes. (Bardají 14)

A second type of cookbook acquires a commercial profile in the late nineteenth century, which ostensibly continues the tradition captured in the recetarios described by Pérez Samper of women exchanging knowledge with other women. The viuda de Uhagón’s dedication of her 1890 Libro de Cocina apropósito para la Mesa Vizcaína to her daughters marks it as part of that tradition, a fact Marañón emphasizes in his description of Uhagón’s Libro de Cocina in his prologue to Nicolasa Pradera’s cookbook: “hay un prologuillo, que la autora dedica a su propia hija, en el que, en palabras sencillas y tiernas, está encerrada toda la filosofía y toda la moral del arte culinario” (in Pradera 15).

Other domestic or conduct manuals published during the nineteenth century shared this dual purpose of providing both instruction about women’s roles and duties in the home and a textual medium through which women communicated with one another. María del Pilar Sinués de Marco’s conduct manuals—El Ángel del Hogar (1859), La dama elegante (1880), and the short-lived magazine version of El Ángel del hogar—are examples of this, as are the growing number of periodical texts authored by women for women readers that began to circulate in Spain in the later part of the nineteenth century.¹⁰ These texts reinforce the

¹⁰ Other magazines include: La mujer published by a society of female writers who declare that their goal “no es el mero capricho, ni darse a conocer como escritoras, sino el ser útiles a su sexo” (qtd. in Perinat 27); or reformer Concepción Arenal’s La Voz de la Caridad, which circulated bi-weekly over a period of fourteen years starting in 1870. In Mujer, prensa y sociedad en España 1800-1939, Adolfo Perinat and María Isabel Marrades write, “[d]urante el último tercio del siglo aparecen además una veintena de revistas, generalmente importantes y serias, publicadas por mujeres y para mujeres” (29).
ideology of domesticity. Writing about meals in *La dama elegante*, Sinués de Marco advises readers about dishes that demonstrate the “buen tono” of an almuerzo: “Ninguna salsa ni frito puede servirse en un almuerzo de buen tono: sólo figuran huevos como primer plato, ya en tortillas pequeñas a la francesa [. . .].” (282). Nonetheless, as Íñigo Sánchez Llama and Catherine Jagoe underscore, these texts also subvert the domestic ideal by arguing for women’s education and literacy (Jagoe 32-33) and by presenting in their examples of women with professional writing careers a model of womanhood whose production (writing) is relevant to the public sphere (Sánchez Llama 28-29). Furthermore, according to Cristina Enríquez de Salamanca, by writing household advice for other women, writers like Sinués de Marco created a female reading community (9).

The four cookbooks I examine in my dissertation are products of this complex social and demographic context. As texts produced for middle-class women who cook in their own homes, rather than for professional cooks or for those who need to train servants, the cookbooks have a precedent in the prescriptive literature that had circulated in Spain since Fray Luis de León wrote *La perfecta casada* in 1583. At the same time, these cookbooks emerged as a result of the publishing boom that sought to capture new readers, especially among women and the working class. In key ways, these cookbooks reached women readers and spoke to them about their roles in a changing Spain. Some of the messages in these texts conform to the ideology of domesticity in reaction to the prospect that middle-class women

---

11 In *El Ángel del hogar: Galdós and the Ideology of Domesticity in Spain*, Bridget Aldaraca defines the ideology of domesticity as the radical separation of social spheres into public and private domains. Social and political equality supposedly exists between men and women, but women do not participate in political life. They “influence” from within the home, and focus on their children and their education as the center of domestic life (18-19).
or those at the margins of the middle class might seek employment outside of the home. At the same time, the cookbooks subvert that ideology and show their readers, the middle-class women limited to the private sphere by domestic ideology, their relevance to the issues these writers confront about the processes of modernization.

In this context, the cookbooks by Pardo Bazán and Carmen de Burgos present a startling contradiction, one that generates the fundamental questions at the heart of this dissertation. Given their open feminist aims, why would Pardo Bazán explicitly make her cookbooks part of a series of texts, the *Biblioteca de la mujer*, published with the aim of furthering feminist goals in Spain, while Burgos published cookbooks as volumes in an extensive series of popular practical manuals that seem to uphold domestic ideology? Indeed, why do three of the early twentieth century’s most progressive intellectuals choose to participate in cookbook writing at all? And finally, what does writing about food and cooking allow all these figures to explore about social and political developments in Spain between 1905, the year Pardo Bazán first authored a cookbook prologue, and 1933, the year Gregorio Marañón wrote his prologue to Basque chef Nicolasa Pradera’s cookbook *La cocina de Nicolasa*?

**Cooking and writing the nation into existence**

These questions underscore a fundamental shift in how I had envisioned this dissertation in my prospectus as compared to how it has unfolded. One of the premises that grounded my initial approach to examining cooking and constructions of the nation in Spain was Jo Labanyi’s argument in *Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel* (2000) that writers in the late nineteenth century attempted to write the Spanish nation into existence.
Labanyi describes Spanish intellectuals’ debates about what it meant to be Spanish and about the configuration of a particularly Spanish modernity. Their written discourses, in creating a Spanish nation on paper, indicate how writing and print texts worked to remap ideas of community in Spain. Citizens formed (national) alliances through the texts they read and wrote, and reading and writing consolidated the “invented traditions” created to anchor a Spanish society as it dealt with the changes imposed by modernization (Hobsbawm).

The virtually unstudied gold mine of culinary texts from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that I encountered during my research trips to Barcelona and Madrid in 2006 and 2007 revealed a wealth of materials with which to begin my examination of the deployment of cuisine as a nation-building discourse. These texts include the Renaixença Catalán cookbook *La cuynera catalana* (1835), the gastronomical writing of Mariano Pardo de Figueroa (under the pseudonym Thebussem) in *La mesa moderna* (1888), the cookbooks by Emilia Pardo Bazán (1913, 1914), and essays on cuisine and gastronomy in Spain by Julio Camba (1929) and Gregorio Marañón (1929, 1933, 1951). And in my dissertation prospectus, I outlined my plans to examine many of these texts to answer a series of questions about gastronomical writing and cookbooks produced in Spain between 1875, the beginning of the Restoration monarchy and the year that scholars identify as the moment when conversations about Spain’s modernity became pressing, and 1936, the beginning of the Spanish Civil War. I wanted to understand how cookbooks, as texts that formalize the practice of cooking, participate in, borrowing Benedict Anderson’s terminology, creating an “imagined [national] community” of readers and cooks. I had planned to show how an imagined community might have allowed women to participate as actors in its creation via cooking at a moment in which they had few social rights and no political ones. Given that as
many of the cookbooks in Spain were authored by men as by women, I wanted to consider how the cookbooks women wrote for female readers differed from those authored by male chefs like Teodoro Bardají, whose texts shifted the focus of prescriptive literature from women’s moral comportment to their culinary abilities and responsibilities.

For the second part of my dissertation, I had planned to consider how gastronomical works like Mariano Pardo de Figueroa’s (Thebussem) *La mesa moderna: Cartas sobre el comedor y la cocina cambiadas entre El doctor Thebussem y Un cocinero de su majestad* (1888), Ángel Muro’s *Conferencias culinarias* (1890–1897), Julio Camba’s *La casa del Lúculo: o, el arte de comer (nueva fisiología del gusto* (1929), and Dionisio Pérez’s *Guía del buen comer español: inventario y loa de la cocina clásica de España y sus regiones* (1929) and *La cocina clásica española* (1936) attempt to create a “taste community” for Spanish cuisine or, as Vázquez Montalbán claims, cast doubts on the possibility of such a community in Spain (Parkhurst Ferguson 17). Formally, the texts in this second group are not cookbooks. Rather, they are textual entries in the ongoing debate about what it means to eat in Spain and what is Spanish about the food people eat. These texts, together, form a kind of “debating forum” about what might constitute the Spanish culinary nation (Labanyi 11) and how food production, food distribution, economic factors, and the homogenizing expectations generated by the processes of nationalization and modernization affect what people eat.

Thus, a major part of my original outline for this dissertation was an attempt to write a poetics of the cookbooks produced in Spain during the period in which the notion of Spanishness was most up for debate. But cooking and eating are by their nature ephemeral practices, only incompletely representable in written form. As Luce Giard makes clear in *The Practice of Everyday Life, Vol. 2* (1998), “doing-cooking,” or “faire-la-cuisine” is a knowledge
born of ritual, repetition of movements, and motion “rooted in the fabric of relationships to others and one’s self […]” (Giard 157, 275). Cooking requires movement and relationships; its significance lies in the inherently fleeting movements and relationships that change as soon as they are expressed, and neither of these things is easily or accurately expressed in language. Jack Goody confirms that the practice of cooking can be only incompletely represented in the form of a written recipe; for Goody the defining characteristic of a recipe is its written form, and yet putting instructions for cooking into print masks knowledge necessary to preparing a dish even as it reveals them (136). The ephemeral nature of cooking and eating made the project of examining how individuals cooked or ate the nation into existence a problematic undertaking. For any consideration of how women’s participation in culinary nation-building via cooking might have contributed to the construction of an imagined community the mediation of the text had to be considered, as well as the question of how inscribing the act of cooking into text alters a practice that in its original form has a “tactical,” subversive potential (de Certeau xix).

Issues of class also complicate the textual representation of cooking and the attempt to construct a poetics of cuisine in early twentieth-century Spain. In *The Logic of Practice* (1980), Pierre Bourdieu suggests that the representation of class will always be controlled by the more powerful class, those individuals with a greater share of a society’s wealth. Less powerful members of society may have an interest in subverting or modifying the dominant representation of class, but those who are more powerful perpetuate a distorted recognition of how class works and how people of different means contribute to and partake of capital (140-141). Given that cooking as a home practice in Spain during this period depended on the labor of two subordinate classes of people—middle-class women laboring in the private
sphere of their households and working-class or peasant women cooking as domestic servants and in their own households—any representation of “cooking the nation” into existence must have been subject to the interests of the more powerful classes. That is, if writing can represent the practice of cooking only incompletely and if elites ultimately control the representation of cooking that will appear in print, then any attempt to understand how cooking might have been part of, or subversive of, nation-building exercises must take this class-power dynamic into account. Cooking produces a meal; in the case of cookbooks and other culinary texts, it also produces a representable practice that can be manipulated to serve a variety of interests.

With the recognition that the “cooking the nation” that happens in cookbooks cannot be understood as separate from “writing the nation into existence,” my attention shifted from recipes and how the instructions they dictate attempt to “do things” (Austin) to the interests served when intellectual figures like Emilia Pardo Bazán, Carmen de Burgos, and Gregorio Marañón participate in cookbook writing.

**Contradictions and prologues**

Carmen Ortiz García’s 1998 article “Comida e identidad: cocina nacional y cocinas regionales en España” historicizes the idea of a “national cuisine” in Spain and considers how such things as national cuisines can be constructed. She explores the links between foods and landscapes and describes how designations like “cocina de montaña” or “cocina fluvial,” which reference the availability of ingredients, become susceptible to being converted into seemingly objective criteria of national distinction: “La fijación del clima, orografía y otros elementos físicos, junto a unas técnicas de explotación que, desde un
principio, se suponen antiguas o tradicionales, parece susceptible de proporcionar un criterio ‘objetivo’ para la distinción” (305-306). Once landscapes are imbued with national meaning, they become a factor in determining the “character” of the people who inhabit them, which in itself becomes an archetype on which nationalist identities are constructed:

A este sustrato físico (visto como natural aunque no lo sea de hecho) se supone el segundo elemento, más difícil de definir y objetivar, pero que igualmente se considera muy cercano a lo natural o innato y, en cualquier caso, es visto como muy antiguo y forjado a través de avatares históricos y tradiciones de gran profundidad temporal: el genio, carácter o modo de ser colectivo, tópico de la nación. (306)

Ortiz García echoes Vázquez Montalbán in suggesting that it makes more sense to talk about Spain’s many cuisines than to speak of a unified monolithic cuisine consumed throughout the country: “[. . .] en cualquier libro de gastronomía podemos encontrar una definición de la cocina nacional que insista, precisamente, en la falta de unidad [. . .].” (309). Furthermore, argues Ortiz García, any attempt at listing the dishes that would comprise Spain’s national cuisine would reflect the regional culinary variations that both comprise and coexist with a national cuisine. Listing paella valenciana, bacalao a la vizcaína, cocido madrileño, caldo gallego, crema catalana, gazpacho andaluz, and pan catalán as examples, Ortiz García argues that there is no such thing as a Spanish cuisine that is not a constructed list of dishes amassed to serve a greater ideological, political, and social purpose.

Two of the most surprising texts I encountered during my research at the Biblioteca de Catalunya and the Biblioteca Nacional de España were the prologues to Emilia Pardo Bazán’s La cocina española antigua (1913) and La cocina española moderna (1914), the two
cookbooks that concluded her *Biblioteca de la mujer*. If Pardo Bazán collected recipes in these volumes and called them “cocina española antigua” and “cocina española moderna,” what ideological, political, and social purposes would be served by the volumes? As part of the *Biblioteca* they would seem to uphold Pardo Bazán’s promotion of feminism in Spain. Yet in them, she is writing in a genre that would conventionally be considered anti-feminist, and, in the prologues, she creates an unflattering representation of her imagined female readers. I also discovered that cookbooks by Carmen de Burgos and Nicolasa Pradera offered equally intriguing prologues. Burgos opens her cookbook with a letter to her editor in which she, seemingly jokingly, frames cookbook writing as an obligation of her gender not worthy of her time and status, while Gregorio Marañón’s prologue to Pradera’s cookbook presents the book’s author, a female Basque restaurant owner and chef, both as the incarnation of tradition and as a vibrant representation of Spain’s idealized modernity. Examining the contradictions presented in these prologues reveals an authorial agenda that is both personal and national, and not solely related to cooking.

Susan Leonardi, in her groundbreaking article “Recipes for Reading: Pasta Salad, Lobster à la Risoholme, Key Lime Pie” (1989), shows readers how the paratextual elements of cookbooks—forwords, introductions, and epilogues—become the textual spaces where cookbook authors develop relationships with their imagined readers and, most importantly, tell readers what the recipes in the cookbook collection mean. If these authors are choosing, or reflecting on, the version of Spain’s national cuisine represented in their cookbooks, then examining the prologues to these recipe collections will shed light on the ideological, political, and social purposes that inform these writers’ interest in cooking and cuisine.
The chapters on the menu

By writing cookbooks, or prologues for them, Pardo Bazán, Burgos, Marañón, and Pradera make the practice of home cooking, carried out by the imagined female readers of their texts, meaningful. My analysis places these cookbooks in their sociohistorical context in a way that shows how the cookbooks served both a national and a personal agenda for each author. Some parts of this double agenda are directly related to cooking and what cooking as a national practice might mean for the regeneration and modernization of Spain. But these prologues are also riddled with contradictions. One reveals the fears of the ruling class as it confronts the possibility of working-class violence. Another underscores the obstacles female intellectuals encounter in their attempts to participate in the dialogues about Spain, its modernity, and its future. All of these writers chose cooking and recipes as a platform for their ideas about women, the nation, and Spain’s modernization processes. Their reasons for making that choice are explored in my considerations of their work.

In Chapter One, “Doña Emilia’s Home Cooking,” I problematize Emilia Pardo Bazán’s decision to publish two cookbooks, which ultimately appeared as the final volumes in the Biblioteca de la mujer, a series Pardo Bazán began in the 1890s to introduce Spanish women to ideas about feminism that were circulating abroad. Critics have typically classified her cookbooks as texts written out of her frustration with Spanish women’s apparent lack of interest in the increasing social opportunities available to them, but Pardo Bazán offers the recipes she collects from women from all over Spain (and the practitioners of Spanish cuisine in the Americas) as evidence of a rich and continuous Spanish national patrimony stretching back to medieval times. Beginning with the prologue to La cocina española antigua (1913), her first cookbook, Pardo Bazán constructs a Spanish national cuisine. In this first
cookbook, she makes a case that women and the recipes they create are as important to the foundation of the nation, just as the efforts of men were in the fields of folklore, literary studies, and anthropology.

Just one year later, Pardo Bazán’s second cookbook, *La cocina española moderna* (1914), takes a different tack. In chapter two, “Deconstructing Emilia Pardo Bazán’s Culinary Ideology,” I examine how Pardo Bazán’s placement of cuisine (the recipes in her cookbooks) in parallel to other nation-building discourses distorts the effects of social class reflected in assumptions about who practices and consumes the Spanish cuisine she invents. It also marginalizes a class of citizens for whom, she insinuates, cuisine would have little interest—the working class. Thus, her framing of Spain’s modern cuisine in this prologue reveals her distaste for and fear of the working class and the very processes that would convert Spain into a modern nation. In what turns out to be a highly contradictory treatment of her imagined female readers, Pardo Bazán abandons her promotion of their progress and education in favor of inscribing within their cooking and table practices a set of idealized middle-class values that serve as a bulwark against the working class and the changes that threaten to upend Spain.

Pardo Bazán’s writing of these cookbook prologues at the end of her career, when her reputation as an intellectual was soundly established (so much so that her publication of cookbooks surprised readers who knew she was a feminist), stands in contrast to the cookbook writing of the middle-class housewife-turned-writer, Carmen de Burgos. Burgos’s first cookbook, *La cocina moderna*, was published in 1906, at a time when Burgos’s reputation as a female columnist who wrote about controversial topics like divorce and voting attracted readers to her articles in Madrid’s newspapers. In my third chapter, “Carmen de Burgos’s
Culinary Erudition: The Modern Spanish Woman as Escritora and Cocinera,” I examine four paratexts that Burgos includes in two of her cookbooks: the “Carta-Prólogo” that she addresses to her editor, Francisco Sempere, in La cocina moderna (1906); the prologue to her 1906 cookbook; the revised “Carta-Prólogo” that Burgos includes in the 1925 reissue of the first cookbook, titled Nueva cocina práctica; and the enormously expanded prologue (from seven pages to sixty-four) that she wrote for Nueva cocina práctica.

Whereas Pardo Bazán stresses her involvement in collecting each of the recipes readers find in her cookbooks, Burgos only rarely even mentions the recipes her readers will find in La cocina moderna and Nueva cocina práctica. Instead, Burgos’s writing interrogates gendered assumptions about the supposed triviality of women’s writing in modern Spain. By engaging in a practice of “double writing” (Zubiaurre 1), Burgos shows that the things that women produce (via cooking and writing) are important for the nation. At the same time, she takes advantage of the supposed triviality of women’s writing about cooking (and cosmetics and the arts of seduction) to inscribe in these texts a covert critique of hegemonic, paternalistic ideas about women and their work, and to mount a defense of her own position as an intellectual contributing to the debates about modern Spain.

In my final chapter, “La cocina de Nicolasa: Gregorio Marañón and Spain’s (Culinary) Modernization,” I consider the prologue to Basque chef and restaurant owner Nicolasa Pradera’s 1933 cookbook, La cocina de Nicolasa, written by physician, writer, and statesman Gregorio Marañón. In contrast to the other cookbooks I examine in this dissertation, Pradera’s writing is limited to the lists of instructions that communicate the steps of her recipes. She does little to tell readers who she is or to establish a relationship with them in her text. That role belongs to Gregorio Marañón. Appearing as Marañón was approaching
the end of his two-year career as a diputado to the Second Republic Cortes, the prologue to Pradera’s cookbook falls in line with his larger political concerns for the nation and Spain’s modernization. My analysis will show how Marañón uses his prologue to Pradera’s cookbook as a platform to react against the social instability of the first years of the Second Republic, and how he uses a misrepresentation of Pradera to market an image of “modern” Spain that masks the tumult wrought by Spain’s modernization processes.

**Scholarship on cuisine and Spain**

Early-twentieth century critics dismissed these cookbooks as trivial, and even contemporary critics have not examined the cookbooks of Pardo Bazán, Burgos, and Marañón as part of these authors’ production. In contrast, my analysis of these cookbooks challenges previous understandings of the cookbook genre as trivial, anecdotal, and, thus, insignificant as objects of study. I read them as part of the *oeuvres* of Pardo Bazán, Burgos, and Marañón.

Recent scholarship on food and women “conclusively demonstrates that studying the relationship between women and food can help us to understand how women reproduce, resist, and rebel against gender constructions as they are practiced and contested in various sites, as well as illuminate the contexts in which these struggles are located” (Avakian and Haber 2). My critical evaluation of cookbooks as cultural artifacts is informed by the work of a group of North American feminist scholars working in the fields of history, anthropology, and literary studies, among them Susan Leonardi, Mary Drake McFeely, Sherrie Inness, Janet Theophano, Laura Shapiro, Barbara Haber, and Arlene Avakian. Beginning in the 1970s, with Haber’s development of the Schlesinger Library cookbook
collection at Harvard’s Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies, the members of this group have challenged conventional understandings of cookbooks as a genre that reinforces domesticity and the confinement of women to the private sphere. Their work has been pivotal in recognizing cookbooks as texts that provide insight into women’s modes of production and their history.

McFeely, for example, explores cooking both as a tool of repression, in that it designates women’s space as the kitchen instead of the public sphere, and as an activity that grants women control over a specific space and work when they “controlled little else” (1). She identifies cookbooks as “agents of society” that “[deliver] expectations of women that may conflict with or support women’s own goals” (3). Sherrie Inness, in her collection of articles *Cooking Lessons*, asserts that cooking and cookbooks are examples of practices and texts that “have offered women a way to gain power and influence in their households and larger communities” (xi). In her monograph *Secret Ingredients* (2006), she lists a series of questions that have guided the questions I have asked of Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks: “Which recipes are included or excluded? Who is supposed to cook or eat them? What ingredients are used and who is able to afford them?” (3).

Janet Theophano’s *Eat My Words: Reading Women’s Lives Through the Cookbooks they Wrote* (2002) presents cookbooks as a venue through which women can explore and express their ideas: “[W]omen of diverse backgrounds have found the homely cookbook a suitable place to record their stories and thoughts as well as their recipes” (3). She argues for analyzing cookbooks for their expressive potential, not just for their utilitarian or aesthetic ends:
The genre of cookery literature—and the terms of kitchen practice—have provided a vehicle for constructing, defending, and transgressing social and cultural borders [. . .]. Women of diverse experiences and backgrounds have chosen the genre as a suitable place to probe issues of social and cultural identity. (Theophano 227)

Nonetheless, despite the focus of mass media and global attention on the cuisine and gastronomy of Spain over the past ten years, cuisine in modern Spain remains a relatively underdeveloped field in literary and cultural studies criticism. Critical work on cuisine, cooking, and food systems in Spain has mostly taken the form of sociological or anthropological studies of discrete eating communities in Spain. For example, Isabel González Turmo’s monograph Comida de rico, comida de pobre: los hábitos alimenticios en el Occidente andaluz (Siglo XX) (1997) focuses on a small town in Andalucía. Her more recent work traces the eating patterns of Mediterranean communities (La antropología social de los pueblos del Mediterráneo, 2001) and alimentary customs in Morocco (Rojo y Verde: Alimentación y cocinas en Marruecos, 2007).

Several groups of scholars in Spain—the Grupo de Estudios Alimentarios (GEA) at the University of Barcelona; the Grupo de Investigación de Cultura Alimentaria associated with the University of Córdoba; and the group Sistemas Alimentarios e identidad cultural, associated with the University of Sevilla—represent, according to Mabel Gracia Arnaiz in her introduction to Somos lo que comemos: Estudios de alimentación y cultura en España (2002), the main groups working on the intersections between food and culture in Spain. These scholars, who are primarily anthropologists and historians, have identified a culinary patrimony in Spain as a topic for scholarly inquiry. For example, Gracia Arnaiz suggests that
As this quotation indicates, these scholars postulate an authentic Spanish cuisine, but they do not interrogate the constructedness of that authenticity. They take for granted a Spanish culinary patrimony and describe it, but they do not historicize or question that patrimony. While “historia de la restauración y las cocinas domésticas” is listed in Gracia Arnaiz’s collection of research topics being investigated by the mentioned research groups, the projects of these anthropologists and historians do not question the existence of a Spanish (or Catalan or Basque) cuisine, nor do they seek to unravel the ideological underpinnings of categories like “Spanish cuisine.”

Scholars have written descriptive texts about historical Spanish cookbooks and they have attempted to reconstruct publication data; two useful examples include Javier Mardones Alonso’s *Bibliografía de la gastronomía vasca* (1997) and the catalogue of gastronomical texts prepared by María del Carmen Simón Palmer in her *Bibliografía de la gastronomía española* in 1977. Luis Haranburu Altuna’s *Historia de la alimentación y de la cocina en el País Vasco* (2000) describes the cookbooks important to the idea of a Basque cuisine and the social and historical changes that made those cookbooks possible. Néstor Luján’s *Historia de la gastronomía* (1988) and Manuel Martínez Llopis’s *Historia de la gastronomía española* (1981) provide overviews of the most important culinary and gastronomical texts that have been
produced in Spain. Yet, neither of these books treats cuisine or gastronomy as an intellectually rigorous field of inquiry. Instead, they frame cooking and eating in nostalgic terms, offering anecdotes and memories in their writing about cuisine and gastronomy rather than approaching the food and what people eat as material that comprises part of Spain’s history.

What is it about cooking and gastronomy that resists critical study in Spain? Simón Palmer commented to me that history faculties in Spain’s universities have neglected to explore the history of everyday life, including food and eating. And Ortiz García offers a comment in “Comida e identidad” that hints at another explanation. She writes that nineteenth-century folklorists privileged oral texts to the exclusion of other types of practices when, in Catalonia specifically, “la comida, con los elementos profundos de identificación que conlleva, debería haber sido uno de los emblemas privilegiados de aquellas nacionalidades que ya, al menos desde el siglo pasado, habían constituido un sistema simbólico de su identidad como claramente ocurre en Cataluña” (315). That comment fuels my suspicion that hunger and scarcity have been such persistent realities in Spain throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that they have inhibited the type of study of cuisine carried out in neighboring countries.

That said, recent work by Robert Davidson and Javier Pérez Eschobotado, in Crítica de la razón gastronómica (2007), shows that cultural studies critics in Spain are including food, cooking, and eating as some of the everyday practices that have come under critical inquiry. For example, in his article “Terroir and Catalonia” (2007), Davidson explores Catalan nationalism’s ties to the land as part of a larger project that will engage the Renaixença and explore its ties to geography, the local market system in Barcelona, the wine boom in
Catalonia, and the “Ferran Adrià phenomenon” (40). Since I began my work on this project, both Hazel Gold and María Paz Moreno have examined Pardo Bazán’s *La cocina española antigua*. And, as I explain in Chapter Three, Lynn Scott, in her dissertation “Carmen de Burgos: Piecing a profession, rewriting women’s roles” (1999), examines one of Burgos’s cookbooks to illustrate the variety of writing Burgos did to establish a career for herself in Madrid.

While carrying out research for this project, I encountered a wide variety of primary materials by writers like Manuel Vázquez Montalbán, Néstor Luján, Álvaro Cunqueiro, María Mestayer de Echagüe (the Marquesa de Parabere), Manuel María Puga y Parga (Picadillo), Julio Camba, and Dionisio Pérez, not to mention the cooking materials produced during the early years of Francisco Franco’s dictatorship by members of the Sección Femenina. This diversity of materials signals the work yet to be undertaken in examining the texts about modern cuisine and gastronomy in Spain. Furthermore, the participation of established scholars of Peninsular Studies like Randolph Pope, Elena Delgado, and Lou Charnon-Deutsch in the 2008 University of Texas-San Antonio “Interdisciplinary Conference on Food Representation in the Humanities, Film and the Other Arts” indicates that this field is just beginning to be defined for Spain.13

---


Consequently, my work in this dissertation project is the first critical study of the cookbook genre in Spain, and it is among the first to examine cookbooks as crucial parts of the oeuvres of early twentieth-century intellectuals Emilia Pardo Bazán, Carmen de Burgos, and Gregorio Marañón. My work in this dissertation also participates in establishing the field of food cultural studies in Spain. Finally, the questions I seek to answer in this work about how cookbooks reflect a series of preoccupations with the nation at the same time that they reflect the more personal concerns of their authors about the processes of modernization are only the first steps. I have planned a series of projects about the relationship between cooking, gastronomy, and ideas of the nation in Spain. In the second part of this project, I will expand my analysis of Pardo Bazán’s, Burgos’s, Pradera’s, and Marañón’s cookbooks to include an analysis of the recipes contained in the books. I will also broaden the scope of the project to include chapters on Galician newspaper editor Manuel Puga y Parga’s (“Picadillo”) 1905 cookbook *La cocina práctica*, reissued more than sixteen times throughout the twentieth century, and chef-writer Dionisio Pérez’s nationalist *Guía del buen comer español* (1925). The second iteration of this project, treating the notion of cuisine and Spain in the early twentieth century, will enable me to establish the foundation for future interrogations of “Spanish cuisine” in the twenty-first century.
1. Doña Emilia’s Home Cooking

Scholars and students alike are always surprised to learn that Emilia Pardo Bazán wrote cookbooks. She published the first volume, *La cocina española antigua* in 1913, followed by *La cocina española moderna* in 1914. Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks generally merit brief mention in criticism on her work (for example Joyce Tolliver’s *Cigar Smoke and Violet Water* [1998]) or casual descriptions in the biographies written about her (for example, those by Carmen Bravo-Villasante, Pilar Faus Sevilla, and Nelly Clèmessy).¹ Many sources on Pardo Bazán’s work mention the series that these two books concluded (her *Biblioteca de la mujer*), but scholars have not evaluated the cookbooks as objects of study. Instead, researchers who do include them in their studies usually cite Pardo Bazán’s own dismissal of them as her capitulation to the fracaso of feminism in Spain—“Suponía yo que en España pudiera quizá interesar este problema [el feminismo], cuando menos, a una ilustrada minoría. No tardé en darme cuenta que no era así” (*La cocina española antigua* 3).²

That the first modern woman whose literary texts gained admission to Spain’s literary canon, Spain’s first female university professor, realist novelist, essayist, short story writer, journalist, feminist, and social commentator also wrote cookbooks surprises so many

---


² In addition to my work on these chapters, Hazel Gold recently presented a paper at the “Primer Congreso Internacional sobre la literatura de Emilia Pardo Bazán” about the cookbooks. Other scholars, for example Carmen Ortiz García, Joyce Tolliver, Maryellen Bieder, and journalist Carlos Fernández Santander mention them, or, in the case of Ortiz García cite from Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks. The cookbooks have been re-edited and re-released at least two times in the past decade, most recently in 2007, and accordingly have received attention from the mainstream press, if not yet from Hispanists.
because few expect that Spain’s most prominent (and precocious) feminist would publish in a genre aligned with the domestic values and ideals that she questioned in her essays and fiction writing. The surprise I encounter when I tell others about these books centers on the fact that Pardo Bazán was a female intellectual who earned her public sphere status by effacing, on many occasions, her own femininity so that her “masculine” writing would be taken seriously, as Joyce Tolliver details in *Cigar Smoke and Violet Water*. The ideology that leads scholars to overlook Pardo Bazán’s writing in a genre centered on female domestic production indicates that, despite the many feminist readings of her work, texts like cookbooks still fall outside of serious scholarly interest.³

The two cookbooks conclude Pardo Bazán’s *Biblioteca de la mujer*, established in 1892. The collection includes: *Vida de la Virgen María*, with a prologue by Pardo Bazán; *Novelas escogidas de Doña María de Zayas*; the biographies, *Reinar en Secreto: La Maintenon*,⁴ by Padre Mercier de la Compañía de Jesús, and *Historia de Isabel la Católica*;⁵ *La instrucción de la mujer cristiana*, *La revolución y la novela en Rusia*; and Pardo Bazán’s *Mi Romería*. The series also includes her translations of two critical treatises on feminism: John Stuart Mill’s *The Subjection of Women* (*La esclavitud femenina*) and Ferdinand August Bebel’s *La mujer ante el socialismo*.

³ Starting in the 1970s with feminist historian Barbara Haber’s development of the cookbook collection at the Schlessinger Library (Harvard University, Radcliffe Institute of Advanced Studies), the notion that cookbooks and cooking were valuable objects of study (not merely “a marker of patriarchal oppression”) began to encroach upon the academic mainstream. Since then, the interdisciplinary fields of Women’s Studies and Food Studies have grown, but Haber and Avakian note the continuing absence of feminist scholarship on cooking and cookbooks.

⁴ This is a translation of the text in French authored by P. Mercier (Clémessy 258).

⁵ Authored by Barón Nervo (Clémessy 258).
Bravo-Villasante and Clémessy link Pardo Bazán’s founding of the series in 1892 to a period of serious, or rabiosa according to Bravo-Villasante, engagement with feminism. For example, Bravo-Villasante cites the publication of articles in the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* about “lo que se piensa en Europa respecto a los problemas que entraña la educación y condición social, jurídica, política y económica de la mujer” (Pardo Bazán qtd. in Bravo-Villasante 182). Pardo Bazán’s 1889 essay “La mujer española” criticized the fact that for the most liberal modern man “el ideal femenino no está en el porvenir, ni aun en el presente, sino en el pasado” (87) and called for a change in the social role for women in accordance with changing and modernizing Spain. Improved education for females is one path to the improvement of the patria; Bravo-Villasante wrote, “Convencida de que las futuras salvadoras de la patria habrán de ser las mujeres españolas, hay que evitar que persista la educación que las destina a criadas o bayaderas” (Bravo-Villasante 184).

Pardo Bazán conceived of the Biblioteca to facilitate the education of women in Spain about feminism and the possibilities of new social roles. However, Clémessy notes that “no fué la empresa coronada por el éxito” (258). And Pardo Bazán, too, describes the failure of the series in her prologue to *La cocina española antigua* and in a letter to her friend Alejandro Berreiro in which she notes the disappointment of continuing the series with cookbooks—“en tan sencilla resolución traslúcex la influencia de un desengaño ideal” (Pardo Bazán qtd. in Bravo-Villasante 280).

---

6 Clémessy also identifies Pardo Bazán’s writing for the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* as the genesis for the library.
7 Bravo-Villasante identifies Berreiro as the director of the newspaper, *La voz de Galicia* (279).
Pardo Bazán’s idea that a society’s opinion about feminism can be interpreted based on book sales conflates an interest in feminism and women’s social role with the financial and cultural capital to purchase and read those books. Pardo Bazán’s own complicity in defining feminism as a discourse and movement for middle-class women is an issue I discuss in the next chapter. Clémessy notes that the decision to publish cookbooks was a final effort to attract a larger readership, necessary given that Pardo Bazán’s economic concerns motivated the series’ hiatus after the ninth volume, *La mujer ante el socialismo*. Clémessy also ascribes the failure of the series to the frivolity of Pardo Bazán’s readership: “eran estos unos temas en exceso severos para unas mentes puramente frívolas” (258). With a sense of irony, she continues,

> En todo caso, constituyen la prueba, para el lector de hoy en día, de que la gran feminista doña Emilia podía dar lecciones, en un arte al que su golosinería hacía apreciar especialmente, a muchas amas de casa a la antigua, precisamente a aquellas que hubiera querido conquistar con su moderna concepción del papel social de la mujer. (258)

Clémessy finds it incongruous that the feminist Pardo Bazán would instruct us as contemporary readers and the early twentieth century old-fashioned housewife in Spain about food and its preparation. Nevertheless, Pardo Bazán’s writing about food predates the publication of her two cookbooks. In fact, she is anecdotally known for her love of food and

---

8 Since Pardo Bazán wrote as much to earn a living as for her vocation, the reality of the book marketplace probably contributed as much to the failure of the series as frivolous women readers. Jean-Francois Botrel demonstrates that in 1900 71.4% of women were illiterate as compared to 43.5% in 1920 (*Libros* 309).
Faus Sevilla describes Pardo Bazán’s corpulent figure in later life and attributes it to her interest in food and gastronomy. Bravo-Villasante lists a series of twenty-one articles Pardo Bazán published relating to food, issues of cooking, and cuisine between 1905 and 1915 in the periodical La Ilustración Artística (328-336). Pardo Bazán also authored a Prologue to the 1905 edition of Galician newspaper editor and writer Manuel Puga y Parga’s (Picadillo) La cocina práctica, a cookbook that has been re-edited and released in over sixteen editions throughout the twentieth century. Pardo Bazán’s prolific writing on topics of cooking and cuisine contrasts with Clémessy’s incredulity regarding Pardo Bazán’s interest in cooking. It also raises the issue of why Pardo Bazán scholars take her description of the Biblioteca de la Mujer’s failure at face value without reading critically the texts that supposedly symbolize feminism’s defeat.

Joyce Tolliver offers one possible explanation in Cigar Smoke and Violet Water. She reveals that Pardo Bazán’s work was better received the more distant it seemed from a stereotypically gendered “female” type of writing. Both the readers of her work and its critics insisted and insist upon gendering her as a writer and gendering her writing. As a result, Tolliver writes, “Pardo Bazán’s writing gains value when it erases those characteristics coded as feminine by her reading public and by Pardo Bazán herself; and her writing loses value, becomes ‘cursi,’ (vulgar and affected) to use Pardo Bazán’s own word, when it allows its ‘feminine’ morphology to be seen” (36). Nevertheless, Pardo Bazán is not consistent in effacing that feminine morphology. At times, she writes “serious” or “masculine” discourses, and at others, she writes “insistently as a woman” (38). Consequently, as Tolliver shows, one can trace how Pardo Bazán’s “reproduction of dominant discourse, and thus of the ideology
inhering in it, coexists in the same text with narrative tactics that undermine that discourse and that ideology” (38).

Given the breadth of women’s accomplishments and activities that Pardo Bazán writes about in the Biblioteca, from biographies of powerful leaders and accomplished women (María de Zayas, Isabél la Católica) to political treatises on the social role of women in society (Mill and Bebel), re-framing the function of cookbooks in a series on feminism makes it possible to understand them as chronicles of another of women’s roles in Spanish society. Classifying these cookbooks as merely Pardo Bazán’s capitulation to frustration and secondary to her “serious” writing falls into the gendered trap of assuming that only her “masculine” writing should be taken seriously.

In this chapter I will show that Pardo Bazán did not consider her cookbooks as frivolous distractions from the serious business of writing novels and publishing essays on feminism. On the contrary, she saw them as important contributions to the project of writing the Spanish nation into being by collecting evidence of a rich and continuous national patrimony stretching back into medieval times. This effort had begun in the mid-nineteenth century with the philological work of Manuel Milà i Fontanals, and culminated in the early twentieth century with the work of intellectuals associated with the Centro de Estudios Históricos in the very years that Pardo Bazán published her cookbooks. An exploration of the parallels between Pardo Bazán’s prologue to La cocina española antigua and the work of intellectuals like Antonio Machado y Álvarez and Ramón Menéndez Pidal will clarify that Pardo Bazán saw recipes as every bit as important to the nation-building enterprise as folklore or a literary canon. The prologue to La cocina española moderna parallels efforts such as those of Galdós to create a new national novel by adapting foreign models.
But Pardo Bazán’s prologues are nation-building with a twist; since women and the recipes they created are as important to the foundation of the nation as the efforts of men.  

1.1 Cooking Up the Nation: Pardo Bazán’s Rhetorical Strategies

Pardo Bazán employs a number of rhetorical strategies to convince her readers that a “cocina española” exists, that libros de cocina are a precious part of the Spanish national patrimony, and that women, as the readers/authors of cookbooks and their recipe contents, have a role in creating the nation. First, Pardo Bazán names the recipes “Spanish” and sorts them according to their main ingredients or meal order, rather than their geographical provenance. Secondly, she describes cuisine as both a relic and an ethnographic document, thus linking items from the past to the notion of fossilized and extinct “popular” practices. Third, she draws a parallel between cuisine and Spain’s national literary identity. Finally, she locates in Spanish national cuisine a way to preserve/maintain influence with Latin American readers.

Naming the project “Spanish cuisine”

The titles of the two volumes give the first hint of the work Pardo Bazán proposes to do with the cookbooks. These titles, La cocina española antigua (1913, CEA) and La cocina española moderna (1914, CEM) present “cocina española,” as an already existing culinary field. La cocina española antigua emphasizes the antiquity of Spanish cuisine. La cocina española moderna

---

9 Anthropologist Carmen Ortiz García and historian Manuel Martínez Llopis note that Spanish cuisine lacks the historical tradition of influential print-text cookbooks and culinary works like those that developed in France during the nineteenth century and influenced the “clases pudientes españolas” (Martínez Llopis 1982: 106 qtd. in Ortiz García). Consequently, the relationship of cookbooks to Spanish nation building has been unrecognized in Spain, despite these scholars’ acknowledgement of Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks, among other texts, that name such a thing as “cocina española.”

36
indicates a separate modern Spanish cuisine. Historian Manuel Martínez Llopis, in his 1993 “Prólogo” to Teodoro Bardají’s *Índice culinario* (1915), describes the absence of comprehensive cookbooks collecting Spanish recipes and articulations of a Spanish cuisine during the nineteenth century, precisely the time when in France “se editaban en los últimos años del siglo XIX y los primeros del XX trascendentales tratados de cocina” (13). Until the 1876 publication of Mariano Pardo de Figueroa’s (pseudonym, “Thebussem”) article “Jigote de lengua,” nineteenth-century cookbooks published in Spain were either “mediocre recetarios” or reflected the influence of French culinary advances (13). Pardo de Figueroa was the first person to insist upon identifying and promoting a “cocina tradicional española,” which, according to Martínez Llopis was “casi perdida para la burguesía a causa del ridículo afrancesamiento que habían sufrido las costumbres españoles” (14). The epistolary series between Pardo de Figueroa and “un cocinero de S.M.,” the pseudonym for José Castro y Serrano, brought more attention to Spanish cooking and cuisine. For example, writer Ángel Muro went on to publish beginning in 1890 *Conferencias gastronómicas*, inspired by Alexandre Dumas, the *Diccionario General de Cocina*, and *El Practicón* (1869). *El Practicón* became the most popular cookbook in middle-class homes during the last years of the nineteenth century; it was released in 34 successive editions until 1928. Only in 1905 with the publication of Manuel Puga y Parga’s *La cocina práctica* (accompanied by a prologue from Pardo Bazán) did cookbooks of exclusively “Spanish” recipes enter the marketplace.

---

10 Bardají was a professional chef who published cookbooks and newspaper articles during the early twentieth century. I discuss his work in more detail in Chapter Four.
Pardo Bazán’s 1913 and 1914 cookbooks, as a result, are the first books that propose to catalogue a “cocina española,” in its old and modern forms. Pardo Bazán assures her readers that such a thing as a “cocina española” exists, compared to local cuisines or cuisines specific to Spain’s regions and diverse climates. Her books collect Spanish “antiguas fórmulas” in addition to “modernizing” old recipes or nationalizing foreign ones, and consequently, represent Pardo Bazán’s idea of Spanish cuisine as a cohesive, complete, and long-standing culinary system.

Throughout the prologues to these cookbooks and in descriptions of the recipes, Pardo Bazán identifies these recipes as Spanish national cuisine: for example, she repeats phrases like “nuestra cocina nacional” (CEA 4), “nuestra cocina regional y nacional” (5), and “los guisos nacionales” (CEM VI). She indicates to her reader the work she has undertaken in collecting the recipes from the regions of Spain in addition to her “propia país”—Galicia. She writes, “Excuso advertir que no presumo de haber recogido ni siquiera gran parte de los platos tradicionales en las regiones. Sería bien preciso el libro que agotase la materia, pero requeriría viajes y suma perseverancia” (CEA 4-5). This quotation references the wealth of the “cocina nacional” and its breadth as it includes traditional recipes from the regions of Spain. Pardo Bazán also alludes to the work required to document these recipes. She indicates that since the Spanish nation is so large, it would require travel and perseverance to document its entirety. She further inflates the prestige and influence of Spanish national cuisine by suggesting a balanced rivalry with French cuisine—“Si hay que dar sentencia en el eterno pleito entre la cocina española y la francesa [. . .]” (CEA 5). However, French cuisine
as a discourse was far more developed during the nineteenth century as a cultural product exported around the world.\textsuperscript{11}

Pardo Bazán organizes the cookbooks by type of food and/or course order, rather than regional geography, which diminishes the regional diversity of ingredients and preparations from the distinct microclimates of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{12} This division also separates regional recipes from one another in order to create an artificially standardized “Spanish” cuisine. Notably, before most sections, Pardo Bazán introduces the type of recipes and describes how she identifies the food/recipes group with her idea of a Spanish national cuisine. For example, in the introduction to the first section (caldos, cocidos, potes, potajes, sopas, migas, gachas) she states, “La olla tenía carácter burgués, con relación al pote o caldero, más popular, superviviente en chozos laboriegos y majadas pastoriles. La división en caldo y cocido del contenido de la olla, es todavía base de la alimentación en España” (CEA 10). By grouping these dishes together and specifying their central role in Spanish nutrition, Pardo Bazán helps her readers understand that these traditional recipes for stews and soups, familiar to her readers, unite them as Spanish citizens across geographic (and class) differences.

Pardo Bazán sees cuisine as an element of national culture that differentiates Spain from other nations. She writes,

\textsuperscript{11} See Parkhurst Ferguson, \textit{Accounting for taste: the triumph of French cuisine} (2006).

\textsuperscript{12} She divides the recipes into the following sections: the “Seccion primera: caldos, cocidos, potes, potajes, sopas, migas, gachas”; “Seccion segunda: los platos de huevos”; “Seccion tercera: fritos, frituras o fritadas, y fritangas”; “Seccion cuarta: peces, crustaceos, moluscos”; “Seccion quinta: aves de corral y palomar [+] caza de pluma”; “Seccion sexta: las carnes”; “Seccion sétima: los vegetales”; “Seccion octava: los accesorios, masas, rellenos, salsas, ensaladas, aderezos, escabeches”; “Seccion novena: los postres”; and a final index.
Cada nación tiene el deber de conservar lo que la diferencia, lo que forma parte de su modo de ser particular. Bien está que sepamos guisar a la francesa, a la italiana, y hasta a la rusa y a la china, pero la base de nuestra mesa, por ley natural, tiene que reincidir en lo español. Espero que, en el tomo de la *Cocina moderna*, se encuentre alguna demostración de cómo los guisos franceses pueden adaptarse a nuestra índole. *(CEA 6)*

She sees it as imperative that Spain cultivate, promote, and celebrate its difference from other countries. Natural law—“ley natural”—dictates that cooking and eating in Spain must be Spanish. Her use of the word *reincidir* indicates her belief that Spaniards have strayed from this natural law by adopting cuisine from other countries *(6)*. But, her cookbooks will show a historical Spanish cuisine coherent with natural law and how to convert “guisos franceses” to Spanish food. Participating in conserving Spain’s difference against the threat of further foreign cultural invasion is a duty that Pardo Bazán exhorts her readers to assume *(6)*.

In *La cocina española moderna*, Pardo Bazán reinforces the importance of eating Spanish national cuisine and nationalizing foreign recipes. She writes,

> Decía yo, en el prólogo de aquel libro, que la base de nuestra mesa tiene siempre que ser nacional. La mayoría de los platos extranjeros pueden hacerse a nuestro modo: no diré que metidos en la faena de adaptarlos no hayamos estropeado alguno en cambio, á otros (y citaré por ejemplo las croquetas), los hemos mejorado en tercio y quinto. *(I)*

---

13 The *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* defines *reincidir* as “Volver a caer o incurrir en un error, falta o delito.”
Pardo Bazán emphasizes the idea that there exists a Spanish “nuestro modo” of cooking that will convert and improve on the French recipe for *croquetas*, among others, even if some recipes are not successfully adapted. She further stipulates that in *La cocina española moderna*:

[La cocina cuyas recetas se encontrarán aquí, es española, aún en sus elementos, modificada con aquella que de la extranjera parece imponerse irresistiblemente á nuestras costumbres, y siempre con tendencia á conservar lo bueno de otros días, aceptando lo que, difundido en nuestro suelo, no pudiera ya rechazarse sin caer en la extravagancia. (IV)]

Pardo Bazán’s consistent repetition of the terms *nacional* and “cocina española” seems to betray an insecurity about the public acceptance of such dishes as “cocina española nacional.” By acknowledging the diffusion of foreign recipes and the impossibility of ignoring them completely in favor of uniquely Spanish cooking, Pardo Bazán entreats her readers to join her in promoting Spanish culinary nationalism. Even so, the syntax of this quotation indicates Pardo Bazán’s preference for a version of Spanish cuisine, and Spain, isolated from and untainted by foreign influence.

Pardo Bazán’s extends her desire for culinary purity/authenticity to the language of Spain’s national cuisine. She writes,

Me limito a afirmar que el lenguaje de un libro de cocina español debe ser castellano castizo. Va cundiendo una especie de algarabía o jerigonza insufrible, de la cual son muestras las minutas de fondas y banquetes.
Librenos Dios de tal lengua franca, semejante a la que se usaba en Liorna.

También hay que defender el idioma nacional. (CEA 7)\textsuperscript{14}

National cooking is best expressed with the national language, though Pardo Bazán indicates that she restrains herself from further, harsher criticism of those who understand cuisine as a domain inevitably influenced by France and the French language. Furthermore, she makes known that the language of the Spanish nation is grammatically correct “castellano castizo,” which affirms her idea of a castiza Spain. Regarding modern Spanish cuisine, Pardo Bazán writes,

Por la misma razón, repugnándome mucho las palabras extranjeras cuando tenemos otras castizas con que reemplazarlas, al no encontrar modo de expresar en castellano lo que todo el mundo dice en francés ó en inglés, he debido resignarme á emplear algunos vocablos de cocina ya corrientes, como gratin y béchamela, poco genuinos, pero que no he hallado manera de sustituir. (CEM IV)

She resigns herself to accepting French culinary terms in the written and spoken language of Spanish cuisine, but not without protest. That the ingredients for the French and Spanish versions are identical, as are the practical instructions for the recipes’ preparation, is secondary to the recipes’ expression in Spanish. Pardo Bazán focuses exclusively on the philology of cooking rather than the materiality of cooking.

\textsuperscript{14}This sentence follows a statement that criticizes the grammar and language of Ángel Muro: “[. . . ] y tampoco se debe copiar una receta sin fijarse en si contiene algo reprobado por el sentido común o por la gramática, caso asaz frecuente. Repito que no pretendo quitar méritos a nadie, ni me precio de Ángel Muro, y por eso omito ejercer severa crítica” (CEA 6-7).
Pardo Bazán’s second rhetorical strategy is to define cooking as both an relic representative of the Spanish nation’s past and an ethnographic document revealing the Spanish nation’s essential being—“la cocina, además, es en mi entender, uno de los documentos etnográficos importantes” (CEA 4). In addition to linking the intellectual field of anthropology/ethnography to cuisine, her identification of cuisine as a document highlights her view of cuisine as a written text-based domain.

As an example, she cites Romantic poet José de Espronceda’s poem, “El canto del Cosaco,” as an example of how food reveals essential truths about a people—“Espronceda caracterizó al Cosaco del desierto por la sangrienta ración de carne cruda que hervía bajo la silla de su caballo [. . .]” (CEA 4). This quotation makes clear that Pardo Bazán equates the brutality of the Cossack’s “sangrienta ración de carne cruda” to the brutality of the Cossack when compared to the luxuries and riches of Europe’s cities/civilization that Espronceda describes in the poem. This image is an example of her idea that cooking and cuisine reveal things about a people not observable or quantifiable through scientific research (reason?): “Yo diré que la alimentación revela lo que acaso no descubren otras indagaciones de carácter oficialmente científico” (4). Further examples include the Spartans and the Romans: “los espartanos concentraron su estoicismo y su energía en el burete o bodrio” (4); and “la decadencia romana se señalo por la glotonería de los monstruosos banquetes” (4). Pardo Bazán’s use of Romans, Spartans, and Cossacks as examples of peoples whose cooking and
food expresses things about them places the Spanish nation she attempts to define on equal footing with civilizations from antiquity and the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{15}

Specifying that “cada época de la Historia modifica el fogón, y cada pueblo come según su alma, antes tal vez que según su estómago,” Pardo Bazán implies that examining cooking and cuisine provides a direct link to the culture and moment of different periods of History—that studying cooking is a way to understand and preserve the past—and that cooking and cuisine uniquely provides a vision into the soul of the pueblo, the “authenticity” of a people (\textit{CEA} 4).\textsuperscript{16} The synchronicity she implies between different historical periods and the existence of distinct pueblos indicates her purpose to convince her readers of the existence of Spanish cuisine throughout history, like the culinary examples of the Romans, Spartans, and Cossacks. She also implies, by acknowledging the effect that the passing of time has on the way people eat (for survival and nutrition), that a pueblo’s culinary choices are tied to an essential identity and way of life—“cada pueblo come según su alma” (4)—more than to literal hunger. As a result, Pardo Bazán’s mythical pueblo does not suffer from hunger,

\textsuperscript{15} The civilization that Pardo Bazán masks, however, is the Muslim domination of Spain. In her writing about how Spanish food and cuisine require a complete and developed vocabulary in Castilian Spanish, she overlooks or neglects to mention the Arabic etymology of words and products like rice, for example.

\textsuperscript{16} Derek Flitter, in \textit{Spanish Romanticism and the Uses of History} (2006), examines the nineteenth-century transformation in the meaning of the term pueblo from “its customary status as the imaginative subject to... the political subject” (130). Flitter, writing about Romantic historiography from the 1840s, explains that the imaginative subject pueblo serves as the “guarantor of Volksgeist and the embodiment of casticismo” while the political subject pueblo “becomes the focus for ideological radicalism” (130). During the nineteenth century and later the pueblo’s demand for political rights interrupts the “essentially nostalgic conservative Romantic” pueblo. Pardo Bazán’s use of the term pueblo in the prologue to \textit{La cocina española antigua} is that of the imaginative subject, though her writing about and disdain for working class riots in a column published contemporarily to the cookbooks indicates an awareness of the second type of pueblo.
famine, or poverty. This pueblo exists only as the idealized construct of Spain’s national cuisine.

Pardo Bazán invokes Spanish national cuisine as an archeological artifact when she writes, “Hay platos de nuestra cocina nacional que no son menos curiosos ni menos históricos que una medalla, un arma o un sepulcro” (CEA 4). She equates symbolic dishes—the feminine domain of cooking—to the masculine relics of History (wars, politics, and monarchs). Furthermore, her comparison of cooking and cuisine to medals, arms and sepulchers is an example of Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s “invented tradition” in the form of public monuments. Like cooking and the recipes that present instructions for the preparation of an emblematic recipe, monuments or medals physically link the present with a past, the “national” significance of which is invented.

Pardo Bazán furthers this link between cuisine as artifact and ethnographic document when she writes,

En la cocina española quedan todavía actualmente rastros de las vicisitudes de nuestra historia, desde siglos hace. En Granada tuve ocasión de ver unos dulces notabilísimos. Eran no recuerdo si de almendra o bizcocho, pero ostentaban en la superficie dibujos de azúcar que reproducían los alicantados de los frisos de la Alhambra; y no por artificio de confitero moderno, sino con todo el inconfundible carácter de lo tradicional. Del mismo modo, perduran formas de panes y quesos, que, al través de las edades, conservan la hechura votiva de los que se ofrecían a las deidades libidinosas de Fenicia o Cartago. (CEA 6)
Again in this example, Pardo Bazán emphasizes how she sees cuisine as a text within which (and in this case, upon which) Spain’s history is written. Her notion of “lo tradicional” encompasses baking that reproduces the “frisos de la Alhambra,” linking the dish to the emblematic building and readers’ association of it with Spain’s assertion of its reconquest in the fifteenth century. She also responds to the possibility that readers might understand such a dish as a *cursi* representation of the emblematic palace, and, as a result, clarifies that such a representation is not the fanciful creation of a modern baker. Even so, her notion of “traditional” reflected in this quotation succeeds in co-opting the representative images of Muslim rule in Spain. Furthermore, this small acknowledgement of Muslim rule in Spain is one of the few examples Pardo Bazán acknowledges of the architectural, artistic, and culinary traces of Islamic culture.  

**Spanish Cuisine and Spanish Literature**

Pardo Bazán defines Spanish national cuisine as an artifact or a textual document (relic, ethnographic document) rather than merely a practice. She also focuses readers’ attention on the vocabulary and language she sees as an integral part of the identity of cuisine. Part of the strategy she employs in showing the value of Spanish national cooking as

---

17 In the third part of his *Reivindicación del conde don Julián* (1970), Juan Goytisolo parodies the spiritual and symbolic investment in the Spanish language as “reflejo de nuestro espíritu” (226) by naming the words that must be purged from the Spanish lexicon in order to purify it. The purification extends to food. He writes, “[. . . ] y lo principal que hago es asistir a sus comidas y cenas, y dejarle comer de lo que me parece castizo y quitarle cuanto etimológicamente es extraño: y así mando quitarle estos entremeses proque contienen arroz y aceitunas, y aquellos guisos por ver en ellos alubias, berenjenas y zanahorias/ desa manera, aquel plato de perdices que están allí dispuestas” (230-231). Goytisolo makes clear in this extended passage the absurdity of linguistic purity when applied to emblematic dishes of Spanish cuisine. Pardo Bazán’s solution to this, as I outline further along in the chapter, is to nationalize foreign words and even dishes, when it comes to France. However, reading together Pardo Bazán’s description of the “alicantados frisos” of the Alhambra and Goytisolo’s passage reveals that the traces of Muslim Spain do not require nationalization; architecture, food, and language are already co-opted into the Spanish national project.
a print-text comes from her comparison of cuisine to emblematic Spanish literary texts. Pardo Bazán writes,

Olla podrida—Si hay un plato español por excelencia, parece que debe ser éste, del cual encontramos en el Quijote tan honrosa mención, y, sin embargo, se me figura que ya no se sirve en ninguna parte, y que, como las gigantescas especies fósiles de los períodos antediluvianos, se ha extinguido [. . .] Bien espumado el puchero y añadidos los garbanzos, se echará tocino fresco y añejo, gallina, jamón, chorizo, manos de ternera, orejas de cerdo, una pelota hecha con picadillo, y más tarde patatas, arroz, judías, habas y guisantes frescos. Todo ello ha de cocer cinco horas, y después se sirve... en las bodas de Camacho. (CEA 12)

Pardo Bazán gives the recipe for the famous dish found in Don Quijote and enjoyed in the “bodas de Camacho.” On the one hand, she notes the extinction of this dish and its status as a fossil of past eating and cooking styles. Marking it as one of “gigantescas especies fósiles de los periodos antediluvianos” (12), she hyperbolically indicates its age and the age of Spanish cuisine, while linking it to the founding flood myth of Christianity. On the other hand, her use of the words fósiles and extinction define recipes like this one as objects of study. One studies fossils to ascertain the origins and evolutions of species; Pardo Bazán wants readers to link these recipes with the origins of Spain’s cuisine and nation. Additionally, intertwining her description of the recipe for olla podrida with references to episodes of Don Quijote establishes the book and the cited recipes as the fossilized proof of Spain’s origins. They exist as a genealogical foundation to which modern literary and culinary production can be traced.
Pardo Bazán invokes *Don Quijote* again in a comparison between French cuisine and Spanish cuisine. She acknowledges the “cocina francesa” and dilutes its prestige and provenance by describing it as “cocina europea”: “Si hay que dar sentencia en el eterno pleito entre la cocina española y la francesa, o, por mejor decir, la europea [. . .]” (*CEA* 5). In contrast to the elaborate preparations of French cuisine, Spanish cuisine is good “siempre y cuando reúne las tres excelencias de la del Caballero del Verde Gabán: limpia, abundante y sabrosa” (5). This allusion to *Don Quijote* symbolizes an alternative to the elaborate classical cuisine of France, while it also echoes the late nineteenth-century literary debates in Spain related to the influence of French novels on Spain’s domestic literary production. Indeed, following her mention of El Caballero del Verde Gabán, Pardo Bazán extols the exceptionality of Spanish cuisine as if in defense of anticipated criticisms of its poverty when compared with that of France.¹⁸ For example, she itemizes the wealth of Spain’s alimentary resources:

En cuanto a las primeras materias, no ignoramos que son excelentes, si bien las carnes de matadero, en otras naciones, se ceban mejor. En cambio, nos podemos ufñar de nuestros pescados de mar y río, de nuestras frutas, de bastantes aves de corral y caza de pluma, de nuestros jamones gallegos y andaluces, y las hortalizas empiezan ya a cultivarse como es debido, [. . .] La cocina española puede alabarse de sus sabores fuertes y claros; sin

---

¹⁸ Her defensive position is understandable since most nineteenth-century descriptions of food and cuisine in Spain are negative. Alexander Dumas, Richard Ford, Phillip Thicknesse, and others highlight that the only good eating places in Spain are those that serve meals “a la francesa” (Forrest).
ambigüedad de salsas y de aderezos; de su pintoresca variedad según las regiones; de su perfecta adaptación al clima y a las necesidades del hombre, a su trabajo y a su higiene alimenticia [...] (CE A 6)

Pardo Bazán’s extended exaltation of the ingredients that make possible its rich “cocina española” fulfills an identical function to that attributed to Don Quijote. The former serves as an example of Spain’s alimentary “primeras materias” while the latter gives evidence of Spain’s sixteenth-century “primeras materias” in the form of an indigenous literary tradition that “proved” that Spain could produce contemporary realist novels in the nineteenth century that reflected Spanish national society (Labanyi 13).

**Spanish national cuisine and Latin America**

In addition to generating a list of the nutritional resources that serve as the bedrock of Spanish cuisine, Pardo Bazán frames Spanish cuisine as a discourse that extends beyond the borders of Spain to its former colonies in Latin America. In *La cocina española antigua* she writes, “Me apresuro a añadir que agradeceré de veras las [recetas] que me envíen, para incluirlas en las sucesivas ediciones. Las solicito de toda España y de América” (5). Her request for recipes for Spanish cuisine from her readers includes Latin America with no acknowledgement of that continent’s difference, in terms of geography, foods consumed, or practices. That she precedes this request with her explanation of the difficulty she encountered in obtaining recipes from her own region—“En mi propio país hay recetas que no he logrado obtener” (5)—, indicates that Pardo Bazán understands her readers in Latin America as distant participants in Spain’s culinary identity. In the same prologue, Pardo Bazán continues,
Que la cocina española propiamente dicha tiene su sello, lo demuestra, entre otras cosas, su extensión y evolución en América. En Cuba, en Méjico y en Chile, abundan los platos hoy nacionales, que revelan a las claras lo hispánico de su origen y la aplicación de los elementos ibéricos al nuevo ambiente. (6)

She stresses to readers that Spain’s cuisine is distinctive, old, and influential; it traveled from Spain across the Atlantic to Latin America. She does allow for the possibility that cuisine from Spain evolved somewhat, but, “a las claras,” Latin American cooking preserves its Iberian roots. Despite Spain’s definitive loss of political power in its former colonies, Pardo Bazán makes a case for Spain’s continuing cultural influence, and she presents her cookbooks as written texts that give evidence of it.

Pardo Bazán, thus, works hard to convince her readers of the existence of a Spanish cuisine: she catalogues cooking in recipe form and names it “Spanish”; equates cooking to ethnographic documents and relics, which places Spain on equal footing with ancient and past civilizations; ties allusions to Spain’s literary “materias primas” in the form of *Don Quijote* to Spain’s culinary ones; and defines Spain’s culinary community as one that even still encompasses Latin America as territory fertile for cultivating Spain’s cuisine. Pardo Bazán catalogs this information, Spain’s national patrimony, into *libros de cocina* for her readers’ continued use, due to the risk of its disappearance.

1.2 Thinking and Writing the Nation: Cuisine’s Parallels to “National” Discourses

Néstor García Canclini, in *Hybrid Cultures*, quotes Roger Bartra: “‘National myths are not a *reflection* of the conditions in which the masses live,’ but rather the product of operations of selection and ‘transposition’ of deeds and characteristics chosen according to
the projects of political legitimation” (Bartra 225-242 in García Canclini 132). Pardo Bazán’s use of rhetorical strategies in presenting her books as the archives and catalogues of Spanish national cuisine demonstrate her construction of Spanish cuisine as a national myth. Pardo Bazán’s placement of Spanish cooking into books represents one of the “operations of selection and transposition” Bartra identifies. Cooking, at its most basic, is a performed act, which Luce Giard calls “doing-cooking” (149, 153). The written instructions, the recipes that represent it only incompletely capture the cooking knowledge born of the ritual, repetition of movements, and motion “rooted in the fabric of relationships to others and one’s self [. . .]” (Giard 157).

García Canclini, deconstructing the idea of “national patrimony,” points out that patrimony is constituted by “the occupation of a territory and the formation of collections” (132). In order to give material proof of Spain’s national cuisine, Pardo Bazán organizes the recipes (which already indicate cooking’s translation from action into language) that constitute Spanish cuisine into the collection form of the book. Additionally, she invokes the political territory of Spain—its present and past forms—and ascribes to it a collection of recipes that reflects the History, ethnography, literature, and “alma” of Spain. As a result, Pardo Bazán shows that cooking exists as a crucial part of nation-building that must be taken into account.

19 The translators of Michel de Certeau, Luce Giard, and Pierre Mayol’s The Practice of Everyday Life, Volume 2: Living and Cooking note that “doing-cooking” is an “awkward translation” of Giard’s term in French “faire-la-cuisine” (275).
The rhetorical strategies I outlined in the previous section converse with or participate in the philological and anthropological traditions being developed since the mid-nineteenth century. At the time of Pardo Bazán’s publication of these cookbooks, these traditions were being institutionalized as mechanisms of modernization to produce a citizenry that would owe allegiance to a united Spain, despite the many tensions (political, social, regional) that fragmented the country.

How to “write a nation”: how to write a national cuisine

Jo Labanyi, in Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel (2000), identifies the establishment of a unified legal code throughout Spain, the formation of a common economic market and currency, and the construction of a literary canon as instruments of Spanish nation-state formation. Symptoms of Spain’s modernization include the establishment of a single market and currency and the development and (slow) expansion of a railroad network linking parts of the State, in addition to the above-mentioned legal codes and their recognition throughout Spain as of 1889. Labanyi designates the period following the 1868 Revolution and the 1875 Restoration as a decisive moment, since laws were written that “standardized all areas of national life,” and the “national novel” flourished. She traces how writing laws, novels, and national histories are examples of attempts to “write the [Spanish] nation into existence” (Labanyi 3).  

This nationalizing impulse extends to painting; “Historical painting was promoted through the Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes,” and historical painting as a genre consistently won top prizes awarded by the Ministerio de

20 She mentions that politicians Castelar and Cánovas del Castillo, the Republican President and the Conservative Prime Minister, were historical novelists and historians.
Fomento (3). By saying the Spanish nation existed and writing it into existence, Labanyi shows how intellectuals, politicians, and artists worked at constructing a Spanish national identity and defining the Spanish nation. She also details how written texts become spaces for debate and negotiation about the complexity of social, political, and economic modernization in Spain rather than merely prescribing certain behaviors for model Spanish citizens.\(^{21}\)

Anthropologist Arjun Appadurai, in his 1988 article, “How to Make a National Cuisine: Cookbooks in Contemporary India,” shows how writing national cookbooks in India foments constructions of national Indian cuisine. In India writing cookbooks of Indian national cuisine belongs to a postindustrial, postcolonial context, motivated by the development of the middle classes and print media growth (5). Despite highly diverse regional ethnic culinary traditions, these Indian national cookbooks participate in “fairly explicit nationalist and integrationist ideology” and manage to incorporate regional cuisines without having those regional cuisines dilute the prestige/power/dominance of the national cuisines (20).\(^{22}\)

Authors of Indian national cookbooks employ a set of what Appadurai calls “standard devices” that work to delineate a national cuisine (19). The first Appadurai mentions is when cookbooks writers “inflate and reify and historically special tradition and make it serve, metonymically, for the whole” (18-19). Appadurai’s describes as an example the writer who “flatly asserts that hers is a book of Indian recipes when in fact it is much

---

\(^{21}\) Labanyi notes that the laws, literature, and history that succeeded in writing the nation into existence formed the representation of a modern Spain that largely existed on paper rather than in measures of modern infrastructure or economic development (26).

\(^{22}\) Appadurai notes that many of these texts are written in English and target Anglophone readers.
more local in its scope” (19), or the widespread conflation of Mughlai food with Indian food. A second strategy involves assembling “a set of recipes in a more or less subjective manner and then, in the introduction to the book, [the author] gropes for some theme that might unify them” (19). Appadurai notes that spices and spice combinations typically serve this function, in addition to processes like roasting or frying. A third strategy consists of focusing on a particular type of food, for example pickles, and providing a set of recipes from many regions of India.

Pardo Bazán's cookbooks provide examples of these three strategies, all of them captured in how she names her project and the recipes in it. As an example of the first strategy, Pardo Bazán’s reifies a castiza definition of Spain in her prologue when she insists that the “el lenguaje de un libro de cocina español debe ser castellano castizo” (CEA 7). Referring no doubt to France and possibly, too, to regional dialects or other languages in Spain, her frustration with the “especie de algarabía o jerigonza insufrible” subjugates regional variations and culinary imports of language and food to a castiza Spanish center (7). She may include recipes from a variety of different countries—for example, the “Cazuela chilena” (12), “callos a la chilena” (94), “Sopa mexicana” (17), or the “Costrada de Cuaresma a la cubana”—or Spain’s regions—“Fabada asturiana” (14), “Escudella catalana” (14), or the “Sobreasada de Mallorca” (116), among many examples. 23 But, the difference represented by these recipes—in ingredients indigenous to the regions, cooking practices, or

---

23 According to Carmen Ortiz García, in her essay “Comida e identidad: cocina nacional y cocinas regionales en España,” the “fabada asturiana” is a nineteenth century creation. Other dishes considered ‘traditional’ in Spain were nineteenth and twentieth century novelties, i.e. “tortilla de patatas,” “samfaina catalana,” and “chuletillas de cordero” (Paraphrasing Marañón, Ortiz García 318).
climate—are subsumed within a Castille-centric definition of Spanish-ness.\textsuperscript{24} The multiple representations of the ‘local’ alluded to in the individual recipes are not inconsistent with Pardo Bazán’s working definition of Spanish cooking and eating. Castile equals Spain and all recipes, despite their regional and country variation, fit under the umbrella of a \textit{castiza} cuisine.

Regarding the second strategy Appadurai identifies, in her prologues to the cookbooks Pardo Bazán does not seek a unifying theme as much as she asserts that cuisine is a nation-building discourse equal to ethnography/anthropology, history, and literature. That said, the work she does in the prologues to her books gives legitimacy and meaning to her subjective collection and presentation of the recipes in the books.

Pardo Bazán’s organization of the recipes in her cookbook gives an example of Appadurai’s third strategy, focusing a cookbook (or a section of one, in Pardo Bazán’s case) on a specific type of dish and including a variety of recipes. Looking at the first section of \textit{La cocina española antigua}, “Caldos, Cocidos, Potes, Potajes, Sopas, Migas, Gachas,” Pardo Bazán states that this section of her cookbook represents the “evolución del primitivo y gran plato nacional: la olla castiza” (10). She defines the \textit{olla castiza} as the origin from which all the recipes she will present derive. The type of food—evolutions from the \textit{olla}—are listed

\textsuperscript{24} Ortiz García also notes that geography and the natural resources belonging to a specific geography, cultivation practices, and “genio, carácter o la raza” are the attributes generally cited when discursively identifying a national cuisine (306). She adds further that in the case of Spain the norm when discussing Spain’s national cuisine is to acknowledge Spain’s regional diversity, which Pardo Bazán indicates by her choice of recipes to include and their names. That said, the necessary factor that converts el gazpacho andaluz, la crema catalana, el pisto manchego, and la paella valenciana into Spanish national cuisine is a necessary “intermediación que legitime, prestigie y patrimonialice desde los productos a las recetas, hasta conseguir que sean asumidos por amplios sectores de la población” (309).
according to their variation: by country, for example “cocido veracruzano” (11), “Cazuela chilena” (12), “Sopa Mexicana” (17), etc.; by region, for example “Pote gallego” (12), “Caldo gallego” (13), “Gazpacho extremeño” (19), etc; and even by social class. She notes, “La olla tenía carácter burgués, con relación al pote o caldero, más popular, superviviente en chozos labriegos y majadas pastoriles” (10).

Appadurai’s article about how cookbooks work to construct a national cuisine demonstrates how the genre of a cookbook and its organization functions as a nation-building discourse. That Pardo Bazán names and writes a cookbook that identifies a Spanish national cuisine is one way those cookbooks join other nation-building discourses identified by Labanyi.

**National relics, ethnography and folklore**

Understanding Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks as a way to define modern Spain by looking at culinary examples from the past is not contradictory; instead, this perspective places Pardo Bazán among an entire generation of liberal and conservative intellectuals who look to the past in order to convince themselves of their modernity. Historian José Álvarez Junco describes this backward-looking tendency as a common characteristic of the ideological crisis born in the latter part of the nineteenth century that culminates in the 1898 loss of the last New World colonies in Central and South America. Intellectuals like Pardo Bazán and Unamuno, among others, mourn the implosion of the Spanish empire at a time when nation-states in the rest of Europe were dividing the world and interpreting the successes of those divisions in terms of racial and national superiority (Álvarez Junco 75).
Catherine Brown, in her 1995 article “The Relics of Menéndez Pidal: Mourning and Melancholia in Hispanomedieval Studies,” describes Ramón Menéndez Pidal’s work—one of Spain’s most influential inventors of traditions—as a discursive/textual weaving. She examines Menéndez Pidal’s excavation of fragmented pieces of Spain’s epic poetry, his “exhumation of Castilian heroic poetry’s fragmented remains” in order to re-incorporate them “into new and newly-signifying bodies: [. . .] the restored corpus of the ‘Spanish Epic’” (18). Her description of Menéndez Pidal’s exhumation suggests a parallel to the type of excavation Pardo Bazán sees necessary to her work of cataloguing (reuniting) the scattered fragments of Spain’s “cocina antigua”. She refers to their breadth of their dispersal by emphasizing the “viajes y suma perseverancia” required in order to amass the recipes of Spanish “cocina antigua” into one collection (4); she implies that there is so much material that their complete recovery would be impossible.

Pardo Bazán also understands the imperative to gather recipes that she frames as relics of Spain’s culinary patrimony. For example,

Hay que apresurarse a salvar las antiguas recetas. ¡Cuántas vejezuelas habrán sido las postreras depositarias de fórmulas hoy perdidas! En las familias, en las cafeterías provincianas, en los conventos, se trasmiten <<reflejos>> del pasado,—pero diariamente se extinguen algunos. (CEA 5)

25 In this article Brown focuses her reading of Menéndez Pidal’s “relics” on the text he authored by that name, Reliquias de la poesía épica española, begun in the 1930s and published in 1950. But she also frames her analysis around his entire body of works since the essential aspect of her analysis is Menéndez Pidal’s literary and analytical practice rather than what he says in a single work. López Sánchez identifies the years 1910 through 1929 as the period of his “madurez” and his work within the Centro de Estudios Históricos, which coincides with the publication of Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks.
The vejezuelas Pardo Bazán mentions take recipes to their graves. The confiterías and conventos that preserve these “reflejos del pasado” are privileged sites of excavation, according to Pardo Bazán’s description. Nonetheless, the threat of the recipes’ extinction is due to the ephemeral nature of cuisine. Outside of writing, it lacks the solid, physical presence of the “armas y sepúlcrros” Pardo Bazán mentions elsewhere and motivates her preservation of them in print-text.

Brown’s definition of a relic becomes useful in thinking about Pardo Bazán’s relic/recipes. According to Brown, Guibert of Nogent “declares that the only true relic is that object whose sanctity is supported by long tradition or authoritative written testimony [. . .] ‘Something essentially extraneous to the relic itself must be provided,’ adds contemporary scholar Patrick Geary, “a reliquary, [. . .] a document, [. . .] or a tradition, oral or written” (20). Pardo Bazán, in her cookbook prologues, gives us one version of this context by placing disparate recipes and cooking practices into a collection of historic Spanish cuisine; she asserts that these recipes, together, form the story of Spain’s eating traditions. Still, she laments the loss of another type of tradition represented by the oral circulation of recipes, preparations, and their histories among members of a community.

Modernity/modernization hastens the loss of recipes not recorded in writing—“diariamente se extinguen algunos”—in addition to a restructuring of the communities that once were constrained to a defined space. Relationships between individuals who once lived in close contact with one another, for example in the convents Pardo Bazán mentions or in neighborhoods the confiterías provincianas served, are restructured as people leave the provinces for urban areas. As a result, the interpersonal links that connect—the stories or testimonies that frame a community’s relics—are depersonalized and abstracted into the
print discourse Benedict Anderson describes in *Imagined Communities* (1983).\(^{26}\) Pardo Bazán’s *La cocina española antigua* is one of those print discourses made necessary by that modernization. Like Menéndez Pidal’s *oeuvre* in Brown’s analysis (18), Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks reincorporate fragmentary remains into new and newly signifying bodies—Spanish national cuisine.

Regina Bendix, in *In Search of Authenticity: the Formation of Folklore Studies* (1997), notes that folklore as a discipline developed in Romantic Germany during the nineteenth century, and that it satisfied a “longing for an escape from modernity” (7). The folk community, free from “civilization’s evils, was a metaphor for everything that was not modern” (7). Furthermore, she shows that nationalism, which “builds on the essentialist notions inherent in authenticity,” depends upon “folklore in the guise of native cultural discovery and rediscovery” (7). As a result, when Pardo Bazán declares “la cocina [es] en mi entender, uno de los documentos etnográficos importantes” (4), she signals her desire to recover a link to a mythical, “authentic” Spanish *pueblo*, in order to escape the changes that Spain’s modernization brings. Bendix writes, “[t]he quest for authenticity is a peculiar longing, at one modern and antimodern. It is oriented toward the recovery of an essence whose loss has been realized only through modernity, and whose recovery is feasible only through methods and sentiments created in modernity” (8). Pardo Bazán subscribes to this view when she asserts that “la alimentación revela lo que acaso no descubre otras indagaciones de carácter oficialmente científico” (4).

---

\(^{26}\) Print discourse creates a community of readers who recognize one another through books, newspapers and other media and form communities by imagining the existence of others living their lives in simultaneity.
The recipe collecting that Pardo Bazán undertakes in the cookbooks by accumulating the fragments of Spain’s supposed “cocina antigua,” creating stories about them and the communities that preserved them, parallels the philological project initiated by Antonio Machado y Álvarez, or Demófilo. Machado y Álvarez, the father of folklore studies in Spain and coordinator of the collection Biblioteca de las tradiciones populares españolas (1883), presents “Folk-Lore” as an intellectual project popular in Europe in which Spain also participates; “los estudios mitográficos, tan en boga en Europa, han tenido sin interrupción alguna órgano que lo represente en nuestra Península [. . .]” (VI). The mission of folklore studies in Spain, as he outlines in the 1883 “Introducción” to the first volume of the series, is to “conocer los tesoros mitográficos” of the regions of Spain (VIII). Materials that folkloristas uncover are “ricos y valiosos” and worthy of their own archivo. Folklore, as a discipline, includes: “literatura popular, [. . .]” (IX-X); “[. . .] la prehistoria;” (XI); “etnografía y mitología” (IX), and “gramática y fonética popular” (IX). Machado y Álvarez identifies the field of folklore as one made necessary by modernization (progreso) as it catalogues the historic traditions that are in threat of extinction, and as one that is necessary for modernization in Spain—“el Folk-Lore [es] como un punto de cita en que pueden reunirse y

---

27 Father of Antonio and Manuel Machado, Machado y Álvarez, in addition to founding the field of folklore studies in Spain, worked throughout the 1870s and 1880s to study and collect flamenco songs. This work resulted in the 1881 publication of Colección de cantes flamencos. To some degree Machado y Álvarez’s monograph was similar to cancioneros published earlier in the nineteenth century by Fernán Caballero, Tomás Segarra, and Lafuente Alcántara. However, his study innovated how popular songs/texts were studied: he included studies of the “informantes’ orales” who contributed the musical texts; the monograph centered on a study of cantes flamencos as a musical and poetic genre; he classified the texts not by theme or style, but by the type of music that accompanied them; he also reproduced the pronunciation and syntax of the informants with whom he worked (Baltanás 117-118). In his second major work on cantes flamencos, Cantares flamencos y cantares (1887), Machado y Álvarez addresses the concept of authorship belonging to illiterate authors of these music texts, which distances him, according to Baltanás, from a Romantic understanding of the pueblo as an anonymous collective “author” (143).
abrazarse los que profesen verdadero amor a las tradiciones, inexplicables sin el progreso y al progreso, inexplicable sin aquellas” (XII).28

During the late nineteenth century Pardo Bazán participated in Machado y Álvarez’s project as the editor of *Folklore gallego* (first published in 1884) and as the first president of the Sociedad del Folk-Lore Gallego, also founded in 1884. In her “Discurso leído en la sesión inaugural del Folk-Lore gallego” (La Coruña, 1884), Pardo Bazán defines Folk-Lore as a “ciencia, doctrina o saber popular” (9). She defines *Folk-lore* as a domain not reserved for erudite intellectuals:

> El Folk-lore *no es* una sociedad que deba componerse exclusivamente de sabios, de eruditos, y de personas competentes o aficionados al cultivo de las letras, ciencias y artes. El Folk-lore *no es* una sociedad que aspire a proteger de un modo especial la poesía o la literatura. El Folk-lore, por último, *no es* político, ni religioso, ni revolucionario, ni reaccionario, no tiene color ni bandera, ni más opinión que la de que debe trabajar mucho y desarrollarse y extenderse cuanto le sea posible. (10)

Pardo Bazán construes popular knowledge, or “ciencia popular” as a domain outside of politics, and outside of erudite, intellectual discourse. She implies that viewing folklore

---

28 That said, the idea that these materials are to be exploited by Spain’s intellectuals and used to prove Spain’s cultural antiquity marks Machado y Álvarez’s commentary on the wealth traditional practices in Spain. Spain’s possession of this cultural wealth seems more important to Machado y Álvarez than the “popular” communities that cultivated them, despite his innovations in the 1881 *Colección* and the 1887 *Cantes flamencos*. For example, “... creo firmemente no sólo que al estudio del Folk-Lore deben dedicarse los representantes de todas las escuelas filosóficas, sino que es de absoluta necesidad que en esta obra, en España de verdadera transcendencia nacional, tomen parte tanto los literatos y artistas, como los dedicados á ciencias naturales ó sociológicas.” (XII).
through these lenses would dilute its authenticity. Pardo Bazáns seems to understand folklore as a material, incontrovertible, essential link to a version of traditional life understandable by amassing collections of popular knowledge. She acknowledges that folklore requires museumizing popular practices. She writes,

\[\text{Todas cuantas personas se hallan congregadas en este recinto, han oído quejarse, o se han quejado alguna vez, de que desaparecen las antiguas costumbres, de que los pueblos pierden su fisonomía, su carácter, su tipo propio, igualándose bajo la mano niveladora de la civilización, que borra lo tradicional. Pues bien, el Folk-Lore quiere recoger esas tradiciones que se pierden, esas costumbres que se olvidan y esos vestigios de remotas edades que corren peligro de desaparecer para siempre. Quiere recogerlos, no con el fin de poner otra vez en uso lo que cayó en desuso, sino con el de archivarlos, evitar su total desaparición, conservar su memoria y formar con ellos, por decirlo así, un museo universal, donde puedan estudiar los doctos la historia completa del pasado. (10)}\]

The threatened loss of traditions that modernity brings, folklore recovers and preserves. While practitioners of folklore are not necessarily erudite intellectuals, the materials gathered serve as objects of later study for those erudite “doctos” (10). The traditions of the pueblo inform the history Pardo Bazán mentions and become a mass of traditional objects to be archived figuratively in a museum, like the fossils and sepulchers to which Pardo Bazán equates recipes of Spain’s cocina antigua.

Both Machado y Álvarez and Pardo Bazán describe collecting practices, traditions, and recipes as a response to the disorienting, fleeting, and rapidly changing present -
modernity. Modernity hastens the disappearance of the past, along with its traditions, belief systems, and customs. Noël Valis, in *The Culture of Cursilería* (2002), describes the mourning for the (mostly rural) traditional life that middle-class, educated writers experience around 1900. Almost all of these writers maintain family links to rural homesteads, as does Pardo Bazán in Galicia, though Pardo Bazán is not middle-class. Furthermore, this mourning is not specific to Spain, since movements elsewhere in the West, for example the Arts and Crafts movement and the interest in medievalism, show how this same mourning and nostalgia for the past characterizes the advent of modernity (204).

Pardo Bazán’s catalogue archives recipes, or as she calls them, culinary “tradiciones” and reflections of “el elemento popular” (*CEM* 1-2). Recipes, like the popular practices, songs, expressions, poetry, and oral literature that folklorists accumulate to construct an old, historied Spanish nation, convert the production of the nameless and faceless popular masses into a representation of the nation. For example, in *La cocina española antigua* Pardo Bazán names few sources for the great majority of the recipes she includes. Her acknowledgement in the prologue of the difficulty she had collecting these recipes—“las recetas en las localidades de ocultan celosamente, se niegan o se dan adulteradas” (5)—indicates the popular origins of these recipes, in addition to the above quoted description of the project that Pardo Bazán mentions in *La cocina española moderna*. Of the individuals to whom Pardo Bazán attributes recipes, she names only the *mayordoma* of her Galicia residence.
and a “una fidalga montañesa, la señora de Somoza Saco,” who belong among the “elemento popular” according to Pardo Bazán’s descriptions (16).29

Furthermore, neither Pardo Bazán nor Machado y Álvarez view collecting folklore by regions to be incompatible with the idea of a Spanish nation enriched by this regional diversity. Pardo Bazán may be acknowledging what regional linguistic diversity offers to folklore practice when she asserts the importance of respecting “las incorrecciones del lenguaje, las sencillas e ingenuas preocupaciones del vulgo [. . .]”; she certainly acknowledges class diversity (Folklore Gallego 11). Conversely, this difference in the linguistic forms that primary folk materials should take differs from the form of popular knowledge Pardo Bazán presents in La cocina española antigua, since, in that text, Pardo Bazán emphasizes the importance of writing about Spain’s cuisine in castellano castiza—“Me limito a afirmar que el lenguaje de un libro de cocina española debe ser castellano castizo” (CEA 7). Consequently, far from being the completely raw materials collected from the Spanish pueblo, Pardo Bazán’s volume already reflects the mediation of her own “graves y profundas investigaciones,” identical in spirit to those carried out by other doctos named in her introduction to Galician folklore, Menéndez y Pelayo, Padre Fita, or Teófila Braga, or the studies organized by Menéndez Pidal within the Centro de Estudios Históricos.

Brown shows Menéndez Pidal’s “devot[ion] to the (re)incarnation of a continuous corpus of Spanish national tradition from discontinuous and fragmentary textual remains

29 Regarding the other authors to whom Pardo Bazán attributes recipes, she makes contributors’ social class clear through her use of titles (don and doña) or a brief description of their position, for example Melquiades Brizuela, the “jefe de cocina en los buques de la Compañía Trasatlántica de Barcelona” (77).
long buried in the humus of history and the dust of archives” (18). Folklorists, too, mine popular materials and practices to piece together Spanish history and collect popular oral texts that become part of Spain’s literary canon. And Pardo Bazán reshapes scattered recipes into a signifying body: a Spanish national cuisine, or, a Spanish culinary canon.30

**Canons**

Pardo Bazán’s writing as a novelist and essayist places her among a group of writers who, according to Labanyi, wrote the Spanish nation into existence. For Pardo Bazán, part of this process of writing the nation included tracing Spain’s “national realist tradition back through Cervantes, Velázquez, and Murillo to *La Celestina*” in her essay “Geneología” (Labanyi 13). Labanyi writes that “All nationalisms try to mask the fact that they are the product of a recently created national-state by positing a national tradition stretching back to mythical origins; a hazy concept whose identity shifts depending on the kind of tradition being invented” (Labanyi 13). Pardo Bazán, along with Galdós, Valera, and Pereda, participates in constructing a “teleological version of national literary history whereby origins are invented in the image of the present in order to present the latter as the realization of manifest destiny” (14). Labanyi describes how realist fiction in Spain, and the construction of a national literary canon—the intellectual projects of Giner de los Ríos, Padre Blanco García, Menéndez y Pelayo, and Menéndez Pidal—functioned to write and historicize the nation.

30 Citing Catalonia specifically, Ortiz García notes that Renaixença folklorists and intellectuals privileged oral literature to the exclusion of other traditions when “la comida, con los elementos profundos de identificación que conlleva, debería haber sido uno de los emblemas privilegiados de aquellas nacionalidades que ya, al menos desde el siglo pasado, habían constituido un sistema simbólico de su identidad como claramente ocurre en Cataluña” (315).
That is, these writers wanted to continue a tradition found in the historical forms of Cervantes and *La Celestina*. They decried the influence of other nation-states, especially France.

Pardo Bazán’s presentation of cuisine in these books is as much a philological project as one that deals the materiality of food and doing cooking. She demands that writing about Spanish food be in Castilian Spanish—“el lenguaje de un libro de cocina español debe ser castellano castizo” (*CEA* 7); Spanish cuisine is best expressed in Castilian while other similar relics or folklore texts preserve their vernacular “in correcciones del lenguaje” (*Folklore Gallego* 11). Furthermore, when writing about her reasons for publishing these cookbooks in her column “Cartas de la Condesa” in the Cuban periodical *Diario de la Marina*, Pardo Bazán criticizes writers of the *Diccionario de la lengua* for their misrepresentation of alimentary names. For example, she does not find references to fish commonly consumed in Spain—“Al “pargo no le nombra; la “sama” sufre igual suerte; la “lubina” también se la comen, sin salsa” (146). And she ridicules how the dictionary writers define the *tortilla* as “un plato vulgar, casero, universal” as “una ‘fritada’ de huevos batidos en aceite o manteca, hecha en figura redonda a manera de torta, y en la cual se incluye, de ordinario, otro manjar” (147). Somewhat contradicting her own demand for Spanish cuisine’s expression in Castilian, Pardo Bazán criticizes these dictionary authors for affecting a *casticismo* that alienates dictionary users and speakers of the language—“Hay en todo esto una afectación de casticismo que en mi concepto lo empeora. La Academia debe ser castiza; pero lo castizo no es lo insólito, lo desechado, lo que ningún español entiende” (147). This effort to create a Spanish culinary tradition in polished Castilian parallels the writing of the nation in Spanish
realist novels and the codification and teaching of the nation’s literary production in the form of a Spanish literary canon.

Reading Pardo Bazán’s comments in *La cocina española moderna* about the influence of France on Spain’s culinary forms and practices alongside Benito Pérez Galdós’ 1870 essay “Observaciones sobre la novela contemporánea en España” reveals Pardo Bazán’s application of literary nationalism to the domain of cuisine. For example, Galdós highlights Spain’s contamination by French cultural forms; the social novel, “peste nacida en Francia” and imported to Spain, smothered the development of Spain’s “novela nacional de pura observación” (107). Similarly, the Spanish aristocracy’s *afrancesamiento* and the resulting fashion of eating *a la francesa* spread to the developing Spanish middle classes.31 French cuisine and recipes so overshadowed food thought of as Spanish cuisine that travel writers throughout the nineteenth century ridiculed Spanish food and advised their readers to seek out French food available in cities. Like Galdós’ call for an end to imitation of the forms of French novels, for the “mercado especial” market for these works to dry up (107), Pardo Bazán indicates that no longer should it be acceptable that ideas of cooking and cuisine from outside of Spain, particularly France, overshadow the autochthonous cuisine of Spain. She writes, “En efecto, sí es verdad que nos ha invadido la cocina francesa, y algo la inglesa y

31 Thebussem, credited as being Spain’s first literary gastronomer, decries French linguistic and culinary influence in his 1888 essay/letter “Jigote de lengua”: “Ahora bien: ¿debe ponerse todo el *menu* en lengua francesa, ó ha de escribirse en la nacional de cada tierra? Después de largas medicaciones sobre esta consulta, y de oír el parecer de sabios académicos, de expertos cocineros, de filosóficos eclécticos y de inteligentes gastrónomos, la respuesta es fácil. —‘La lista, dicen sin vacilación, ha de redactarse en el idioma nacional, dejando de los extranjeros aquellos nombres, ya técnicos ó ya de ciertos manjares, admitidos por el buen uso’” (12). He also calls for a return of Spanish dishes to the Spanish aristocracy’s table: “Que la olla podrida debe figurarse entre los manjares de los banquetes reales de España, en señar de respeto y deferencia al plato nacional de dicho país” (25). Furthermore, travelers to Spain like Dumas and Ford wrote about the deficiencies of the Spanish diet and maintained that one could only eat well “a la francesa.”
alemana, tambièn hay una reacciòn favorable a la nacional y regional” (CEM V). Spanish cooks can and should adapt foreign dishes, and those dishes improve though their nationalization:

La mayorìa de los platos extranjeros pueden hacerse à nuestro modo: no diré que metidos en la faena de adaptarlos no hayamos estropeado alguno; en cambio, á otros (y citaré por ejemplo las croquetas), los hemos mejorado en tercio y quinto. (I)

Consequently, in *La cocina espaìola moderna*, Pardo Bazán defines modern Spanish cuisine in order to reclaim and restore its reputation—“Combinar lo excelente de los guisos nacionales con el gentil aseo y exquisitez que hoy se exige en la cocina universal, es lo que este libro tiende a fomentar un poco” (CEM VI)—and show how Spanish cuisine makes possible and exacts “la adaptaciòn de los guisos extranjeros a la mesa espaìola” (I).

The challenge Galdòs proposes in this essay is to encourage the development of a *novela de costumbres* focusing on the middle class, the motor of Spain’s modernization:

Esa clase es la que determina el movimiento político, la que administra, la que enseña, la que discute, la que da al mundo los grandes innovadores y los grandes libertinos, los ambiciosos de genio y las ridículas vanidades: ella determina el movimiento comercial, una de las grandes manifestaciones de nuestro siglo [. . .].” (Galdòs 112)

He faults Spain’s writers for privileging foreign influences and not paying attention to the fertile material offered in Spain: “El gran defecto de la mayor parte de nuestros novelistas, es el haber utilizado elementos extraños, convencionales, impuestos por la moda, prescindiendo por completo de los que la sociedad nacional y coetànea les ofrece con extraordinaria
abundancia” (105). Pardo Bazán expends a great deal of effort in La cocina española antigua convincing her readers that Spain does indeed have a historic “cocina antigua.” Echoing Galdós’ pronouncement, “Por eso no tenemos novela” (105), about Spain’s modern cuisine in La cocina española moderna would defeat the project she initiated with La cocina española antigua. However, just as Galdós identifies the Spanish middle class as the fertile ground for material for Spain’s modern novel—“Pero la clase media, la más olvidada por nuestros novelistas, es el gran modelo, la fuente inagotable. Ella es hoy la base del orden social [. . .]” (112)—Pardo Bazán constructs a modern “cocina española” for that class in La cocina española moderna. She prescribes ways of eating that nationalize foreign influences, foods, recipes, and preparations, while also celebrating that such prosaic and traditional dishes as “callos a la madrileña” are served on the tables of the well-to-do, the aristocracy that the middle-class emulates:

Hace treinta ó cuarenta años se proscribían platos que hoy se admiten y salen ás plaza en mesas muy escogidas. Nadie se hubiese atrevido acaso, en otros tiempos, á servir un plato de callos a la madrileña teniendo convidados, aun cuando fuesen de confianza [. . .]. (CEM V)

In Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation (1993), John Guillory proposes understanding how literary canons form by thinking about them as cultural products; but social class and literacy limit access to these products, a topic I examine in detail in the next chapter. Guillory prioritizes examining not the inclusions and exclusions

---

32 This is what Galdós will do in practice by incorporating novelistic models from France and England into his work even though he does not say it in “Observaciones.”
from the canon, but the institutions and schools that create curricula and syllabi that grant specific texts a status of canonicity. In Spain, cultural institutions—the Krausist Institución Libre de Enseñanza and Centro de Estudios Históricos—and publishing houses, together with their collaborating scholars, define the Spanish literary canon and make it part of a new, nation-building school curriculum.

In 1846 publisher Manuel Rivadeneyra founded the Biblioteca de autores españoles, under the direction of Carles Aribau. This series collected “classic” works of Spanish literature already in print (Don Quijote); defined other texts “classic”; and recuperated “lost” texts into the library. Between 1905 and 1918 Menéndez y Pelayo continued the collection, under the name Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles and the publishing boom continued with the series Clásicos Castellanos (Marco García). The role of publishing houses in establishing this literary canon converts the texts into commodity items. Sold by their labels as “classic” Spanish literature, they attract readers who then make the association between themselves and the version of the “Spanish” community these texts present.

The Institución Libre de Enseñanza and the Centro de Estudios Históricos are two institutions whose work revolutionize the study of literary texts in Spain and influence the growth of the publishing marketplace. The Institución Libre de Enseñanza (ILE) was founded in 1876 and headed by Krausist Francisco Giner de los Ríos. Its purpose was to reform education, and make it a path toward mankind’s self-improvement that would be

---

33 Aribau, in addition to collaborating with this Biblioteca, was also one of the major figures articulating a Catalan literary canon, and later, Catalan nationalism. His poem 1833 poem, “Oda a la pàtria” written from Madrid, serves as a touchstone for the Romantic Catalan Renaixença.

34 This is a process that Anderson theorizes in Imagined Communities (1983).
accessible to all classes. The ILE was the principal source of liberal nationalism and responsible for a “gigantesca tarea intelectual” (Mainer 87). The Centro de Estudios Históricos (CEH) was created in March 1910 by royal decree, and directed by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, who supposedly had been a student of (at the very least a acquaintance of) Giner de los Ríos. This institution changed the cultural landscape and created studies of “nacionalismo filológico” (Mainer in Marco García 83-84).³⁵ Both of these institutions and their collaborating researchers devoted attention to creating new philological practices in Spain in order to “rescatar los estudios hispanos de manos extranjeras” (López Sánchez 294). This effort among philologists led by Menéndez Pidal, influenced by the ILE and working within the CEH, had as its purpose to “descubrir España” through literary texts, mostly epic poetry in Castilian (294). They sought to “devolver a España una conciencia más exacta de su pasado [. . .], una razón de ser como colectividad,” in order to “penetrar en el período de ‘orígenes’ de la literatura nacional y recobrar el legado histórico de aquellos siglos oscuros” (295). These efforts were linked to their desire to establish Spain’s membership in a group of European nation-states that could trace their “national” literatures back to the Middle Ages, which gives weight to “la presencia de una conciencia nacional castellana y español de rancio abolengo” (296). This work within the CEH was influenced by the work of Andrés Bello, Manuel Milá, and Menéndez y Pelayo, and López Sánchez credits the

³⁵ In “De historiografía literaria española: el fundamento liberal” (1981), Mainer defines the term “nacionalismo filológico”: “En el exacto promedio de estas encurucijadas, se hallaba de cierto, el embión tardío de un concepto “national” de la literatura española, surgido al fin de las bodas del nacionalismo liberal y de la filología. Y bien arropado en el proyecto de la escuela del Centro de Estudios Históricos que, una vez más, respondía al peculiar esquema de actuación de los grupos intelectuales más fecundos en la vida nacional; una hábil combinación de oficialidad y de privatización, de categorías morales y exigencias científicas, de asepsia profesional y actividad pública” (qtd. in Marco García 84).
institutional structure of the CEH as the motor that successfully diffused the work of its researchers, unlike scholarly work undertaken by Giner, Altamira and Menéndez y Pelayo in previous decades.

The work begun by Rivadeneyra’s publishing house in 1846, Giner’s work within the ILE, folklorist Machado y Álvarez’s contributions of popular literary texts mined from folklore, Padre Blanco García’s *La literatura española en el siglo XIX* (1891-1894), Menéndez y Pelayo’s massive *ouvr*ere constructing a national literary tradition, and the work done within the CEH led by Menéndez Pidal results in a concrete and exemplary series—the *Biblioteca Literaria del Estudiante* (1922-1935). This series contains those texts deemed “obras clásicas de la literatura” (López Sánchez 312), and it indicates the definitive construction of the literary canon, a construction that converts the fruits of these scholars’ studies into a curriculum for use in the public school systems. As a result, these literary texts are institutionalized and become the Spanish Literature that shapes Spain’s future citizens.

The *regeneracionista* discourses that shaped this canon formation project capitalized on earlier efforts to write the nation and its history in order to plan the future of Spain. Given the ILE’s belief that Spain would not modernize until its citizens’ cultural level and education improved, these institutions’ construction of the Spanish literary canon responded

36 Labanyi describes this text as rabidly nationalist since Blanco García appropriates literature published in Latin America for his three-volume anthology.

37 These works include *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (five volumes, 1880-1882); *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España* (five volumes, 1883-1891); and *La ciencia española* (three volumes, 1887-1889) (Labanyi 14).

38 The series, attributed to Menéndez Pidal, includes 30 volumes published from 1922, among them: *Cuentos tradicionales*, *Cancionero musical*, *Prosistas modernos*, *Calderón*, *Tirso de Molina*, *Lope de Vega*, *Escritores místicos*, *Cervantes Don Quijote*, *Romancero*, and *Cuentos Medievales* (Espinosa 199).
to the need to invent characteristics of a national citizenry and to inculcate that citizenry with
the proper mentality for a modernizing nation-state; examples of tools for this task include
songs, speeches, military ceremonies, jingoistic cartoons, and articles (Balfour 29). Spain was
no longer united by the idea of empire and domination, and was further separated by
growing nationalist movements in Catalonia and the Basque Country; the increased wealth of
middle-class citizens and modernization further encouraged ideas of alienation from the
center. Pardo Bazán proposes cuisine as another of the tools with the possibility to foment
citizens’ allegiance to the Spanish nation-state. She places Spanish national recipes into a
cookbook that preserves recipes under threat of disappearance and presents a repository of
recipes that, since the Middle Ages, have shaped and fed the Spanish “soul.” However, the
example of the development of the Spanish literary canon shows the importance of state
institutions and the marketplace that institutionalize canonical literature. Though she makes
a case for her text as a culinary canon, Pardo Bazán’s lack of institutional support and
consumer market support, noted in critics’ writing about her cookbooks, indicates the
implausibility their institutionalization.  

Ángeles Ezama Gil, in “Una escritora con vocación de historiadora de la literatura: el
canon de escritura femenina de Emilia Pardo Bazán,” sees Pardo Bazán’s “vocación de
historiadora de las letras” in several literary history projects that ultimately remained
incomplete: the Historia de las letras castellanas, the Filósofas y Teólogas españolas del Renacimiento,
the Historia de la literatura mística y ascética. Ezama Gil sees a compensatory “enfoque
historicista que aplica a su labor crítica” resulting from Pardo Bazán’s failure to complete

39 Clémessy writes that although the books were “llenos de enseñanzas, poco se vendieron” (258).
these projects. And due to her “enfoque historicista,” Pardo Bazán recognizes “la existencia de una cultura femenina, floreciente en el periodo brillante que abarca el final del siglo XV y el XVI,” according to Ezama Gil (94). In her 2001 chapter “My Distinguished Friend and Colleague Tula: Emilia Pardo Bazán and Literary-Feminist Polemics,” Tolliver, too, describes how Pardo Bazán traced the intellectual contributions of women throughout Spain’s history; she wrote biographies of María de Zayas, Isabél la Católica, and La Maintenon, and included them in her Biblioteca de la Mujer series. So, Pardo Bazán’s interest in the history of feminine literary production could explain her interest in creating an archive of Spanish recipes—an archive constructed of the recipes of the (mostly unnamed) women who share them with her. Yet, her collection of recipes is not just a reflection of popular practices. By framing the recipes in the language of the nation—“Castellano castizo”—and referring to Cervantes—both to the “Bodas de Camacho” chapter of Don Quijote and to the figure of the Caballero del Verde Gabán—, Pardo Bazán places cooking in dialogue with canonical Spanish literature. And she indicates that a culinary history generated by women is important for the Spanish nation, just like its literary history.

**A Spanish culinary empire**

Pardo Bazán’s discussion of ingredients, cooking practices, and recipes from outside of Spain indicates the perception of Spain’s culinary and cultural backwardness when

---

40 Ezama Gil notes that her thesis in this article departs from the perspective offered by Maryellen Bieder; Bieder maintains that Pardo Bazán preferred to be recognized within the tradition of well-known female Spanish authors and as a contemporary of mainstream male Spanish authors, rather than “tratar con los grupos de las literatas contemporáneas” (89). According to Ezama Gil, Pardo Bazán’s “concepción de la historia literaria” and “su conciencia de clase” determined the female writers whose work she appreciated, more so than any feeling of solidarity with a female literary cohort (90). Furthermore, the early volumes of Pardo Bazán’s Biblioteca de la Mujer reflect Pardo Bazán’s respect for Santa Teresa de Jesús and María de Zayas.
compared to more modernized nation-states in Europe, particularly France. It also alludes to readers in Latin America and recipes from there. Throughout the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century, Spain’s exceptionalism and its decline as a world power since its peak in the seventeenth century defined what it meant to be Spanish. According to Conservatives, Spain declined because of Enlightenment influences, the imposition of foreign government models, and the abandonment of “unity, hierarchy and militant Catholicism” (Balfour 25)—the latter were the qualities upon which Spain had constructed an empire. According to Liberals, Spain’s decline was based on its failure to modernize. This was due to inept leadership, reactionary ideology, and insufficient participation on the part of the masses. Intellectuals like Pardo Bazán, Unamuno, and liberal Menéndez Pidal and others who participated in the intellectual movement called regeneracionismo prioritized the institutionalization of national discourses, like the realist novel, Spanish history, folklore, and canonical literary texts. Regeneracionista intellectuals focused on the project of planning the future and modernization of Spain and creating “an alternative bourgeois hegemony in opposition to the traditional order imposed by landowners, financiers, and aristocrats” (Krauel 13). Part of determining Spain’s future was redefining the relationship between Spain and its former colonies in Latin America.

In her cookbooks Pardo Bazán emphasizes how cooking and eating characterize Spain. The “platos de nuestra cocina nacional” exist alongside “medallas, un arma o un sepulcro” as material evidence of Spain’s distinction and history (CEA 4). Cooking and cuisine provide evidence of Spain’s modernization and development: “Entre los síntomas de adelanto que pueden observarse en España, debemos incluir el que se coma mejor, y sobre todo, con más elegancia y refinamiento” (CEM I). Pardo Bazán includes Latin American
recipes and reader/participants in the project of Spanish national cuisine; claiming these readers and their cooking includes the territory covered by Spain’s spiritual patrimony. For example, she identifies regional cuisines of the peninsula and Latin American cuisines as examples of Spain’s “cocina antigua” and “cocina moderna.”

Que la cocina española propiamente dicha tiene su sello, lo demuestra, entre otras cosas, su extensión y evolución en América. En Cuba, en México y en Chile, abundan los platos hoy nacionales, que revelan a las claras lo hispánico de su origen y la aplicación de los elementos ibéricos al nuevo ambiente.

This quotation indicates Pardo Bazán’s location of the origin of culinary practices in Peninsular Spain and the movement of those practices from the peninsula (“elementos ibéricos”) to the new world, not the reverse. Eating customs, recipes, and ingredients do travel with the people who settle, populate, and colonize; this is not an entirely ideological assertion. What makes it ideological is the sense in which Pardo Bazán uses the extension and movement of these recipes and cooking practices as evidence of an already existing Spanish national cuisine that molds cooking in Latin America. In so doing, she ignores that traces of cooking, eating practices, and agricultural products originating in pre-colonial and colonial Latin America move to Europe along this same route. For example, many recipes in La cocina española antigua call for potatoes—the “Cazuela chilena” or the “tortilla de patatas”—or tomatoes; Pardo Bazán offers five separate recipes for gazpacho (18-19).41

41 Botanists agree that the potato species originated in the Andes, from Colombia and Venezuela to Chile and northern Argentina, with concentrated genetic diversity concentrated in the area of Perú. Pedro Cieza de León’s Crónica del Perú (Seville 1533) contains the first reference to the potato in Europe. Potatoes were
Spain’s colonization of Latin America and the Caribbean facilitated the import of these foods indigenous to Latin America just like other raw materials. However, Pardo Bazán highlights the influence of Spain’s empire over Latin America, instead of acknowledging what the lands of the new world contributed to foods consumed in Europe. As colonies of the Spanish empire, this territory was ideologically and politically part of Spain at the time of those products’ import to Europe. However, in 1913 and 1914, Pardo Bazán asserts Spain’s postcolonial influence in Latin America by characterizing cuisine in Latin America as Spanish. She classifies any practices, recipes, or ingredients that move from the new world back to Europe as evidence of Spain’s culinary patrimony.

In *La cocina española antigua*, Pardo Bazán’s calls for readers to share their recipes for classic Spanish dishes—“Las solicito de toda España y de América” (5). Pardo Bazán may acknowledge the provenance of recipes from Latin America in their titles, but her request for Latin American women’s participation in cataloguing Spain’s national cuisine reveals her idea of a continued special relationship between Latin America and Spain in which Spain molded Latin America, not the reverse.

Spain’s loss of the Phillipines, Puerto Rico and Cuba as colonies in 1898 brings with it a perceived economic crisis, though critic Loureiro notes that this was largely a perception of crisis since the first decades of the twentieth century were prosperous ones (66). The crisis cultivated in Spain around the same time and called “papas.” A notice from 1573 shows that potatoes were being fed to the sick in a monastery of Seville, still under their Quechua name. (Wikipedia). Additionally, the wild species of the tomato was found from Ecuador to Chile and is known to have originated in South America and, possibly, Mexico. Cortez landed in/conquered Mexico in 1519 and the first reference to them in Europe is in Italy in 1544. There are still arguments as to the origin of the tomato (“tomato,” UGA web).
that did take place was one of the legitimacy of the Spanish state. Regenerationist intellectuals responded to this crisis by attempting to find a cure for the disease of the Spanish state-body in order to make it healthy again; metaphors of disease, poor health, and ‘to make healthy’ were all employed in this rhetoric. Reconstructing the relationship between Spain and Latin America was one of the tasks identified by Regenerationists.

Javier Krauel, in his dissertation, “Spiritual Bonds and the Singularity of Literature” (2006), notes the “ideological blind spot” of both conservative and liberal Spanish intellectuals regarding Latin America following the termination of Spain’s political empire there. Krauel writes, “the discourse about Hispanic cultural identity is best understood as the place where three traditions of cultural representation converge: first, the tradition that constructs Spanish culture as the genealogical foundation of Latin American culture; second, the fashioning of language as the unifying expression shared by the people of Spain and Spanish America; and third, the production of the role of the intellectual as an individual who disinterestedly creates knowledge, free from any social determinations” (2). Hispanismo, or the discourse characterizing this relationship, assumes several configurations, among them a desire to preserve the hierarchical order of the colonial past (Pike in Krauel), Spain’s location of the foundation for its regeneration in Latin America (Sepúlveda in Krauel), and Latin America as a site for “national self-understanding” (Krauel 10) and/ or a “site of restitution for Spain’s dejection” (Loureiro 69).

What these descriptions of Hispanismo and the relationship between Latin America and Spain highlight is a desire among Spanish intellectuals to preserve ties with this region based on language, Spain’s role in the continents’ “foundation,” social ties, and a continued spiritual investment in Latin America. Consequently, reading Pardo Bazán’s references to
Latin America in her cookbooks, on the one hand, demonstrates both a desire for commonality and an attempt at a neo-imperial ownership of Latin America’s variant of Spanish cuisine. On the other hand, part of Pardo Bazán’s inclusion of this area in her cookbooks stems from a desire that political difference and separation not become a wall that blocks the mutual influence and interest generated by shared language and a shared origin. For example, Pardo Bazán notes in her letter to Alejandro Barreiro that her disenchantment with her authoctonous public encouraged her to look to Latin America instead: “Y gracias a que no soy de condición de propagandista, el desencanto ha sido mejor. En Europa y América avanza lo que aquí no da señales de vida” (Pardo Bazán qtd. in Bravo-Villasante 281).

**Conclusion**

At the beginning of this chapter I proposed reading Pardo Bazán’s cookbook writing, her feminine writing, as serious writing. Her cookbook prologues reveal how she aligns the feminine, domestic sphere of home cooking with the dominant, masculine intellectual project of the early twentieth century to uncover the relics and fragments of Spain’s history and literature and to establish the legitimacy of the Spanish nation as the dominant ideological paradigm of Spain. By aligning cooking and cuisine with philology, folklore, history, literature, and Spain’s regeneration, Pardo Bazán converts a major domestic activity of women, the idea and print-form of the recipes they author, into a public document, and a textual contribution to the development of the “Spanish” nation. Her identification of cooking and recipes as key discourses gives women a role in nation-building, a role Pardo Bazán claims for herself. Moving away from instructing her female readers as a
teacher or leader in their education about feminism or exhorting them to know about suffrage and the demand for rights by women outside of Spain, Pardo Bazán also gives other women a role through her, since she entreats them to send her the recipes that create a cocina española. However this tactical change is not without its contradictions; the ambivalence characteristic of Pardo Bazán’s relationship with her female readers and the issue of social class in Spain are issues that, I argue in the next chapter, motivated her writing in the prologues to her cookbooks.
2. Deconstructing Emilia Pardo Bazán’s Culinary Ideology

In the previous chapter, I outlined how Emilia Pardo Bazán constructs cooking and cuisine as a nation-building discourse for Spain in her cookbooks La cocina española antigua (1913) and La cocina española moderna (1914). Creating parallels between cuisine, anthropology, folklore, and literature, Pardo Bazán offers cuisine as another platform upon which the Spanish nation can be written into existence. Yet, the Spanish cuisine Pardo Bazán invents captures the participation of some citizens, while it marginalizes others. In an impulse to define cuisine as a domain in conversation with these other nation-building discourses, Pardo Bazán distorts the representation of social class reflected in assumptions about who practices and who consumes Spanish cuisine. At the same time, she treats contradictorily her relationship with the female readers of her Biblioteca de la mujer for whom she imagined the cookbooks.

Two issues, the problem of the working class and the role of women, were conflated in the late nineteenth century into the “social question” (Labanyi vii). The social question was no less pressing in Spain in 1913 and 1914, when an increase in working-class revolts against the political system and an emerging understanding of the new roles that modernization opened for women provoked a rising anxiety. This chapter deconstructs Pardo Bazán’s elaboration of a Spanish national cuisine in two ways: first, from the perspective of social class, focusing on her treatment of social class in her cookbooks and in her articles about the cookbooks; and second, through the lens of her ambivalent relationship to the women to whom the cookbooks were directed.
2.1 Writing the Nation

According to Jo Labanyi, the process of writing the nation into existence during the Restoration period was a process similar to that experienced by countries throughout Europe during the nineteenth century. The development of liberal bourgeois states across the continent served as the catalyst for the formation of national identities. The success of the liberal state in these countries was measured by its ability to create a society united under a single national configuration. The tools of this consolidation were the political, juridical, and fiscal institutions that united bourgeois society, a centralized economic system, a political system accepted as legitimate by the society’s elites, a cultural model reflective of and conducive to the development of a national conscience, and an education system capable of integrating its citizens culturally and linguistically (Carasa 166-167). Despite efforts by Spain’s elites to develop the state institutions necessary to unite Spain under a single national paradigm, Spain’s institutional structures fell short. The Spanish state remained politically and socially weak, and distant from the interests of the majority of its citizens.

The model of the liberal nation-state failed in Spain for four principal reasons. First, by operating as an oligarchy structured on the power networks of mostly rural caciques, the modern Spanish state created no mechanism for integrating the participation of the peasantry, which in 1900 comprised two thirds of the employed population (Álvarez Junco 82). Although universal masculine suffrage had been written into law in 1869, the needs and concerns of rural citizens were managed through the caciques system. The caciques, or local political bosses, controlled a network of patronage that dictated electoral outcomes for national political parties and thus guaranteed the electoral majorities necessary to maintain
the Restoration turno político system.¹ Caciques worked by “falsifying suffrage” or directing the votes of male peasant citizens to orchestrate electoral majorities (Carr Spain 367).² This system effectively excluded the peasantry from the political sphere of “official Spain” (Ortega’s term, cited in Álvarez Junco 82). As a result, neither the peasantry nor the working class identified with the state.

Compounding the dissociation between the state and the working class was the growth of urban Spain and its accompanying industrial proletariat in Barcelona (textiles), the Basque Country (iron), and Asturias (mining); this working class sector also included artisans and those working in the service sector (domestic servants). The growth of this group of workers and the associated migration of peasants from rural Spain to the cities meant that in a span of thirty years, between 1900 and 1930, the proportion of the population working in agriculture decreased from two-thirds to forty-six percent (Álvarez Junco 82). This movement resulted from the expansion of industrial opportunities in the cities. But it also meant that the poverty characteristic of rural life was transferred to and concentrated into the cities, where local governments had neither the resources to house and support new workers nor the policies in place to manage the growth of the working class.

¹ Álvarez Junco, in his description of caciquismo, distinguishes caciques from aristocrats, latifundista landowners, and an older political bloc whose power derived from land sales (84). Together these groups represented the political power structure in place that helped the Restoration monarchy function by guaranteeing the turno instead of responding to the votes and interests of voting citizens.

² Carr arguing that the system has been unfairly demonized for transforming a “democratic monarchy into an oligarchy” (Spain 367), sees the political institutions that developed in Spain in this period as a natural growth that consolidated local influence into a social institution and defends the system as a necessary “political device in a backward society” (369). However, he does acknowledge that the characterization of the electorate espoused by Ramón y Cajal (“the necessary connection between an indifferent electorate and the politicians”) is representative of a patronizing attitude that prolonged the cacique system and prevented the development of a more engaged electorate (369).
Second, Spain’s lack of a transportation infrastructure, the slow progress of modernization outside of urban centers, and the weak development of a state-level internal market, enabled the survival of traditional identities. The “new liberal-national identity, one of ‘citizens’ and ‘Spaniards,’ was unable to impose itself on regional, local, and religious identities” (Álvarez Junco 83). As a result, the idea of a centralized state and its “indivisible national sovereignty” remained illusory for the majority of Spain’s population (83).

Third, regional movements in Catalonia and the Basque Country worked to establish alternative national identities that undermined Spanish national unification and hindered the development of nationwide parties, which further weakened the political structures of the Spanish state (Carr Modern 60). Catalan nationalists, led by a group of elites disenchanted with the leadership of the centralized state, worked to strengthen the Catalan nation, which identified with other modernizing nation-states in Europe as opposed to the Spanish nation-state based in Madrid. Basque nationalism, on the other hand, developed out of anti-modern ideas in reaction to the industrial development happening in Bilbao.³ All three of these factors presented serious challenges to the formation and consolidation of the Spanish liberal state.

---

³ Catalan nationalism is rooted in the European Romantic movement, which saw resurgence in popular uses of the Catalan language and poetry. Politically, Catalan nationalists celebrated their medieval Mediterranean empire and, as the nineteenth century progressed, moved their political interests from supporting Spanish centralism to viewing the Spanish state as “a Castilian concern” and their own concerns as based in federalism and the preservation of Catalan difference (Carr Modern 62-63). According to Carr, Basque nationalism, on the other hand, originated with local, conservative peasant concerns and produced no literature or scholarship of modern thought, unlike Catalan nationalism. Sabino de Arana, or “the prophet of Basque nationalism,” succeeded in romanticizing the fueros - the medieval privileges awarded to the Basque Provinces - as institutions of popular democracy (Carr, 2001 68). His development of the idea of Basque racial difference, along with religion and the Basque language, served as the platform for the development of Basque political nationalism, which was threatened by “urban liberalism and industrialism” (Carr Modern 68).
The fourth challenge to national integration was the loss of Spain’s last colonies in Latin America in 1898. While the loss of its colonial holdings resulted in a crisis of legitimacy for the Spanish state and the Restoration monarchy, the events of 1898 were not a surprise, nor did they provoke an outpouring of nationalist sentiment from the majority of Spanish people. Instead, 1898 became a symbolic and dramatic catalyst for a series of transitions. Intellectuals, perceiving a decline after 1898 that they attributed to Spain’s failure to modernize, called for Spain’s regeneration. In contrast, the working class formed political and grassroots organizations and escalated strikes and protests aimed at spurring the state to create policies that reflected the interests of workers. For example, peasants and workers rebelled against army conscription for the State’s colonial wars (the Semana Trágica), against taxation, and against repression and abuses perpetrated by the federal civil guard, particularly in the countryside (Álvarez Junco 85).

Working class and peasant revolts took place throughout the 1870s and 1880s, but they intensified during the 1890s and 1900s and spurred a restructuring of the web of social sympathies. The middle class, previously sympathetic to the lower and working classes, transferred its allegiance to the upper classes and the aristocracy due to fears of a revolution (Carasa 185). It also embraced “una nueva valoración del ser civilizados, de una nueva sensibilidad civil, de un sentido de la humanidad más autónomo y menos dictado por los valores tradicionales de carácter religioso o institucional [. . .]” (Carasa 185-186). This

4 Carasa notes, “El error estuvo en anteponer el orgullo y el interés de las elites ante el sentido realista y práctico de la sociedad, en sobrevalorar la reacción nacionalista del pueblo español ante una posible cesión o venta de una colonia, en exagerar la supuesta amenaza de la Monarquía, en no percibir que lo que realmente desaba el pueblo español era la paz a cualquier precio y el cese de la sangría humana de las quintas enviadas a Ultramar” (183).
realignment of sympathies and interests coincides with Pardo Bazán’s publication of *La cocina española antigua* (1913, CEA) and *La cocina española moderna* (1914, CEM).

Writing the Spanish nation into being, then, is a project complicated by Spain’s imperial disintegration, its internal political disarray, and competition for national allegiance by the Basque Country, Catalonia, and Galicia. Yet, intrinsic to the nationalizing process that Labanyi describes are Spanish intellectuals’ debates about what it meant to be Spanish and the configuration of a particularly Spanish modernity. The written discourses that created a Spanish nation on paper indicate how writing and print texts worked to re-map ideas of community in Spain. Citizens formed (national) alliances through the texts they read and wrote. Intellectuals also engaged in the ideological practice of inventing traditions, which would anchor a Spanish society as it dealt with the changes modernization imposed.

Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger define an “invented tradition” as “a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate [citizens with] certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past” (1). In the period from 1870 until 1914, “the creation of traditions was enthusiastically practiced in numerous countries” as a response to the social transformations of the period (Hobsbawm 263). Taking France as an example, Hobsbawm identifies “the development of a secular equivalent of the church—primary education,” the “invention of public ceremonies,” and the “mass production of public monuments” as forms of invented traditions created in response to the reorganization of political loyalty in states that experienced the political upheavals of modernization (271).
Pardo Bazán identifies the recipes in her cookbooks as Spain’s culinary traditions inherited from the *vejezuelas* who serve as their custodians and she places these recipes into cookbooks that identify them as Spain’s national cuisine. Thus, Pardo Bazán’s invention of Spanish cuisine is one response to the changes occurring in Spain during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, inventing a culinary tradition in Spain and delineating that tradition in print have crucial consequences for those for whom the nation, national traditions, and traditional practices are imagined. Whose loyalties and political obedience to the state and the Spanish nation does Pardo Bazán hope to influence?

### 2.2 Cookbooks and Contradictory Feminism

Reading Pardo Bazán’s cookbook writing, her “feminine” writing, in Joyce Tolliver’s words, as “serious” writing reveals how Pardo Bazán aligns the feminine, domestic sphere of home cooking with the dominant, masculine intellectual projects of the early twentieth century. Pardo Bazán places cuisine alongside the relics and fragments of Spain’s history and literature that functioned in the early twentieth century to reestablish the legitimacy of the Spanish nation as the dominant ideological paradigm of Spain. By aligning cooking and cuisine with those discourses, Pardo Bazán claims a role for herself as a woman in the building of the nation. She makes herself the collector and chronicler of popular women’s recipes at risk of being lost if they are not recorded. Pardo Bazán makes clear the importance of these women from Spain’s *pueblos*, the *vejezuelas*, to the construction of Spain’s culinary patrimony and therefore the Spanish nation.⁵ Equating their *platos* to the *medallas*, *sepulcros*,

---

⁵ In her reference to the *vejezuelas* who preserve Spain’s recipes Pardo Bazán is never completely clear about whether these women are the mythical peasant women of the past or simply the women from Spain’s *pueblos*.
and armas of masculine national relics, Pardo Bazán asserts her own role as a nation-builder by collecting these recipes into the volumes of her cookbooks (CEA 4). Furthermore, she seems to attribute a similarly important role to her modern readers, whom she asks to send her their recipes.6

It appears that Pardo Bazán ascribes to women an important role in generating national discourses, Yet, examining the relationship she creates with her modern women readers in her cookbooks reveals her highly contradictory treatment of them, especially given the role she attributes to popular women (vejezuelas) as the custodians of Spain’s culinary traditions.

On the one hand, Pardo Bazán constructs an authorial persona who has things in common with her female readers. She describes her cooking modestly and takes care to communicate that her publication of cookbooks is a casual project not linked to her other work as a professional: “Al publicar un libro de Cocina, me parece natural decir que no tengo pretensiones de dominar esta ciencia y arte. Soy, tan sólo, una modestísima aficionada. Más que enseñar, deseo aprender” (CEA 3). She indicates her involvement in planning meals, preparing them, and directing this domestic task. She also discusses the collection of recipes she has collected and tried:

from whom she collected the recipes for her cookbooks. By marking them as peasant women, however, she implies that their status is ahistorical.

6 In La cocina española antigua she writes, “Me apresuro a añadir que agradece de veras las que me envíen, para incluirlas en la sucesivas ediciones. Las solico de toda España y de América” (5).
Al correr el tiempo, mis cajones iban llenándose y rebosando de recetas recogidas aquí y acullá, y entre las cuales había de todo: platos regionales, otros que son secreto de una familia o de una persona, otros inéditos, que ensayábamos y salían bien y quedaban aprobados; otros usuales, vulgares; alguno más refinado; una pintoresca mezcla” (“Mi libro. . .” 222).

Furthermore, in her 1913 Diario de la Marina article “Mi libro de cocina,” Pardo Bazán mentions her longstanding interest in cooking: “Afición, sí he tenido siempre a la cocina; y no me cabe duda que era algo atávico” (222). Her use of the adjective atávico indicates that her interest in cooking comes to her through her ancestors. She mentions her aunt, who founded an “escuela de cocineras” in La Coruña much missed by the “amas de casa de la generación actual” (222), and her desire to preserve her own family’s traditions: “Otro móvil que me ha guiado, en el caso presente, es el deseo de tener encuadernadas y manejables varias recetas antiguas o que debo considerar tales, por haberlas conocido como desde mi niñez y ser en mi familia como de tradición” (CEA 4). In this way, Pardo Bazán makes her family situation seem like that of any of her women readers. She wants to preserve her family’s recipes and her family’s domestic traditions—a role assigned to women by the ideology of domesticity.7

Yet even as she highlights her similarities to her readers, Pardo Bazán also uses several strategies to remind them of her difference from them. She emphasizes that the

7 In using this term, I refer to Bridget Aldaraca’s work in El Ángel del hogar: Galdós and the Ideology of Domesticity in Spain (1991). Aldaraca defines the ideology of domesticity as one characterized by the radical separation of social spheres into public and private domains, a supposed social and political equality between men and women in which women do not participate politically or socially but “influence” from within the home, and a focus on children and their education as the center of domestic life (18-19).
decision to publish her cookbooks was motivated, in some part, by her desire to make the recipes she had collected for so many years more manageable in order to avoid wasting time when passing them along to family and friends. She reminds her readers that her time is valuable, in short supply, and not usually devoted to domestic tasks:

Y el ir archivando tantas recetas me hacía perder el tiempo un tiempo precioso, no por el hecho de recogerlos, sino porque me pedían copias, y me obligaba a papeleas incesantemente. Si necesitaba una receta, para mi propio uso, el buscarla también era difícil. ("Mi libro . . .” 222)

She justifies publishing her cookbooks by citing her own pleasure in cooking: “siempre me he preocupado de cosas caseras porque me entretienen” (CEA 4). In a letter to her friend Alejandro Barreiro, director of the newspaper *La voz de Galicia*, she reiterates the pleasure that she finds in domestic tasks and notes her regret at not having more time for household chores: “Por mi parte siempre anduve en guisar, y hasta le tengo afición a estos quehaceres y siento no disponer de más tiempo para practicarlos” (Pardo Bazán qtd. in Bravo-Villasante 281). Yet, her emphasis on the contentment she derives from kitchen activities underscores precisely Pardo Bazán’s distance from her middle-class readers. Cooking can be a pleasure for her since, as an aristocrat and a woman who supports her lifestyle through her writing, she has little direct involvement in the management of her household. This contrasts with the lifestyle of a middle-class woman who, though she likely has at least one servant, is
responsible for meal planning, provisioning, and preparation, as well as cleaning, washing clothes, and ensuring that the house has cooking and heating fuel.8

In practically every text in which she talks about food, her cookbooks, or her interest in cooking and recipes, Pardo Bazán acknowledges the surprise others express upon learning that she has written cookbooks. In _La cocina española antigua_, she writes, “y como me han visto aficionada a estudios más habituales en el otro sexo, puede que se sorprendan de que salga de mis manos, o mejor dicho, de mis carpetas, un libro del fogón” (C.E.A 4). In the “Mi libro de cocina” article, she writes: “No es descriptible la sorpresa de mucha gente, ante una noticia que, a mi corto entender, no tiene nada de particular” (220).

The surprise elicited by her interest in cooking and her publication of cookbooks underscores the contradictions that characterize her public intellectual profile. Pardo Bazán recounts examples of the harassment she received for being a female public intellectual, from being labeled a “fruto de una equivocación de la naturaleza” and “un desaforado marimacho” to having the state of her household speculated about during a public lecture: “¡Buena tendrá su casa esta señora!” (“Mi libro . . .” 221). Pardo Bazán takes care to remind readers that easy categorizations of occupation according to gender are inaccurate; for example, the “calle de Bordadores” in Madrid refers to male embroiderers rather than to the females who do that job (221). By placing her career and society’s expectations of gender conformity in the forefront while writing about cooking, Pardo Bazán both highlights her

---

8 For example, in her 1911 novel _Dulce dueño_, the protagonist, Lina, lives in poverty and yet she maintains her status as a middle-class señorita even as she struggles to keep her hands from acquiring the red roughness of a working-class woman. Lina employs one servant who helps her with the cooking and cleaning, though she cannot afford to buy this servant proper brooms.
distance from her readers and, at the same time, makes her womanliness a central aspect of this project.

We can see a final example of the difference Pardo Bazán creates between herself and her readers in her letter to Barreiro. Describing the cookbooks, she writes, “No soy Doctora en el arte de Muro, Dumas, Rossini, Brillat Savarin y Picadillo, pero jamás vi incompatibilidad entre él y las letras” (qtd. in Bravo-Villasante 281). The names she mentions all belong to well-known, male professional writers who have published texts on cooking and cuisine; Pardo Bazán identifies no other women. Although she assesses her culinary skills as inferior to those of the men—“No soy Doctora en el arte”—Pardo Bazán frames her writing about food in dialogue with the work of these male writers who chronicled cooking and cuisine in Spain. Consequently, she announces to her friend that the cookbooks do not merely signal a late-blossoming femininity. On the contrary, they contribute to an existing body of writing about food, by men, that has already won public respect.

Carmen Bravo-Villasante, in her biography of Pardo Bazán, offers an anecdote that illustrates Pardo Bazán’s tricky negotiation between her interest in women, domestic life, and possibilities for women, and maintaining her own status as a woman rendered “androgynous” by her public career (Tolliver 33-34). During a 1905 visit to Salamanca,

[s]e aloja doña Emilia en casa de Unamuno; como en un momento de intimidad, como mujer curiosa que es, pregunta a la esposa de Unamuno si

---

9 Ángel Muro was a cookbook writer and journalist. Alexander Dumas wrote about his travels and meals in Spain in his Grand dictionnaire de cuisine (1873). Jean-Anselme Brillat Savarin authored La Physiologie du Goût (1825). Manuel Puga y Parga, or Picadillo, was a Galician newspaper editor and cookbook writer. Pardo Bazán authored the prologue to his La cocina práctica (1905).
Pardo Bazán’s friendship and professional relationship with Unamuno is the reason for her stay in his home. Her curiosity to know if Unamuno’s wife might share a similar position to her own as an intellectual woman motivates her question to “la hogareña señora.” That Pardo Bazán’s response to the hogareña woman’s disavowal of such a position is to present her a copy of the cookbook reveals Pardo Bazán’s contradictory position: she is concerned for the social welfare of other women, but her participation in the male-dominated public sphere distances her from them.

This distance between her life as an intellectual woman and the lives of a middle or working-class woman becomes more visible in Pardo Bazán’s disillusioned comments in La cocina española antigua about her attempt to introduce feminism to Spain by publishing the Biblioteca de la Mujer, a series she began in 1892. Pardo Bazán describes her attempt to make the series appealing to an imagined female readership by including a variety of texts, from the devotional—Vida de la Virgen María—to the historical—Historia de Isabél la Católica. The

10 This is not the only occasion on which Pardo Bazán presented a cookbook to Unamuno’s wife. In an informal conversation, Pardo Bazán scholar Rubén Rodríguez Jiménez related his finding among letters at Unamuno’s house that Pardo Bazán also sent a copy of her La cocina española antigua to Unamuno with instructions that he should pass it along to his wife. This exchange demonstrates Pardo Bazán’s positioning of herself as Unamuno’s intellectual peer, rather than his wife’s domestic peer. Sending the book to Unamuno also indicates her desire that he take notice of her publication of a cookbook.

11 Pardo Bazán identifies feminism as the central focus of her Biblioteca de la mujer and, given her participation in international conferences and knowledge of intellectual trends from abroad, her use of the term aligns her work with articulations of feminism in England and the United States. It also indicates her engagement with feminism as a political project, rather than qualities of females, or femininity, other definitions of feminism offered by the Diccionario de la Real Academia.
poor sales of the first volumes motivated her decision to cease publication after the ninth volume (La mujer ante el socialismo). She continued the series in 1913 with the purpose of “enriquecer la Sección de Economía Doméstica,” since “la opinión sigue relegando a la mujer a las faenas caseras” (CEA 4). Indicating her own capitulation to the desires of “la opinión,” Pardo Bazan blames the patriarchal nature of public opinion for women’s previous disinterest in the series and in feminism.

However, Pardo Bazán also attributes the failure of her project to women themselves. She states that taking up the domain of cooking or domestic economy is a return to the “senda trillada,” or commonplace. This phrasing reveals her cynicism about both the opportunities society offers to women and women’s desire to take advantage of them. She continues this criticism in her letter to Barreiro,

He visto, sin género de duda, que aquí a nadie le interesan tales cuestiones [el feminismo], y a la mujer, aún menos [. . .] Aquí no hay sufragistas, ni mansas ni bravas. En vista de lo cual, y no gustando de luchar sin ambiente, he resuelto prestar amplitud a la Sección de Economía doméstica de dicha Biblioteca, y ya que no es útil hablar de derechos y adelantados femeninos, tratar gratamente de cómo se prepara el escabeche de perdices y la bizcochada de almendra. (qtd. in Tolliver 61)

12 The entry for this text in the Biblioteca Nacional’s catalogue does not mention a date. Gómez Trueba confirms that Pardo Bazán began the series in 1892.

13 Tolliver quotes Pardo Bazán’s letter to Barreiro, which Bravo Villasante reproduces in her 1973 biography (285).
Condemning the neglect of her project even by Spain’s educated female minority, Pardo Bazán continues: “Suponía yo que en España pudiera quizás interesar este problema, cuando menos, a una ilustrada minoría. No tardé en darme cuenta de que no era así” (CEA 4). Furthermore, she expresses her annoyance that even in the years since she began the Biblioteca (in 1892) the interest expressed in feminism, an issue much debated outside of Spain, had been only isolated and superficial: “en los años transcurridos no se hubiesen presentado sino aislados y epidérmicos indicios de que el problema feminista, que tanto se debate y profundiza en el extranjero, fijase la atención aquí” (4).

Thus, on the one hand, Pardo Bazán writes her cookbook “insistently as a woman” (Tolliver 38); her multiple comments about the surprise elicited by her authorship of it places her womanliness front and center.14 On the other hand, Pardo Bazán also participates in a masculinist critique of women as insufficiently intellectually prepared to support feminism in Spain and not to be counted on even to read about it. In sum, in the first few paragraphs of La cocina española antigua, Pardo Bazán introduces the project as a woman, distances herself from that image of the woman whose voice she has just adopted, and criticizes that woman for not being smart enough to engage with feminism as a result of having being relegated by “la opinión” to “las faenas caseras” (4). This rhetorical strategy allows Pardo Bazán to present Spain’s lack of preparedness for feminism as the fault of both “la opinión” and of women themselves. Pardo Bazán subverts the ideology of domesticity by presenting

14 In Cigar Smoke and Violet Water, Tolliver analyzes Pardo Bazán’s gendered writing and shows how she reproduces “dominant discourse” and its ideology only to undermine that ideology in the same text (38). No doubt Pardo Bazán’s frustration with the lack of success of her Biblioteca is genuine. At the same time, her rhetorical criticism of the women to whom these books are directed is an example of the gendered code switching that Tolliver finds in Pardo Bazán’s essays and other writing.
feminism and domesticity, in the form of home cooking, as complementary discourses and by attributing to women the authorship of recipes and texts that comprise a national, public discourse. Nevertheless, she also reproduces the hegemonic ideology of the moment by indicating that women in Spain are not prepared or suited to participate in the public sphere.\(^{15}\)

Pardo Bazán had good reason to be disappointed in women and in the role they were accorded in Spanish public life. In “La mujer española,” published in 1890, twenty-three years before the cookbooks, Pardo Bazán describes her belief that middle-class women in Spain should be able to aspire to a greater role in Spain’s public life. She criticizes the sexual double standard of gender roles in Spain, which define women only in their relationship to men, and argues that the insufficiencies of women’s education are responsible for perpetuating women’s inferiority to men (Tolliver 15). While a good education for men is considered an honor, she notes, education is a dishonor for women. The period between “La mujer española” and her cookbooks saw few changes in education for Spanish women; women had few real opportunities to pursue a solid education, other than training in Catholic religious doctrine. In her “Mi libro de cocina” article, Pardo Bazán mentions that the state opened paths to public life for women by allowing them to study, for example, in

\(^{15}\) In another passage of her prologue to _La cocina española antigua_, Pardo Bazán performs this gendered code switching as a transition into her discussion of cooking as an important Spanish ethnographic artifact: “En esta cuestión de la cocina, como en todas las que a la mujer se refieren, la gente suele equivocarse. Sin recordar la superioridad de los cocineros respecto a las cocineras, se da a entender que la cocina es cosa esencialmente femenil” (4). She acknowledges that male cooks are superior to female cooks, although this fact is forgotten by unnamed others, perhaps “la opinión,” who understand cooking as essentially female. In this passage, Pardo Bazán performs a careful rhetorical dance, acknowledging the masculinist ideology of Spain and the superiority of men as cooks, the public opinion that easily forgets that fact, and the subsequent consideration of cooking as an essentially female domain.
official educational centers. However, she refers obliquely to the power of social pressures to hold women back, equating women being “allowed” a career to being “allowed” to grasp at the moon: “es como si le permitiese coger la luna, porque son escasísimas las mujeres que siguen carrera” (“Mi libro…” 223).

Reflecting on her disappointment in her female interlocutors in her article, “Mi libro de cocina,” Pardo Bazán tempers her critique of Spanish women with an acknowledgement of how resistant society is to the changes she proposed in her Biblioteca de la mujer: “comprendí también que con el ambiente no se lucha con inmediato resultado” (223). She also signals a more positive view of the possibility of overcoming (dominarlo) the perhaps natural impulses that guide women’s interest in domestic life rather than public opportunities: “Conviene adaptarse a lo que es más fuerte que nosotros, en espera de poder algún día, quizás, dominarlo” (223). Nonetheless, the overwhelming impression Pardo Bazán presents of her contemporary female readers is one of deep ambivalence. In contrast to the role she outlines for the popular women of the past, the women she names the custodians of Spain’s culinary traditions, Pardo Bazán’s ambivalent portrayal of Spain’s modern women would seem to make them irrelevant to the project of writing these cookbooks. Why does Pardo Bazán even address them?

2.3 “Cartas de la Condesa”: From the Fear of the Working Class to Culinary Philology

Pardo Bazán reveals her motivation for writing these cookbooks in an article she published in the La Habana, Cuba newspaper, the Diario de la Marina, on October 22, 1911, “Cartas de la Condesa (Sobre la huelga, la filología de la cocina, El Diccionario de la
Academia)."\textsuperscript{16} The themes in the article’s title seem unrelated, and yet Pardo Bazán begins the article very seriously with a terrified description of contemporary life. Beginning with the exclamation “¡La actualidad!”, she laments the chaos of modern life and current events in Spain (“Cartas. . .” 143). She acknowledges the responsibility she feels as a writer to chronicle contemporary life: “Yo reconozco que es la musa del cronista; que debe acercarse a él, sonriente y apresurada, y, llevándole la mano y la pluma, inspirarle esas cosas del momento, que pasan como la ola” (143). Yet she also expresses a fundamental distaste for turmoil, or “agitación y ruido hondo,” characteristic of that life (143). Contemporary life, which she characterizes as having “una cara mucho más fea que la del pecado,” distances Pardo Bazán from the erudite, educated life she leads, “nuestros ensueños y nuestras curiosidades eruditas [. . .]” (143).

Pardo Bazán’s strong reaction to contemporary life was provoked by the Socialist UGT’s declaration of a statewide general strike in Spain on September 17, 1911, but her description of the “huelgas aquí y acullá, de esas huelgas turbias, con sombrío matiz político y antisocial y revolucionario” responds to a more general political and social landscape characterized by working class and peasant strikes, protests, violence, and terrorism that had

\textsuperscript{16} Pardo Bazán wrote a regular column for the \textit{Diario de la Marina}. In her critical compilation of Pardo Bazán’s \textit{Diario de la Marina} articles published between 1909 and 1921, Juliana Sinovas Maté notes that Pardo Bazán’s column covered topics ranging from theater openings, literature, and book reviews, to politics, feminism, and fashion, in addition to cuisine and cooking. Both Sinovas Maté and Eduardo Ruiz-Ocaña, author of \textit{La obra periodística de Emilia Pardo Bazán en La Ilustración de Barcelona}, state that Pardo Bazán published these articles in a variety of American periodicals for income (Ruiz-Ocaña Dueñas 24-25). In addition to writing articles for the \textit{Diario de la Marina} (La Habana) and \textit{La Nación} (Argentina), Pardo Bazán’s publications also appeared in \textit{Fray Mucho} (Buenos Aires), \textit{Plus Ultra} (New York), \textit{La Tribuna} (New York) and \textit{La Revista Ilustrada} (New York). Pardo Bazán was a popular contributor to newspapers serving “colonias de gallegos, españoles e hispanohablantes” (Sinovas Maté 15), which helped readers to keep abreast of events in Spain relating to daily life, politics, literature, art, feminism, and the economy. For example, Pardo Bazán encouraged her female \textit{hispanoamericana} readers to buy and use lace fabricated in Spain after the destruction of French and Belgian lace factories in the First World War.
intensified in the first decade of the twentieth century ("Cartas. . ." 142). Following Spain’s 1868 Gloriosa revolution, politicians of the First Republic (lasting from 1873 to 1874) implemented radical changes in the form of universal (masculine) suffrage, freedom of the press, decentralization, freedoms of association and commerce, the disappearance of consumption taxes, and the abolishment of obligatory military service, but they failed to enact the economic and social reforms that would grant stability to a democratic Spain. Antonio Cánovas de Castillo’s orchestration of the Restoration constitutional monarchy returned stability to Spain in 1874; however, the context of the Sexenio had made possible the inclusion of a plurality of political voices in Parliament; for example, universal suffrage allowed Carlists to have representation in Parliament. At the same time, the working class began to organize through political channels; Marxist socialists formed La Nueva Federación Madrileña 1872, which, in 1887, paved the way for the formation of the Partido Obrero Socialista Español and the socialist Unión General de Trabajadores (Martin 96).

Despite worker party organization through official channels, this period saw a series of protests, strikes, and violence perpetrated by anarchists, socialists, and radical republicans. The UGT organized local strikes and work stoppages in the 1890s, and both opposed (in 1890) and supported (in 1905, 1911, and 1917) general strikes throughout the first decades of the twentieth century. Anarchists, too, organized general strikes and work stoppages, for example in favor of the eight-hour work day in 1890, which ended only with the state’s declaration of martial law.  

17 Socialists, republicans, and anarchists also developed educational programs, for example Ferrer’s Modern School in Barcelona. Worker groups and organizations theorized that the revolution would come about
instigated attacks against the state beginning in the 1870s. They burned harvests and factories in the 1880s; occupied Jerez de la Frontera on January 8, 1892; attacked public buildings (the Fomento de Trabajo in 1891 and the Barcelona Liceu opera house in 1893\(^{18}\)); bombed the 1896 Corpus Christi parade in Barcelona\(^ {19}\); and carried out assassination attempts against General Martínez Campos in Barcelona (in 1893), against prime minister Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (in 1897), against Alfonso XIII (in May 1905, May 1906, and April 1913), against conservative prime minister Antonio Maura (in 1904 and 1912), and against liberal prime minister José Canalejas (on November 12, 1912). They succeeded in killing Cánovas del Castillo and Canalejas (Boar web).

Responding to the worker violence that had marred Spain’s public and political life for so long, Pardo Bazán characterizes the strikes in Spain as “antisocial y revolucionario; y revolucionario, sin ideal” (“Cartas. . .” 143). By calling the strikes “revolucionario sin ideal,” Pardo Bazán refuses to acknowledge the concerns of strikers in Spain as valid. She admits that certain strikes and revolutions are justified, for example those that “han podido ayudar a las evoluciones, ser el tirón del comadrón que saca a luz la criatura cuyo nacimiento se retrasa, y salva a la madre en peligro de muerte” (143). The changes brought about by justified revolutions, according to Pardo Bazán, are recognized and legitimized “a posteriori, si

---

18 The bombing resulted in 22 deaths; 10 individuals were detained for the crime and 6 were executed.

19 As a result of this attack, the state cracked down again on anarchists, which resulted in the arrest of over 400 anarchists, *sindicalistas*, intellectuals, and workers. In what became known as the “proceso de Montjuic,” six individuals were tortured and condemned to death.
fueron en efecto aspiraciones con algo de legítimo sostenidas mediante la violencia” (143-144). However, she labels the strikes occurring in Spain and the accompanying violence as merely “parodias del monstruoso modelo de la Commune francesa” (144). Her characterization of worker unrest in Spain as illegitimate transforms the working class into a frightening mass of people completely separate from the romantic image of the pueblo she reifies in La cocina española antigua. She presents a dehumanizing portrait of the working class: 

la destrucción por la destrucción, el crimen por el crimen; la obra oscura e informe de la multitud desenfrenada, una larva que sale de las tinieblas, un espectro que toma cuerpo, y más que con sus actos, espanta con su figura, con la forma de horror goyesco que adquiere al mostrarse a la luz del sol, el cual, como ha notado exactamente d’Annunzio, acrecienta las sensaciones del espanto, precisándolas [. . .]. (144)

The working class are diabolical parasites, specters of danger, violence, and fear. Describing a political caricature from thirty years earlier in which politicians were represented as saying one thing while the view into their opened skulls revealed their true ambition, Pardo Bazán equates her rhetorical caricature of the rioting working classes to that poster, accusing the working class of masking material desires and violent behavior in the language of revolution:

Pues bien, estos sucesos horribles nos han revelado lo que había en el cráneo de esas muchedumbres. Había el reparto de las tierras, [. . .]; había el asesinato, estúpido, feroz; el juez de Sueca con la cabeza colgando, del hachazo que le descargaron; su actuario arrojado al río con una piedra sobre el pecho, para que no se salvase, después de acribillado de heridas y golpes; había las casas saqueadas, los muebles lanzados por las ventanas, aplastando
The list of violent acts presented in this passage reproduces the terror provoked by the strikes and paints worker unrest with the darkness of the referenced events, even as Pardo Bazán sarcastically questions workers’ revolutionary ideals. The “juez de Sueca” she mentions is an allusion to a particularly violent event that took place during the September 1911 uprisings in Cullera, Spain, a small town outside of Valencia. In an attempt to quell the worker unrest there, a judge and three government officials traveled to Cullera and were subsequently brutally murdered, in part due to their heavy-handed attempts to bring order to the town. In a judicial overreaction, seven of the individuals held responsible for the killings were sentenced to death in 1912, but international protests and pressure from the Left resulted in the pardon of all seven alleged perpetrators (JDJ web).

The events at Cullera give force to Pardo Bazán’s rejection of the notion that protesting workers and peasants have legitimate reasons to revolt. She sees neither hunger nor desperation, which would justify the strikes, as motivating issues for Spanish protesters:

[. . .] y esto ni siquiera procedía del hambre, de la desesperación, como los atentados de la horda que describe Zola en *Germinal*, ni de la vergüenza de la invasión y la derrota, las largas privaciones impuestas por el sitio, la enormidad del desastre nacional, orígenes secretos quizás de la locura incendiaria de la *Commune* [. . .]. (“Cartas . . .” 144)

In her reading, hunger, desperation, poverty, and national disaster justifiably motivated the *Commune*. And yet, she ignores the fact that hunger was a chronic feature of the lives of the
Although the small farms in the north of Spain produced sufficient food to sustain the region’s population, assuming sufficient rainfall and adequate soil quality, peasants living on farms with poor soil or little rain lived in semi-starvation (Brenan 93). On the larger estates, for example those in Castile, Extremadura, and La Mancha, peasants often had their long-term leases converted to short-term ones, forcing them to pay increasing rents to absent landlords. They not infrequently paid both the taxes on the land and a second rent to the managing steward. In 1929, the vast majority of tenants or landlords (847,548 of 1,026,412) subsisted on less than one peseta of daily earnings (113). In Andalucía, the latifundia system created an “agricultural proletariat” (120). Three quarters of the population of this region worked only part of the year, starved during periods of unemployment without shop credit, received no relief from the state or church, and lived in a state of “chronic hunger and malnutrition” even greater than in other areas of Spain (120). Families often had no furniture other than a cooking pot, ate their meals on the ground, and, even during harvest times, subsisted on gazpacho and bread provided by the landlords.

The cities of Spain may have offered some improvement in lifestyle to the peasants who emigrated from the countryside (Brenan 124). However, Benjamin Martin characterizes urban life for the working class as fraught by “malnutrition, disease, overwork, deficient housing, and unhealthy working conditions” (Martin 48). Mortality rates from 1890 through the first decades of the twentieth century were significantly higher in Spanish cities than in
industrialized and undeveloped cities elsewhere in Europe. The urban poor were vulnerable to epidemics of typhus, cholera, and smallpox, fueled by the cramped living quarters resulting from a shortage of housing and endemic malnutrition. The wages of the average male worker were insufficient to support families. In 1913 an average daily wage in Madrid ranged from 3.85 to 4 pesetas, whereas a family of four required 5.75 pesetas to meet basic needs, due largely to the high price of food and other essential goods. Workers during the first decade of the twentieth century spent two-thirds to three-quarters of their earnings on food, compared to 34% in Brussels and 30% in Paris; “meat in 1909 was more expensive in Barcelona than in London.”

Subsistence crises often motivated labor conflicts and social protests, among them the general strike of 1917, when the cost of food exceeded wages. The policies developed under both Liberal and Conservative Restoration governments systematically ignored the labor interests of workers in favor of the economic interests of landowners, financiers, and industrialists. When labor disputes disrupted public order in Spain’s cities and towns, understaffed law enforcement were unable to handle protesters, which resulted in violence and protests increasing during this period represents the greater organizational ability of organized labor, their political parties, and grassroots activists.

---

20 In 1890 in Cádiz, 44.6 per thousand; in 1900 in Seville, 40.7 per thousand. In 1910 in Madrid, 27 per thousand, compared to 17 per thousand for Paris. “Maura tells us that ‘a population of sickly, undernourished appearance was responsible for the fact that the mortality rate of Barcelona (24.1 per thousand) was much higher than that of London, Paris, New York and Tokyo [. . .]’” (Martin 49).

21 Martin recognizes that Conservative Maura and Liberal Canalejas, both in office between 1898 and 1912, were among the most successful Restoration prime ministers in creating policy to represent working class interests. That violence and protests increased during this period represents the greater organizational ability of organized labor, their political parties, and grassroots activists.
calls for military intervention. The fear that a revolution would destabilize Spain motivated quick government intervention.22

Pardo Bazán’s absurd dismissal of the poverty of Spain’s proletariat (and peasantry) is an expression of the depth of the ruling class’s fear of a proletarian revolution in Spain. Pardo Bazán ignores the complicity of the ruling class in Spain—the social class to which she belongs—in creating the conditions that led to working class revolts. Instead, she intimates that the living conditions of the working class in Spain compare favorably with conditions in France, and she accuses the rioting Spanish working classes of opportunism: “no; esto [the strike to which she refers] era una consigna, un programa de antemano redactado y adoptado, para ser ejecutado en el momento oportuno” (“Cartas. . .” 144). She accuses the rioters of planning and taking advantage of “el desorden, con el puñal, con las llamas [. . .]” (144). And she identifies emblematic buildings and women, and especially nuns, as innocent victims of the uprising:

[. . .] de antemano estaban consagrados al fuego, ciertos edificios, dentro de los cuales vivían inofensivas mujeres, bien ajenas al encarecimiento de los artículos de primera necesidad, bien sin culpa en lo de la guerra de Marruecos, bien alejadas de todo lo que fuera ruge: monjas contemplativas, monjas de enseñanza [. . .]. (144)

22 Martin notes that Catalonia saw the greatest political and social unrest and that citizens lived in an “estado de excepción” during which constitutional rights were suspended for more than sixty years, from 1814 to 1900 (243).
The mention of the “encarecimiento de los artículos de primera necesidad” and “la guerra de Marruecos” is intended to establish that innocent women and nuns were uninvolved in the social problems that motivated the violence.\(^{23}\) However, these comments also allude defensively to another worker uprising, Barcelona’s July 1909 *Semana Trágica*, and represent a recognition that the violence was indeed born of hunger.

Adding to the hardships experienced by Spain’s urban working class, the government levied taxing military demands on those who, unlike the landowning classes, could not pay the 2,000/1,500-peseta *redención* to escape conscription. Worse, the state could not compensate soldiers adequately, leaving those conscripted unable to provide for their families. The call-up of reserve soldiers from Barcelona to fight another colonial war in Morocco spurred the violent events of the *Semana Trágica*. The call-up virtually assured the destitution of the working class families affected, not to mention the fact that conscripted soldiers both left Spain and returned malnourished. Peaceful protests in opposition to the war, organized and supported by socialists, radical republicans, *Solidaridad Obrera* members, and anarchists, began on July 26th, initially, with the support of the middle class, factory owners, and law enforcement officials.

However, the situation quickly grew tense, in part due violent denouncements of the war in Barcelona’s Republican newspapers. The strike committee lost control of the protest, which morphed into a generalized riot led by no particular party or union organization.

---

\(^{23}\) According to Carr, “violent anti-clericalism [was] the most immediate means of attack on bourgeois values” for Lerroux’s radical Republicans (*Modern 50*).
Alejandro Lerroux’s radical Republican leaders directed rioters to target religious institutions; forty religious schools, churches, convents, and welfare centers were burned as well as twelve parish churches (Martin 139). People shot at those below from balconies and rooftops, armories were attacked, and electricity was shut down. Civil governor Ángel Ossorio had originally planned to let the insurrection run its course, but he was pressured to declare martial law by minister of the interior Juan de la Cierva. Since many soldiers already in Barcelona refused to participate in subduing the riots, troop reinforcements had to be sent, arriving in the city on July 28th.

The government also acted to prevent the general strike from spreading beyond Barcelona, Sabadell, Terrassa, Reus, Vilanova, and Badalona throughout Spain, particularly to Madrid, where a general strike had already been planned for August 2nd. Activists and party leaders fled either to France or to rural Catalonia to avoid imprisonment. The insurrection came to an end, due to the “excessive harshness” of the state’s suppression, on August 1st, but the entire country remained in a state of martial law until September 27th, and Catalonia until November 7th (Martin 140-141).

Three priests died in the violence, nine policemen and soldiers were killed, 104 civilians died, and 216 were wounded. As a result of the uprising, 2,500 individuals were imprisoned and 1,725 were indicted. Five individuals were executed, including the leader of the anarchist Modern School, Francisco Ferrer, which led to outrage throughout Spain and

——

24 Lerroux (1864-1949) led the radical wing of Republicans. Reformist Republicans were headed by a group of university intellectuals for whom “the form of the regime, which lay at the heart of historic Republicanism, was less important than the implementation of a practical programme of democratic and social reforms” (Carr Modern 49). Lerroux succeeded in forming an alliance with the working class—the Barcelona proletariat—and led a political fight, via machine politics, against the Catalan bourgeoisie (gent de bé) with a platform that attacked “religion, property, and the family” (Carr Modern 50).
abroad. The final casualty of the uprising was political: Alfonso XIII requested prime minister Antonio Maura’s resignation.25

Pardo Bazán’s diatribe against worker uprisings reflects the anxiety and instability that these uprisings caused in a state made fragile by its loss of colonial markets in 1898. Personally horrifying to her is the recognition that these individuals share none of her values; “revolutionaries” burned both works of art and “edificios que representan riqueza” (“Cartas. . .” 144). Radical, striking workers, according to Pardo Bazán, have no interest in the art they burn, nor, by extension, can they appreciate cuisine as a similarly valuable cultural artifact. This portrayal of the working class is entirely divorced from the image of the pueblo she manipulates in La cocina española antigua to invent a Spanish national cuisine.

In fact, Pardo Bazán invokes two very different images of the lower classes in her writing: the inhabitants of “las localidades” who preserve the recipes she collects as representations of Spain’s “cocina antigua” (CEA 5) and the protagonists of the “huelgas turbias, con sombrío matiz político y antisocial y revolucionario” she describes in “Cartas de la condesa” (143). These two images reflect a wider transition in the understanding of pueblo, identified by Derek Flitter in Spanish Romanticism and the Uses of History (2006). Flitter argues that nineteenth-century Spanish intellectuals used history to provide organizing notions of “Spanishness” in order to contain and repress expressions of revolutionary ideas that might

25 Following the events of the Semana Trágica, Solidaridad Obrera, the moderate labor organization that previously tried to represent all the labor bodies—socialists, anarchists, Lerroux’s republicans—delayed its planned meeting from September 1909 until the next year. In the 1910 meeting, delegates voted to form a new organization, the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo. The anarchist CNT held its first conference in Barcelona in September 1911.
have travelled from France to Spain.\textsuperscript{26} A vision of Spain as a democratic liberal state (elaborated by the authors of the 1812 Constitution and again during the \textit{Gloriosa} and \textit{Sexenio Democrático}) and its accompanying modernization brought with it frightening elements from the French Revolution that intellectuals hoped to downplay; for example, the notion that the working classes and peasantry would become “citizens” with the right to participate in and shape the politics of Spain. Democracy would require the restructuring of traditional values and social relationships, which politicians in the early twentieth century sought to manage by implementing social reforms from above.

The impetus of modernization is also reflected in the transition in the concept of \textit{pueblo}. While the \textit{pueblo} once signified the “essentially nostalgic conservative Romantic picture of ‘the people’ as collective imaginative construct organically transmitting a stable cultural legacy” (Fox qtd. in Flitter 130-131), the new meaning of \textit{pueblo} connoted “a pro-active political subject” (130) that offered a focus for ideological radicalism. These manifestations of \textit{pueblo} came into conflict during the Restoration monarchy, which lasted from 1875 to 1923 and spanned the lives of two monarchs. In her cookbooks, Pardo Bazán presents the traditional Romantic \textit{Volk}/ \textit{pueblo} as a powerful force in nation formation. In \textit{La cocina española antigua} Pardo Bazán links the food cultivated, prepared, and eaten by the “elemento popular” to \textit{Don Quijote} and identifies popular recipes as the cultural and ethnographic documents that characterize a Spanish national way of eating and cooking. However, the recipes themselves mark a shift in the conceptualization both of cooking and of the popular

\textsuperscript{26} Other uses of history identified by Flitter include the medieval revival, the rejection of the Enlightenment, the Romantic perception of Two Spains, and the construction of a \textit{castizista} cultural identity and literary history.
classes. In her cookbooks, Pardo Bazán appropriates the knowledge (the recipes and dishes) supposedly created by the less-threatening Romantic pueblo for the use of the middle class. She also exploits the image of this safe manifestation of the pueblo by characterizing it as a repository for Spain’s culinary traditions, in contrast to the dangerous, ideologically radical pueblo against whom she writes in her “Cartas de la Condesa” article.

The function of philology

In the “Cartas de la condesa” article, Pardo Bazán proposes to escape the “tristes páginas” of her discussion of the striking workers by finding refuge in philology and discussion about food. In order to “dar esquinazo a la actualidad, y charlar de cualquier otra cosa [. . .],” Pardo Bazán turns to “lo más sencillo, de lo más inocente; de lo que no pesa sobre el pensamiento ni sobre el espíritu. Hablemos pues un poco de filología a propósito de cocina” (145).

However, the rhetorical contrast between the violence of “la actualidad” and the apparently esoteric, erudite concern about how dictionaries represent the vocabulary of food and cooking masks the links between the two domains. The violence upsets her, causes confusion, alienates her as a learned person who values art and culture from a mass of people for whom she assumes those signifiers have no meaning. The representation of cooking and philology, together, as a refuge from contemporary society or as a figurative domain that remains distant from literal violence obscures the fact that food is not an issue separate from the uprisings of the working class. Pardo Bazán acknowledges this indirectly when she mentions hunger as a legitimate justification for an uprising: “y esto ni siquiera procedía del hambre, de la desesperación [. . .]” (“Cartas. . .” 144). She insists, however, that
the Spanish riots are illegitimate, when compared to the Commune, and dismisses the notion that food issues motivated working class strikes from 1868 through the first two decades of the twentieth century.

By assimilating cocina into philology, Pardo Bazán redefines the meaning of cocina; her conceptualization of cocina no longer refers only to the act of preparing foods. Rather, the cocina Pardo Bazán enjoys is contained in books and print texts: “Es grato, cuando el mundo anda tan revuelto, y no nos incumbe arreglarlo, cultivar la menudencia, y hasta la cominería: hojear libritos para encontrar en ellos cosas inesperadas” (“Cartas. . .” 145). The books she mentions represent an escape from the problems of an overwhelming, tumultuous world that Pardo Bazán says she has no role in solving. The phrase, “y no nos incumbe arreglarlo [the world],” indicates the pleasure she finds in her irresponsibility for and irrelevance to political current events (145). After identifying the Diccionario de la Lengua as one of these books into which one can escape, she asks, “¿Qué tienen que ver con la cocina estas observaciones?” (145).27

In answer, Pardo Bazán offers her interest in collecting recipes, storing them, and thinking about the words that communicate them:

Es el caso que soy aficionada a recoger recetas, y alguna que otra vez, en el caso rarísimo de tener tiempo, a ensayarlas; y, al guardar una fórmula en el cajón donde las voy echando, me ocurre frecuentemente el deseo de conocer bien las voces que las recetas encierran.” (“Cartas. . .” 145, italics mine)
Pardo Bazán’s description of her recipes and the box where she stores them corresponds to the structure, form, and function of the *Diccionario*. She collects recipes, keeps them in a box, and converts these instructions for the preparation of food into containers for ideas and language, just as a dictionary stores words. Furthermore, her statement about these recipes evokes the idea of the recipe as privileged artifact. Consequently, Pardo Bazán sees cooking and food not uniquely as a practice (for which she has little time, as she takes care to inform her readers), but primarily as a text.

Pardo Bazán’s philological construction of cuisine requires understanding her wish to “conocer bien las voces que las recetas encierran” (“Cartas. . .” 145), not as the recognition of the link between a recipe and its author, who, in the example of *La cocina española antigua*, would be a woman of the popular classes in Spain from whom she gathered the recipes for that book. Morag Shiach’s analysis of Highland society and Ossian’s poetry reveals that the “re-discovery’ of oral popular traditions was used by the upper classes, not to empower, or even recognize, those who had produced and preserved the tradition,” but only to support an “imaginary” of national unity and identity (7). Pardo Bazán’s allusions to the women from whom she collected the recipes in *La cocina española antigua* reinforce this idea. The custodians of Spain’s traditional cuisine may be the “vejezuelas [. . .] depositarias de fórmulas hoy perdidas” or the women of the *localidades* who hide or adulterate their *fórmulas* from Pardo Bazán (*CEA* 5). Yet, the images of these members of the (safe) *pueblo* serve Pardo Bazán’s construction of an imaginary of Spain’s national unity.28

---

28 Even though the breadth of the project spans all of Spain—“Excuso advertir que no presumo de haber recogido ni siquiera gran parte de los platos tradicionales” (*CEA* 3)—Pardo Bazán recognizes few individuals as contributors of the recipes in her cookbooks. The few who do receive credit for contributing recipes are
The unnamed collective of women whose voces might have communicated the recipes Pardo Bazán collects hold no interest for her as individuals. Instead, the voces that interest her are the dictionary meanings of the words in the recipes. Her aim is to reveal how the Diccionario de la Academia and its authors do a disservice to their community and nation by using esoteric language about food. For example, she writes that she does not find references to fish commonly consumed in Spain—“Al ‘pargo’ no le nombra; la ’sama’ sufre igual suerte; la ’lubina’ también se la comen, sin salsa” (“Cartas. . .” 146). She ridicules how the dictionary writers define the tortilla, “un plato vulgar, casero, universal,” according to Pardo Bazán, as “una ‘fritada’ de huevos batidos en aceite o manteca, hecha en figura redonda a manera de torta, y en la cual se incluye, de ordinario, otro manjar” (147). Pardo Bazán criticizes these dictionary authors for affecting a casticismo that alienates speakers of the language: “Hay en todo esto una afectación de casticismo que en mi concepto lo empeora. La Academia debe ser castiza; pero lo castizo no es lo insólito, lo desechado, lo que ningún español entiende” (147). The irony is that even as she takes refuge in philology to escape everyday life, she criticizes philologists for misrepresenting that everyday life by disdaining the culinary vocabulary ordinary people use to talk about food. So philology is not a refuge from daily life as much as it is a refuge from a class of citizens for whom she assumes philology has no meaning.

Pardo Bazán’s peers or acquaintances, members of the middle class or aristocracy; she only names her housekeeper, “la mayordoma de las Torres de Meirás” specifically (CEA 58).
Cooking as text

The discussion about philology shows how Pardo Bazán’s construction of a Spanish national cuisine in *La cocina española antigua* relocates cooking from the domain of practice into the world of language and print-discourse, and thus marginalizes non-readers from the project of culinary nation-building. However, examining the invention of Spanish cuisine in her cookbooks also reveals the invented nature of the cuisine itself.

The transformation of cooking from a practice to a print-text discourse contained in cookbooks represents one example of the transformation of popular practices and cultural knowledge wrought by the technological changes that occurred as part of Spain’s modernization. Circulating printed recipes in newspapers, as did Picadillo in his *El Noroeste* column, or publishing them in cookbooks like Pardo Bazán’s, converts the practices of the domestic kitchen into a written public discourse and, in the case of Pardo Bazán, a canonical, nation-building discourse. Converting cooking into text also modifies the practice of cooking; it changes the way cooking creates meaning and it imposes literacy as a prerequisite to participation in the nation through cooking.

In *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word* (2002), Walter Ong notes that the ideological consequences of scholars’ focus on “texts” led to assumptions that oral and written verbalizations were identical, with the supposed oral equivalent not worthy of study.

---

29 Rupert de Nola’s *Llibre de Coch* (1520) is recognized as the first cookbook in Spain. Between the time Nola created this recipe book and the late nineteenth century, most cookbooks were written for a professional class of male cooks who worked in the homes of the aristocracy. Cookbooks as texts for a domestic audience appear in the late nineteenth century, even though women who could write kept recipes for food and medicines in private notebooks prior to this period.

30 “Picadillo” was the nickname of Manuel Puga y Parga. He was the editor of the Galician periodical *El Noroeste*, in which he published a column about food, cooking, and recipes. Pardo Bazán also authored the prologue to his 1905 cookbook, *La cocina práctica*. 
But oral and written verbalizations are not identical; oral tradition does not have the “residue or deposit” that written words signal (11). Ong writes, “when an often-told oral story is not actually being told, all that exists of it is the potential in certain human beings to tell it” (11). Ong’s idea that “oral literature” cannot exist, since it illustrates an inability to conceive of an alternative epistemology’s organization of knowledge, suggests that, in the case of cooking, knowledge that circulates orally between individuals in a community cannot share the written form of a recipe in a cookbook nor can it form a culinary canon in parallel to a literary one.

According to Jack Goody, the defining characteristic of a recipe is that it is written (136). He describes how committing a practice of preparing a food to paper can mask parts of those instructions as much as reveal them. Recipe instructions acquire the form of a shorthand vocabulary made necessary purely by the act of creating a written recipe. Furthermore, recipes and their instructions depersonalize, make objective, and impose a standardization of ingredients and practice. This standardization exists in contrast to the improvisation based on “knowledge of cooking acquired by participation rather than by instruction [. . .] and tied to the ingredients readily available” (140).

Luce Giard’s definition of “doing-cooking” in The Practice of Everyday Life: Volume 2: Living and Cooking describes the essential “poetry of words” that translates cooking as “gestures” (154). Cooking knowledge born of the ritual and repetition of movements and motion is “rooted in the fabric of relationships to others and one’s self [. . .]” (157). Consequently, “doing-cooking” is active and only incompletely representable in the textual form that the recipe imposes. Ong’s insistence on oral and written knowledge as distinct epistemological fields and Goody’s classification of the recipe as a form that belongs only to written knowledge make it difficult to imagine that cookbooks as a genre are meaningful to
the women who, using Giard’s term, “do-cooking” without also participating in literate culture. If a woman is unable to read a cookbook, the contents are meaningless since the information that they impart is incommunicable.

Thus, cuisine for Pardo Bazán is at least as much about written texts and the preservation of culinary vocabulary as about the dishes that make it to a household’s table. The community that participates in her project of cooking as a written text is one that Benedict Anderson links to modernization and nation formation. Women who do not read, and whose communities still function without the mediation of print, exist outside of this new way of conceiving of cooking as a textual discourse. Without access to literacy and books, these women are barred from access to the Spanish nation that Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks participate in writing into being, even though Pardo Bazán uses popular recipes—their recipes—as the foundation of the Spanish national cuisine she invents. In excluding the women of the pueblo, the very women whose popular practices she relies on to develop her cookbooks, she delineates a role for the modern, reading, middle-class women—those same women she criticized for their disinterest in feminism—in strengthening the Spanish nation.

2.4 Modern Reading Women, Modern Spanish Cuisine

Pardo Bazán’s appropriation of traditional recipes into text makes literacy a prerequisite to participation in the culinary nation-building project. Literate women will help her to construct a bulwark against the dangerous political impulses of the working classes. In contrast to Spain where the widespread growth in literacy rates took place in the early twentieth century, literacy expanded rapidly in Europe during the nineteenth century,
especially among women and the working class.\textsuperscript{31} This expansion was spurred by the diminishment of an urban/rural literacy divide, the development of state-sponsored public education, the shortening of the working-class workday, and the subsequent expansion of leisure time (Lyons 313-314).\textsuperscript{32} Prior to this period of growth, women’s reading had been confined to the home, where they were taught to read so that they could understand the Bible and catechism, or read aloud to family members while their husbands kept the family accounts. Increasing opportunities for female public employment as teachers or shop assistants did more to expand female literacy than formal education, which trailed the increase in literacy rather than serving as its catalyst. Female readers in the home functioned as “guardian[s] of custom, tradition and family ritual,” while the public development of the magazine industry and their female writers were viewed as a threat to domestic stability (Lyons 316).

Spain lagged behind the rest of Europe in literacy expansion. At the end of the nineteenth century, 55.8\% of Spanish men and 71.4\% of women were illiterate (Botrel \textit{Libros} 309). By 1930, those percentages had shrunk considerably; only 37\% of men and 47.5\% of women were illiterate. Literacy was one index of Spain’s modernization (Folguera Crespo

\textsuperscript{31} Lyons writes that in revolutionary France “about half” of men could read as compared to 30 percent of women. In Britain in 1850, 70 percent of men could read as compared to 50 percent of women. And, in 1871 Germany, the population was 88 percent literate. These statistics mask the variation between rural and urban dwellers. Nonetheless, Lyons pronounces that by 1890 “90 percent literacy had been almost uniformly reached, and the old discrepancy between men and women had disappeared” (313). Spain is not accounted for in Lyon’s description.

\textsuperscript{32} Though women and members of the working class, as new readers, provided new sources of revenue for publishing houses and periodicals, they also contributed to unease among social élites. Lyons mentions England’s 1848 revolutions as the motivation for the “spread of subversive and socialist literature, which reached the urban worker and a new audience in the country-side. [. . .] England’s new readers, who never bought a book or subscribed to a library, provided middle-class observers with a sense of discovery, tinged with fear” (315).
And female literacy, including access to education for women, provoked numerous debates. The Krausist *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* supported education for women as a central tenet of the nation’s progress (Johnson 15). And Pardo Bazán gave speeches and wrote articles in support of equal access to education for women, and in opposition to limiting women’s education to “obediencia, pasividad y sumisión” (Pardo Bazán qtd. in Folguera Crespo 464).

The expansion of literacy throughout Europe and Spain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and broadened opportunities for female formal education indicated the expansion of a reading public for all types of printed texts. However, Jean-François Botrel makes the point that a particular level of literacy does not automatically constitute a reading public. The ability to sign one’s name or read a contract does not correlate to the ability or desire to purchase books or magazines or engage in the latest literary and political debates. Literacy is a necessary foundation, but it does not automatically convey access to the cultural capital required to participate in literary and political culture transmitted through print.

The literary marketplace in Spain did grow tremendously during the first three decades of the twentieth century and expanded the production of literary texts with illustrations to benefit individuals learning to read (Louis 7-8), a practice that Botrel traces to

---

33 As an index of the “proceso de incorporación progresiva a la modernización del país,” according to Folguera Crespo (466), increases in literacy varied according to geography. For example, she cites the higher levels of illiteracy that characterized mostly rural, agricultural Murcia, Baleares, Galicia, while lower levels were characteristic of the more industrialized Navarra and Basque Country (466).

34 Pardo Bazán’s comment is from her 1892 article “La educación del hombre y de la mujer” (*Nuevo Teatro Crítico* 2 Oct. 1892). Female public education was a much-debated topic that inspired opinions from across the political spectrum. For example, moderates supported women’s education in typically feminine domains so that they could support themselves economically if necessary (Rosa Sensat and María Baldo in Folguera Crespo 465). Progressives supported women’s equal access to higher education, to the workplace and other “actividades liberales” (Rafael Torres Campo qtd. in Folguera Crespo 465).
nineteenth-century folletines (Creación 119). Anarchist Ateneos and socialist Casas del pueblo also facilitated access to texts and reading instruction. However, for working-class women throughout Europe, household obligations were primary. For working-class women who did read, according to Lyons, “to admit to reading was tantamount to confessing neglect of the woman’s family responsibilities. The idealized image of the housekeeper seemed incompatible with reading.” (Lyons 321). As a result, working-class women who did read “persisted in discrediting their own literary culture” (321).

Furthermore, cookbooks were not really part of the working class woman’s daily struggle to get by. Lyons characterizes cookbooks, a genre about private, home life for women, as texts that instructed their female readers about bourgeois table manners and gestures, subjects of mealtime conversations, how to entertain, and how to direct household servants. Lyons identifies the cookbook as a manual for the nineteenth-century bourgeoisie’s invention of its own “distinctive style of social behavior, or its own gestural code, which would allow it to recognize its own, and to identify interlopers” (317). Though the preface to the 1846 edition of the French cookbook La Cuisinière bourgeoise identifies a wider potential readership (in that the contents of the book could be read aloud to servants), the prologue in Lyons’s description indicates that the individuals “using” cookbooks were reading them. Even though a working-class woman might follow the directions of a recipe read aloud to her by a middle-class señora, the indirect contact she has with the contents of a cookbook does not change the meaning of her cooking practice.

---

35 Lyons discusses the French Restoration bestseller, La Cuisinière bourgeoise (1746), which typified the cooking of the Enlightenment by employing a more scientific approach to diet and eschewing both the luxuries of the aristocracy and recipes that supposedly represented the less refined tastes of the lower classes.
Folguera Crespo’s description of the difference in privacy and intimate spaces between working class urban households and middle class ones further supports the idea that cookbooks were texts for the middle class. For the working class, household activities occurred between the household and the street, in the patios or corralas. Cooking and food provisioning were activities with which “las mujeres que habitan estos barrios desarrollan fácilmente los lazos de solidaridad y de sociabilidad” (Folguera Crespo 458). In contrast, in the private domestic space of the middle-class home, the cookbook mediated the social relationship between women who were peers in the same community. It invited discussion, depersonalized communication, and debate between the recipe author and his or her readers.36 The domestic servant who received instructions from a recipe read aloud did not necessarily participate in that creation of community. The cocinera has no agency in choosing to participate in a “distinctive style of social behavior, or its own gestural code, which would allow it to recognize its own, and to identify interlopers” that the cookbook foments (Lyons 317).

Pardo Bazán’s audience, then, is not the women from whom she gets her foundational recipes, but modern, middle-class women. The women for whom Pardo Bazán imagines her cookbooks belong to a difficult-to-define, always tenuous middle class, according to Noël Valis. This is the case not only in Spain, but also in other European nation-states and in the Americas. Only France had a prominent and easily defined bourgeoisie due to the political prominence of the July Revolution (Seigel in Valis 9). Valis

36 For example, Pardo Bazán describes the community of women readers who debated Picadillo’s recipes: “Hubo señoras que recortaron las recetas, y las discutieron, y las corrigerón, y acabaron por discernir a PICADILLO borla de doctor, máxime cuando hubo probado que unía la práctica a la doctrina [. . .]” (Pardo Bazán in Puga y Parga 9).
further notes that the middle class in Spain signaled in its indeterminacy “a perturbing class confusion” for members of more established groups like the aristocracy (Valis 9). For the aristocracy, defining and controlling the middle class was imperative and its tenuousness a source of anxiety. Without a clearly defined, tightly controlled middle class, those living at the border between the middle class and working class might align their sympathies with the protesting proletariat.

Thus, Pardo Bazán’s second cookbook, *La cocina española moderna* (1914), functions as a text that shows her readers the lifestyles and attitudes of the middle class. Valis describes middleclassness in Spain as something that can be attained by adopting certain attitudes and lifestyles; in this sense, it can exist to some degree without the financial wherewithal that would support it (11). For women whose middle-class status is fragile or whose financial circumstances might place them more accurately among the working class, Pardo Bazán’s cookbook presents a model of (modern) middle-class attitudes about food and cooking for her women readers to adopt.

As a cookbook *La cocina española moderna* is organized similarly to *La cocina española antigua*, with Pardo Bazán’s prologue and a selection of “modern” Spanish recipes organized by food type and course. In the prologue, Pardo Bazán defines modern Spanish cuisine as an adaptation of foreign models: “el que ahora sale á luz representa la adaptación de los guisos extranjeros á la mesa española” (*CEM* I). It serves as an index of Spain’s modernization: “Entre los síntomas de adelanto que pueden observarse en España, debemos incluir el que
se coma mejor, y sobre todo, con más elegancia y refinamiento” (I). Furthermore, in contrast to the abundance and “muy sólidos y suculentos platos” of Spain’s “cocina antigua,” modern Spanish cuisine is visually pleasing:

Más que la abundancia maciza de los antiguos yantares, se busca hoy la comida grata, modernizada, delicada, un tanto pulida en la presentación (aunque no se sueñe con los primores de esos platos montados que representan ya un molino de viento, ya una alegoría de la primavera [. . .]. (IV)

And, Pardo Bazán finds that imitating elements from French cuisine that make the dish attractive to the eye is not problematic:

Lo que hay que copiar, eso sí, de lo francés, es el chiste y garabato con que transforman un rábano en una flor, y con que á fuerza de cacharros cucos, chismecillos de cristal y plata, servilletas diminutas orladas de encajes, y otra monería y jugetes, realzan el valor de lo que ofrecen al apetito.” (VII) 39


37 That Pardo Bazán describes the elegance of the dishes people eat in Spain while members of the working class and peasantry starve clearly indicates her decision to exclude the popular classes.

38 Pardo Bazán refers to the culinary sculptures characteristic of French haute cuisine, most likely the work of Escoffier, when she comments about the undesirable extremes of presenting “platos montados que representan un molino” (CEM IV).

39 It is ironic, however, that in La cocina española antigua Pardo Bazán praises the quality of Spain’s primary ingredients, calling them excellentes and praising “nuestros pescados de mar y río, de nuestras frutas, de bastantes aves de corral y caza de pluma, de nuestros jamones gallegos y andaluces [. . .]” (5). However, in this example, she advocates adornments and table chismes to distract diners from the quality of food that might not live up to the appearance of the table.
Civilization, for Elias, refers to “[…] the level of technology, to the type of manners, to the development of scientific knowledge, to religious ideas and customs” (3). It also “expresses the self-consciousness of the West. One could even say: the national consciousness” (3). The self-consciousness refers to how individuals and societies seek to establish their superiority over the primitivity of previous centuries or other societies and to describe their society’s “special character,” “what it is proud of,” “its technology,” and “the nature of its manners” (4).

Pardo Bazán’s description of Spain’s culinary modernity contains two concepts that Elias develops. First, that civilization is a process or the result of a process; “It refers to something which is constantly in motion, constantly moving ‘forward’” (Elias 5). Pardo Bazán’s description of the evolution of Spain’s “cocina antigua” from the “antiguas yantares” to a modern Spanish cuisine, within which “se busca hoy la comida grata, modernizada, delicada, un tanto pulida en la presentación” (CEM IV), indicates a narrative she wants to create connecting characteristics of an older, primitive Spain with the dreams Pardo Bazán and other Regenerationists have for the country’s modernization. Pardo Bazán’s descriptions contain a double message. On the one hand, she wants her reader to know that certain civilizing goals have already been achieved; how people eat in Spain is an index of Spain’s modernization. On the other hand, she outlines the work that her female readers still have to do. She encourages them to adopt certain practices from outside of Spain to make their tables more visually appealing, acknowledging that these visual tricks mask the possibly inferior quality of the ingredients that comprise the dishes. Making food visually appealing is something women can do at any (middle class) income: “La comida más corriente y barata admite escenografía. Basta para ello un poco de cuidado y habilidad” (VI).
Civilization also refers to the “form of people’s conduct or behavior. It describes a social quality of people, their housing, their manners, their speech, [and] their clothing” (Elias 5).\footnote{With this description, Elias notes the equivalencies between the German meaning of \textit{kultiviert} and civilization.} For Pardo Bazán, the questions was whether Spain had modernized enough that these social qualities could represent its distance from a primitive past. Pardo Bazán acknowledges both this lingering primitivity, which she insinuates readers should leave behind, and the veneer of “poetry” and “sociability” civilization imposes:

La función natural más necesaria y constante, es la nutrición. En su orígen, se reduce á coger con los cinco mandamientos y devorar á dentelladas, como las fieras, la piltrafa ó el fruto. Lo que ha enoblecido esta exigencia orgánica, es la estética, la poesía, la sociabilidad. Por eso ya no nos basta la olla volcada, ni sufrimos el mantel moreno y gordo de nuestras abuelas, ni nos resignamos á ver enfrente de los ojos un entero queso de bola, que hay que tajar arrimándolo al pecho, ni unas aceitunas flotando en agua turbia y amarillosa. La grosería nos molesta; la suciedad nos horripila; y los manjares queremos que se combinen con tal disposición, que si uno es pesado y fuerte, otro sea ligero y fácil de digerir, y que alterne lo vegetal con los peces y la carne.\footnote{(CEM VIII)}

Pardo Bazán’s description of eating and nutrition as a basic fact of human nature evokes the animality (“devorar á dentelladas”) of eating with one’s hands and with one’s teeth in direct contact with a bone. Manners dignify human nature; sociability, poetry, and aesthetics convert the organic needs of the body into an act (cooking or eating) that Pardo Bazán
makes representative of Spanish culture/society. That Pardo Bazán describes the generalized abuela’s dirty tablecloth from which modern Spanish cuisine has evolved indicates that she sees Spain’s evolution as belonging to the recent past; only two generations separate early twentieth century Spanish culinary modernity from its uncivilized roots. She leaves her readers with two images of Spain’s culinary incivility: the cheese balanced against an individual’s chest while being cut and olives floating in unappetizing “agua turbia y amarillosa” (VIII).41 Pardo Bazán’s use of these images as examples of the suciedad that horrifies her creates a formidable standard of comportment for her readers.

A society’s confidence in its national boundaries and national identity correlates with how ideas of civilization diminish national difference in favor of “what is common to all human beings or—in the view of its bearers—should be” (Elias 5). That is, the more secure a society is in its identity or nationhood, the more receptive that society is to acquiring the polish of civilization, since civilization is a quality that nations share across borders. Here again, Pardo Bazán’s rhetoric seems to be arguing for Spain’s development as a modern civilization, ready to join in a civilized community of nations. She mentions throughout the prologue that the recipes in the cookbook reflect the “adaptación de los guisos extranjeros á la mesa española” (CEM I). Additionally she identifies the recipes as “española[s] aún en sus elementos, modificada[s] con aquellos que de la extranjera parece imponerse irresistiblemente á nuestras costumbres” (IV). And finally, she writes:

---

41 This passage reminds me of a romanticized image of a peasant cutting into a cheese in the middle of a field. In another context, this image would serve as a nostalgic representation of Spain’s pueblo and roots. In this circumstance, however, readers are supposed to view this ideal with disgust.
Combinar lo excelente de los guisos nacionales con el gentil aseo y exquisitez que hoy se exige en la cocina universal, es lo que este libro tiende a fomentar un poco, facilitando la tarea, tantas veces ímproba, de las señoras deseadas de que no derrochando, la mesa esté bonitilla y los manjares no aparezcan conforme salen de la cacerola. (VI)

These three different definitions of modern Spanish cuisine each depict a different relationship between Spanish and foreign cuisines. First, Pardo Bazán asserts that modern Spanish cuisine is an adaptation of foreign cuisine to the Spanish table; so, it is something imported and altered. Second, modern Spanish cuisine is fundamentally Spanish, but accepting of foreign elements. Third, modern Spanish cuisine is the combination of national dishes with the veneer of “gentil aseo y exquisitez que hoy se exige en la cocina universal” (IV). Although Pardo Bazán proposes to define for her reader what modern Spanish cuisine is, she is unable to arrive at a stable definition. The recipes she includes in the cookbook will, she asserts, present her readers with a variety of dishes that comprise modern Spanish cuisine, but her presentation in the prologue reveals nothing that makes the recipes particularly Spanish. On the contrary, all the definitions she offers illustrate the difficulty of defining something that is truly modern and Spanish and reveal, instead, the influence of foreign cuisine in Spain.

*Is there a cocina española?*

Pardo Bazán’s inconsistent definitions of modern Spanish cuisine reveal the impossibility of imposing a veneer of civilization over Spain, its citizens, and its cuisine by telling female readers how to prepare aesthetically pleasing modern cuisine. Despite Pardo
Bazán’s efforts to convince her readers otherwise in *La cocina española antigua*, all of Spain does not participate in and cannot share a single culinary identity. Both geographical and economic limitations made it impossible that individuals throughout Spain could eat and prepare dishes comprised of the same ingredients.\(^4^2\) Isabel González Turmo’s analysis of diets in Spain reveals the impossibility of a shared culinary identity; her study, in *Comida de rico, comida de pobre*, focuses on towns in Andalucía from the 1920s until the 1960s, excepting the years of the Civil War and post-war period, which was marked by hunger and food scarcity. González Turmo identifies three different strata of eating and alimentary acquisitive power: the working classes; the middle classes, who eat more or less the same kind of food as the lower classes but in greater quantities; and the upper classes, whose food tastes and menus reflect not only greater wealth, but also the ability to eat the produce and meat cultivated on their land. Typical menus of the lower and middle classes included morning coffee (“la mayoría de las veces cebada o malta”) and toast or fried bread (42).

Depending on the work schedule of the male head of household, the mid-day meal might include toast with sardines, potatoes, or leftovers from the previous day. The *puchero*, *cocido*, or *potaje con carne*, or at least with *tocino* and *chacina*, comprised the “plato fuerte” of the day for families with slightly increased means. When money was scarce, families often substituted tomato soup or “un potaje de castañas con o sin arroz, una gachas o unas

\(^4^2\) Railway historian Antonio Gómez Mendoza notes that the development of a railroad industry in Spain did make possible a more open food marketplace—in Madrid. Railroads made it possible to eat fish in areas distant from the coast and the inhabitants of the “meseta central” began to consume new products (*Ferrocarril* 136-137). Nevertheless, foodstuffs, including wine and canned goods, travelled on the slowest rail lines lines for which there existed no reliable schedule. Wine and its products were the most transported goods via railway (*Ferrocarriles y Cambio* 205), followed by wheat. However, instead of opening new markets for wheat cultivated in Spain, the development of the railway system into the early twentieth century paradoxically reinforced the strength of local marketplaces and, more detrimentally, facilitated the import of inexpensive wheat from abroad, which further eroded food markets in Spain (184).
poleás” (González Turmo 47). Fruit, eggs, milk, fish, and meat were eaten only on special
days. The middle classes ate the same basic diet, augmented by daily consumption of the
puchero or cocido, in addition to fruit, other meat, and, on occasion, fish, although this was
difficult and costly to purchase inland.

Pedro Carasa describes the diet of the urban proletariat as consisting of mostly
carbohydrates, little protein, and only “symbolic” quantities of vegetables, fruit, meat, or fish (251). The majority of calories in the working class diet derived from bread, wine, beans, and
starches. Carasa cites archival data from the Comisión de Reformas Sociales: “Distingue tres
niveles de capacidad adquisitiva, bajo (hasta 6 reales de salario), medio (entre 6 y 10) y alto
(más de 10 reales diarios)” (251). The lowest earners in this list subsisted on a menu of a cup
of aguardiente, bread and cheese at midday, and cooked beans for supper; those in the middle
would eat cured or smoked fish for breakfast, 200g of garbanzos with tocino and a little wine
at midday, and cod with potatoes for supper accompanied by 600g of bread per day. The
highest earners enjoyed escabeche and wine for breakfast; 200g of beans with tocino and meat,
cheese, and wine at midday; and for supper a potaje of sardines with a daily ration of more
than a kilogram of bread (251).

According to González Turmo’s description of class stratification of typical diets, the
recipes Pardo Bazán offers in La cocina española moderna correspond most readily to the typical
diet of the elite and landowning classes, not the middle classes. González Turmo mentions
that for the elite, the typical first course was cocido, potaje and guiso de patatas, followed by the
beef redondillo or solomillo, and a “tercero de huevos o friturillas” (48). Pardo Bazán offers
recipes for all these dishes and notes in the individual recipes which preparations are most
suitable for meals “en confianza” and which are appropriate for guests or special dinners. In presenting a vision of Spain’s “cocina antigua” that erases the geographical differences and limited local markets, Pardo Bazán also erases any awareness of the economic limitations that dictate what the majority of people in Spain can eat. Rather, she invents a national cuisine that corresponds to the diet—and the budget—of the rich. In the process, she holds up an unachievable lifestyle ideal for her middle-class readers.

_Cursileria_

Pardo Bazán’s invention of a modern Spanish cuisine can be understood as a culinary project that illustrates the effects of Spain’s incomplete modernization. A consideration of the social role of the _cursi_ can help to illuminate how this project leads Pardo Bazán to uphold a lifestyle for her middle class readers that reflects the possibilities of the wealthy more than those of the middle class. In _The Culture of Cursilería_ (2002), Valis defines the term _cursi_: the term refers to “la persona que presume de fina y elegante sin serlo.” Ortega y Gasset defines _cursilería_ as characteristic of “un pueblo anormalmente pobre que se ve obligado a vivir en la atmósfera del siglo diecinueve europeo, en plena democracia y capitalismo” (xiv). Valis describes the “nervous, obsessed with appearance” middle class who “sharply felt [a] sense of inferiority (in relation to powers like France and England)” (32). They channeled that sense of inadequacy into projects that would bolster a historical

---

43 As I have mentioned elsewhere, Pardo Bazán offers recipes for several varieties of _cocido_ or _puchero_ in both cookbooks. This seems to be the only dish that can reliably be eaten by members of all social strata in Spain, although González Turmo notes that working-class families were frequently unable to purchase meat for the dish. Pardo Bazán offers in _La cocina española moderna_ fifty pages of recipes for beef and lamb dishes, twenty pages of recipes for egg dishes, and more than twenty-five pages of recipes for _friturillas._

44 Valis quotes the definition from the _Diccionario de la Real Academia_, originally from 1864 (xiv).
sense of identity, like Pardo Bazán’s *La cocina española antigua* (32). By creating the “escenografía” that Pardo Bazán describes in *La cocina española moderna* as being possible on any budget, housewives attempt to reproduce the food of the wealthy elite and demonstrate a type of culinary *cursilería* (*CEM* VIII). The plan for modern, national cooking and eating that Pardo Bazán proposes demands the same obsession with appearance that Valis notes, and it discourages serving dishes that might appear prosaic or be identified with a poorer diet. For example, in *La cocina española moderna* Pardo Bazán writes:

> En *La cocina española antigua*, abundan las recetas de arroz, tan nacionales; aquí escasearán, puesto que, en mesa un poco refinada, el arroz no puede figurar sino á título de guarnición ó como plato de almuerzo, si los invitados son de confianza. (249)

Modernity connotes refinement and a wealthier diet; staples like rice and potatoes, the base of working people’s nutrition, are marginalized to the periphery of “guarnición” (249). “Las carnes” become more central—“dificilmente se prescinde del plato de carne en comida o almuerzo bien arreglados” (*CEM* 171)—which contrasts with Pardo Bazán’s description of the role of meat in *La cocina española antigua* as “la parte flaca de la alimentación española” (90). In another passage, Pardo Bazán teaches middle-class women how to avoid being *cursís*, even if it means eliminating tasty dishes from the table:

> Para mesa escogida, lo más recomendable es el jamón. Si los convidados son de gran confianza, puede admitirse un embuchado, un guiso. Los despojos como rabo, oreja, morro y costilla, no pueden figurar más que en suculentos cocidos. Los pies de cerdo trufados se admiten en almuerzo, y deben comprarse preparados ya, pues es difícil que, caseramente, salgan bien. El
codillo de cerdo es ordinario, por muy sabroso que sea. Hay, pues, que
restringir algo las fórmulas de cerdo, si se quiere que sean lucidas y hasta
elegantes. (CEM 219)

Pardo Bazán instructs her readers about the cuts of meat most appropriate for an elegant
table, warns against those cuts too *ordinarios* to be served to guests, and suggests limiting
recipes for pork altogether. Modern Spanish cuisine is not merely appetizing to one’s palate;
instead, it is a crucial way to proclaim a family’s middle-class status.

Pardo Bazán identifies her intended readership as that woman who is unable to
navigate the requirements of a modern, elegant home and who might embarrass herself by
serving inappropriate dishes to guests:

Esta obra, sin embargo, no será muy útil á las personas que pueden pagar
cocinero, porque no es, ni por semejas, tratado de alta cocina, y conviene más
á los que, limitándose á una mesa hasta casera, aspiran sin embargo á que
cada plato presente aspecto agradable y coquetón, y á poder tener
convidados sin avergonzarse del prosaísmo de una minuta de “sota, caballo y
rey.” (CEM II)

She envisions this cookbook as a tool for a woman whose income is insufficient to pay a
male cook, a *cocinero*. But even women who have to make do without the services of a top-
notch female *cocinera* can prepare modern food: “No abundan, que escasean, las casas donde
funciona un docto cocinero; aun las cocineras con pretensiones son un lujo; y añadiré que el
tener cocinero ó cocinera de fuste, no excusa á la dueña de la casa de enterarse
cariñosamente de cómo anda el fogón” (II). In this way, Pardo Bazán normalizes the middle
class woman’s presence in the kitchen. She attempts to harness the anxieties of “nervous,
obsessed with appearance” Spanish women in order to channel their concerns about finances, class, and status into the project of cuisine (Valis 32). And she reframes cooking and involvement in preparing meals as an elegant activity.

By outlining how women should present their homes and meals so that they communicate elegance, refinement, civilization, and tono, Pardo Bazán equates the idea of cocina moderna with the material means for women to populate their homes with the “cacharros cucos, chismecillos de cristal y plata, servilletas diminutas orladas de encajes” that “realizan el valor de lo que ofrecen al apetito” (CEM VII). She thus presumes a certain class status in her readers. She also equips her readers with the information they need to create and maintain a middle class lifestyle in ways similar to María del Pilar Sinués de Marco’s domestic guides and conduct manuals El Ángel de Hogar (1859) and La Dama Elegante (1880).45 This, in turn, would bolster their identity as a class and as members of the Spanish nation.

Pardo Bazán’s La cocina española moderna shares two major characteristics with the work of Sinués de Marco. First, she echoes Sinués de Marco’s portrayal of women’s obligation to create a pleasant home life for their husbands and families: “Los deberes de la casada se reducen a un solo [precepto]: ser agradable a su marido. [. . .] sé en fin, la amante y la amiga de tu marido: si hubiera muchas mujeres así, no habría tantos maridos infieles y extraviados y tantos hijos que carecen del amor de sus padres” (Sinués, Cuentos del color del cielo 345 qtd. in Sánchez Llama 345). Pardo Bazán reiterates this dictate in her instructions to

45 María del Pilar Sinués de Marco (1835-1893) was the most prolific writer of her time. Her work included romances in prose and verse, conduct manuals, periodical articles, serialized novels, biographies, costumbrista novels, children’s stories, translations, and adaptations (Sánchez Llama 326).
women about how to care for and honor their homes so that they remain inviting for their husbands:

[. . .] hacer grata la diaria pitanza al marido, al padre, habituándole á no andar por fondas y cafés... es un ideal que ha influido más de lo que parece en la vida doméstica, perfeccionando la mesa, y generalizando conocimientos que, además, forman parte de la higiene. (CEM III)

That Pardo Bazán, who argued for greater access for women to public roles and occupations, shares this notion with Sinués, who preached the ideology of domesticity, underscores a shift in Pardo Bazán’s thinking about the possibilities for modern women. As I examined earlier in this chapter, Pardo Bazán noted her frustration with women’s reluctance to take advantage of public opportunities available to them. Faced with the failure of middle-class Spanish women to take up feminism and pursue public lives, Pardo Bazán shifts her attention in *La cocina española moderna* to the domestic sphere women already inhabited. If women are not interested in pursuing professional lives, they can carry out their housewifely responsibilities in a way that professionalizes their work within the domestic sphere and strengthens the hygiene of the middle-class family:

Pocos serán los que hoy no sigan un régimen, ó, por lo menos, no tengan que atender á indicaciones facultativas en el sistema de alimentación. Van aumentando el número de vegetarianos. Tiene, pues, que intervenir la dueña de la casa en mil detalles, relacionados con las órdenes del médico, con la preparación de la pitanza. (CEM III-IV)

Pardo Bazán’s use of the rhetoric of science and health to describe household tasks communicates to her readers that their work in the home is modern. Managing the
thousands of details of the household and its members is a job that requires specific skills and abilities. She frames the idea of caring for a home as an honor to that home and provides a list of tasks that not only represent the benefits of caring for the home, but that demonstrate how the skills of being a prepared and talented housewife all form part of living a modern Spanish life:

Un bien fundado punto de honra impulsa hoy á muchas mujeres “de su casa”, a aun á bastantes no tan caseras, á cuidar de la mesa, para poder, sin excesivo gasto ni gran complicación, honrarla con manjares que antes parecían algo misterioso, reservado sólo a los privilegiados de este mundo. Enseñar a las cocineras de la clase media ciertos platos que prestan un sello distinguido á las comidas; conjurar la monotonía del eterno guisote; remediar graciosamente, y acaso con más sazón para el paladar, lo que se ensalza tanto de las listas de los hoteles de tono, lo que se gallardea en los escaparates de las pastelerías y restoranes de moda; salir “de un apuro” cuando forzosamente hay que invitar á personas que entienden de culinaria [. . .]. (III)

However, and this is the second similarity I note between Pardo Bazán and Sinués, the frequency and intensity of Pardo Bazán’s discussion of the aesthetics of cuisine indicates a preoccupation with the ability of Spanish women to comply with this way of making Spanish cuisine modern. In Galería de escritoras isabelinas: La prensa periódica entre 1833 y 1895 (2000), Íñigo Sánchez Llama notes how Sinués’ work “textualiz[a] ansiedades sobre el posible descenso social de la clase media, entendida como grupo social homogéneo, que preceden a la específica preocupación por la mujer española burguesa, rasgo visible en su escritura desde el decenio de 1870” (346). Pardo Bazán shares those anxieties about the
fragility of the middle class; she is perhaps even more invested in strengthening the middle class because of the terror and violence of the working class uprisings I described in the first part of this chapter. Morag Schiach, referring to the practice of collecting folk songs in nineteenth-century Britain, notes that the act of collecting indicated the “strength of the collectors’ convictions that folk songs represented a bulwark of coherence and significance, against a culture of decay, triviality and commercialization” (122). Pardo Bazán participates in a similar practice of collecting; she assembles recipes of Spain’s *cocina antigua* to give coherence and significance to Spanish national cuisine and the Spanish nation. And in *La cocina española moderna*, she uses the recipes she collects to create a bulwark of middle-class values against the class conflict sparked by Spain’s modernization. However, Pardo Bazán’s effort to strengthen the middle class as a “baluarte” against a violent working class is complicated by the fact that Pardo Bazán’s own status as a member of the aristocracy leads her to impose unachievable standards on middle-class women. When she offers recipes that represent how the upper class ate as models for the middle class, and when she characterizes as incivil the abuela’s rustic tablecloth, Pardo Bazán imposes a version of culinary modernity that is unrealistic for the women reading her cookbooks.

### 2.5 Controlling Representation: Cuisine, Class, and Gender

Literacy is the key to access to Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks and to their codification of a culinary canon in Spain. In *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (1993), John Guillory writes, “The fact of class determines whether and how individuals gain access to the means of literary production, and the system regulating such access is a much more efficient mechanism of social exclusion than acts of judgment” (ix). Pardo Bazán’s writing
against the working class in the “Cartas de condesa” article demonstrates her complicity in excluding the interests of the working class and in curtailing their participation in shaping the modern Spanish nation-state. Pardo Bazán may have argued for greater access for women to education and for their remunerated public employment, but her cookbook prologues demonstrate her ideological support for a socio-political system that inherently blocks the access of working class to literacy and participatory citizenship. Pardo Bazán makes clear that citizenship and shaping the Spanish nation and its cuisine are responsibilities that belong to elites and the always-tenuous middle class. As a result, her work to strengthen middle-class values, to construct a bulwark of practices and ideas of civilization between the middle class and the working class, serves to reinforce the “mechanism of social exclusion” that she hopes will keep the working class contained (Guillory ix).

In *The Logic of Practice*, Pierre Bourdieu suggests that the representation of class will always be controlled by the more powerful class, those individuals with a greater share of a society’s wealth. Less powerful members of society may have an interest in subverting or modifying the dominant representation of class, but those who are more powerful perpetuate a distorted recognition of how class works and how people of different means contribute to and partake of capital (140-141). Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks capture that tension in that the only safe representation of the working class in Spain is the Romanticized *pueblo* whose recipes she collects in *La cocina española moderna*, not the emerging proletariat, whose uprisings she fearfully describes in her “Cartas de la Condesa” article. And, an integral tool to elites’ monopoly of representation is literacy.

In her 1905 Prologue to Manuel Puga y Parga’s (“Picadillo”) *La cocina práctica*, Pardo Bazán addresses the reading public for cookbooks—women readers:
Al consagrar PICADILLO su hasta entonces, si no me engaño, inmaculada pluma, a inundar de saliva las fauces de sus leyentes, a enseñar triquiñuelas y adobos a las guisanderas amas de casa—las cocineras propiamente dichas _no padecen la enfermedad de leer_, y por eso no miden la sal ni pesan la leche—demostró que conocía donde les aprieta el zapato a los mortales. (Pardo Bazán in Puga y Parga 9, italics mine)

Pardo Bazán makes the distinction between housewives who cook in their homes—the “guisanderas amas de casa”—and the _cocineras_ who enter into employment outside the home as domestic servants (9). By describing the literacy of working-class, female servants literacy as an illness, Pardo Bazán attempts to mask that reading is a tool of liberation.46 It is risky for Pardo Bazán to represent a servant who reads because that would indicate that working class might gain access to cultural capital. Instead, Pardo Bazán highlights the instinctual practice of cooking associated with not using recipes; women who do not read from a recipe the quantities of ingredients they should use have no use for measuring ingredients precisely. She frames the illiterate _cocinera_ this way to invoke readers’ sentimentality for a pre-modern, instinctual practice of cooking and, in so doing, she safely represents the _cocinera_ as a member of the _pueblo_ who does not challenge the social order.

In contrast, she represents the community that forms via literate women’s engagement with Picadillo’s recipes:

Hubo señoras que recortaron las recetas, y las discutieron, y las corrigieron, y acabaron por discernir a PICADILLO borla de doctor, máxime cuando hubo

46 Anarchists and socialists alike sought to make it possible for members of the working class to learn to read.
probado que unía la práctica a la doctrina [. . .]. (Pardo Bazán in Puga y Parga 9)

Pardo Bazán creates an image of the community these señoras create by reading, cutting out, discussing, and correcting Picadillo’s recipes, and finally judging him to be a competent practitioner of the act of cooking as well as the writing and teaching of it. Recipes result in the creation and maintenance of a social network facilitated by a text, the newspaper El Noroeste where Picadillo published his recipes. In this way, Pardo Bazán links literacy, recipe reading, and community formation. Or, as Benedict Anderson would say, Pardo Bazán reports how print texts create a reading community that allows individuals to recognize others through those texts.

Pardo Bazán controls the representation of the community formed around food and recipes. Both in the prologue to Picadillo’s cookbook and in La cocina española antigua, she explicitly writes working-class females out of the project of culinary nation-building, an act closely related to her escape into philology in the face of working class uprisings in “Carta de la condesa.” In the final paragraph of La cocina española antigua, Pardo Bazán advises her middle class readers:

En las recetas que siguen encontrarán las señoras muchas recetas donde entran la cebolla y el ajo. Si quieren trabajar con sus propias delicadas manos en hacer un guiso, procuren que la cebolla y el ajo los manipule la cocinera. Es su oficio, y nada tiene de deshonroso el manejar esos bulbos de penetrante aroma; pero sería muy cruel que las señoras conservasen, entre una sortija de rubíes y la manga calada de una blusa, un traidor y avillanado rastro cebollero. (7)
Pardo Bazán creates an image of a nameless and faceless woman defined only by her position as a servant to a woman who aspires to wear rubies to dinner. This servant handles the dirty parts of cooking, the parts that leave odors. These *cocineras*, as Pardo Bazán relates in her prologue to Picadillo’s cookbook, “no padecen la enfermedad de leer” (9).

**Conclusion**

As shown in the last chapter, Pardo Bazán’s decision to continue her *Biblioteca de la mujer* with cookbooks challenges the ideology of domesticity because her construction of cuisine as emblematic of the Spanish nation converts that knowledge about domestic cooking into a public, nation-building discourse. By including cookbooks constructing a “cocina española” in a series on feminism, Pardo Bazán converts a major domestic activity of women, the idea and print form of the recipes they author, into a public document and a textual contribution to the development of the “Spanish” nation. However, in the cookbooks, Pardo Bazán alters her relationship to the implied female reader she had constructed in the previous volumes of the *Biblioteca de la Mujer*. She no longer speaks to her female readers as a teacher or leader in their education about feminism, nor does she exhort them to learn about suffrage and the demand for rights by women outside of Spain. Instead, she focuses on domestic life, surprising everyone by emphasizing how much her life is like that of any women, and by writing about the recipes she enjoys. Nevertheless, Pardo Bazán also goes to great lengths to establish her distance from these women. She draws attention to the surprise elicited by her publication of cookbooks and she reiterates that cooking can be a pleasure for her, since, unlike her readers, she has a life beyond the home.
In addition to Pardo Bazán’s ambivalent treatment of her middle-class female readers, her scornful representation of working class women, the nameless and faceless cocineras who handle the garlic and onions, reveals that another of her motivations for writing cookbooks that participate in nation-building stems from the social instability generated by Spain’s modernization. She nostalgically characterizes Spain’s pueblo as the guarantors of Spain’s traditions, refusing to acknowledge the evolution of that pueblo into a radical proletariat. She expresses her fear of the rioting working classes and shows contempt for their grievances. As a member of the elite and an intellectual, Pardo Bazán participates in the creation of cultural capital in Spain and she helps control the representation of society, Spain’s past, and its modernization process. And yet, Pardo Bazán has an interest in “perpetuating [the] misrecognition” of social class in Spain, to quote Bourdieu (140). As a member of the powerful elite in Spain she participates in attempts to contain the working class and peasantry in their sometimes-violent efforts to subvert the hegemonic organization of political power in Spain. As nation building texts, Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks represent her attempt to bolster the middle class’s identity as Spanish citizens in defense against a radical working class whose means of expression and attempts to participate in society she fails to understand.
3. Carmen de Burgos’s Culinary Erudition: The Modern Spanish Woman as Escritora and Cocinera

A self-described bas-bluen, or bluestocking (Burgos Nueva 70), Carmen de Burgos’s literary reputation was formed by the more than 80 melodramatic novellas she published in Spain’s periodical press starting in 1907 with El tesoro del castillo. Burgos also published feminist essays on divorce (“El divorcio en España” in 1904), voting (“El voto de la mujer” in October 1906), and the rights of modern women (La mujer moderna y sus derechos, 1927); ten full-length novels, several of which were developed from shorter versions published as novelettes; and short stories and poetry. But her relationship to the literary establishment throughout her career remained as tenuous as her financial situation was in the early years of her career (Louis 7, Núñez Rey 627-641). Burgos was a thoroughly modern woman with very modern aims during a period of rapid change in Spain. She wanted earn her living through her writing, and to establish her position as a full participant in Spain’s intellectual culture. Yet, her class and her gender caused intellectual circles to be closed to her, and the writing for which she became most well known addressed the private sphere of the home and the supposedly sentimental interests of her middle-class female readers. These sometimes contradictory goals—to be an intellectual and to earn a living through her writing—created conflict for Burgos during her lifetime, and they continue to create contradictions for scholars, who must balance Burgos’s authorship of some of the most
progressive discourse about gender and sexuality in Spain during the early twentieth century\(^1\) with her production of more than twenty-seven practical manuals, texts that apparently uphold domestic ideology in which Burgos instructs her female readers about cosmetics (*¿Quiere usted conocer los secretos del tocador?*, 1917); seduction (*El arte de seducir*, 1916); and cooking (Scott 20).

Burgos published three cookbooks: *La cocina moderna* in 1906, *¿Quiere usted comer bien?* in 1916, and *Nueva Cocina Práctica* in 1925. Scholars categorize these cookbooks with the other “self-help” manuals Burgos wrote to pay the bills (Louis 7); Burgos herself characterizes them as an obligation assigned to her because of her gender: “Entre la pasión de las novelas y del arte, estos libros, seguros y prácticos, parecen como un deber de la escritora [. . .]” (Burgos qtd. in Scott 97, ellipses Scott’s). Although Burgos defends their usefulness to her women readers—“La serie de estos libros, de variados temas, con su apariencia frívola y ligera, encierra conocimientos útiles para la cultura de la mujer”—her choice of adjectives, *frívola* and *ligera*, tends to undermine the estimation of the books’ utility to her readers (Burgos qtd. in Scott 97). However, in the very same quotation, she indicates that writing these manuals “es una obra social a la que se debe dedicar [. . .] la escritora” and that she is not “arrepentida de haber escrito estos libros tan sencillos, tan femeninos” (Burgos qtd. in Scott 97, ellipses Scott’s). If Burgos considered these cookbooks to be

---

\(^1\) See Roberta Johnson’s chapter “Biology as Destiny” in *Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Modernist Novel* (2003) for an analysis of Burgos’s criticism of the biological interpretations of sexuality developed by Gregorio Marañoń.
simple, cursi, and frivolous, why did she expand the introductory essay from the seven-page essay in *La cocina moderna* (1906) to sixty-four pages in *Nueva cocina práctica* (1925)?

Even scholars working to undo dominant scholarly representations of Burgos as a lightweight writer of popular sentimental romances for women have tended to view the cookbooks as trivial. Over the past twenty years, scholars like Michael Ugarte, Roberta Johnson, Anja Louis, Concepción Núñez Rey, Catherine Davies, and Elizabeth Starcevic have succeeded in rescuing Burgos from characterizations of her as merely an “escritora-ama de casa” (Simón Palmer *Escriitoras* 130). This group of scholars has worked to contextualize Burgos’s literary work, exploring the relevance of her feminist writing and popular fiction to the changing social, literary, and economic landscape of Spain in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Since the cookbooks appear to uphold the domestic ideology Burgos questions radically in her other works, they create frustrating contradictions for those who try to understand her as one of Spain’s most influential early feminists. Perhaps as a result, these scholars have focused their efforts almost exclusively on Burgos’s fiction and her unquestionably feminist essays and periodical articles.

---

2 Lynn Scott, to my knowledge, is the only scholar who has examined Burgos’s practical manuals critically, but she focuses primarily on their chronology and publication history, establishing a compelling new chronology for the originally undated manuals. The entry for *La cocina moderna* in the Biblioteca Nacional’s catalogue specifies 1918 as the publication date, information that Nuñéz Rey accepts in her biography. The catalogue lists 1927 as the publication date for the volumes published as part of Sempere’s *Obras completas*. However, working with information offered in the covers of the manuals, Scott makes a convincing case for dating the publication of Burgos’s *La cocina moderna* as 1906 and her *Nueva cocina práctica* as 1925 (51-56). I have chosen to follow Scott’s dates rather than the dates offered in the Biblioteca Nacional’s catalogue.

3 Scholars group Burgos’s cookbooks with the other practical manuals she authored. Burgos published a total of twenty-seven practical manuals on topics ranging from seduction and beauty to letter-writing, “arts” of elegance, and household budgets (Scott 20). These texts, in addition to her 1904 translation of Paul J. Mobius’s *La inferioridad de la mujer*, a project from which she distanced herself in her 1927 *La mujer moderna y sus derechos*, are the works most often cited as evidence of the “temas opuestas” about which Burgos wrote (Simón Palmer *Escriitoras* 130).
Of those who do mention the cookbooks and practical manuals (Davies, Louis, Scott, and Starcevic),\(^4\) Catherine Davies mentions the “cookery books” to illustrate the breadth of Burgos’s production as a backdrop to her focus on Burgos’s life story as representative of the rapid changes wrought by Spain’s modernization. Anja Louis sees Burgos’s cookbooks as texts produced for the income, but Louis leaves unanswered her own question of why Burgos consented to the re-issue of her cookbook in 1925 when, according to Catherine Davies, Burgos was earning a good salary through her other writing jobs. Louis leaves the impression that it made little sense for Burgos to pander to the market and to the stereotypes generated about her work by continuing to publish this type of text, even as she acknowledges that Burgos’s work in other genres also perpetuated female stereotypes, for instance by focusing on female protagonists who are, with few exceptions, victims living in and responding to a hostile male world (Louis 7). Lynn Scott, in her 1999 dissertation, “Carmen de Burgos: Piecing a Profession, Rewriting Women’s Roles,” views the practical manuals as examples of the varied writing Burgos did to create a career for herself. Scott concludes that the manuals, many of which contain material from previous versions published under new titles, are a less important part of Burgos’s work than critics might otherwise have thought. And finally, Starcevic echoes the prevalent idea that Burgos published the manuals out of economic necessity; for Starcevic, the manuals are works

\(^{4}\) Ugarte and Johnson do not mention the practical manuals at all, while biographer Núñez Rey includes them only in her bibliography of Burgos’s works. Focusing on Burgos’s fiction, Johnson explores how domestic situations are central features in the cultural production by modernist authors including Burgos. Ugarte analyzes how Burgos’s essay and periodical writing contributed to the initiation of legal reforms that challenged traditional constructions of feminine spaces and shaped Madrid’s image as a modern city.
Burgos produced to “ganarse el pan” in a time when “era muy difícil de vivir de la pluma, aún cuando [Burgos] contaba con varias fuentes” (47).

However, these scholars have arrived at this understanding without closely examining the pieces of writing in which Burgos tells her readers why she wrote cookbooks, the “Carta-Prólogo” that opened two of the books and the introductory essays for those books. An analysis of these largely unstudied texts reveals that Burgos’s cookbooks are not trivial texts produced to earn a living. Rather, they serve two very different purposes. On the one hand, in these cookbooks Burgos shows her women readers how the things that women produce (cooking) have an impact on the nation. On the other hand, she displays in her writing, ostensibly about cooking and the recipes in the books, an anxious desire to bolster her credibility, demonstrate her erudition and her relevance as a woman to Spain’s politics and literature, and make a role for herself in Spain’s modernization/regeneration.

In this chapter, I examine both the original version of the “Carta-Prólogo,” which first appeared in La cocina moderna (1906), and the edited version included in Nueva Cocina Práctica (1925), as well as the introductory essays Burgos wrote for each volume. My readings of these pieces complicate the prevailing analysis of Burgos’s cookbooks as merely practical manuals that uphold traditional gender roles, written to pay the bills early in Burgos’s career. I have divided the chapter into four sections. In section one, I provide the context for Burgos’s publication of the cookbooks within the growth of Spain’s literary marketplace in the early twentieth century. This expanded market made Burgos’s career possible, but it also

---

Scott analyzes Burgos’s “Carta-Prólogo” but she does not comment on any of the other introductory materials or the recipes contained in the cookbooks.
contributed to critics’ dismissal of her as a frivolous author of mass-market texts for women.

In section two, I present my close reading of the “Carta-Prólogo,” a text Burgos addresses to her editor, Francisco Sempere. My reading shows how Burgos undermines the conventional idea of a cookbook as a text coherent with domesticity by an act of “double writing” that allows her to make tactical use of the cookbook genre, a genre she herself describes as “tan sencillo [and] tan femenino[. . .]” (Burgos qtd. in Scott 97). This allows Burgos to, on the one hand, confirm the male literary establishment’s notion of her work in the cookbooks as frivolous while, on the other hand, she radically alters conventional associations between women and cooking. In section three, exploring the purpose of Burgos’s “double writing,” I argue that Burgos’s 1906 introductory essay to La cocina moderna makes an example of powerful women who cook to show her women readers how their activity affects politics and the nation. In addition, by suggesting the importance of women’s culinary education, Burgos attempts to move cooking out of the kitchen into the public sphere, thereby weakening the ideology of domesticity.

In the fourth section of this chapter, I argue that Burgos creates a deliberate parallel between her practice of cooking and her practice of writing, between her role as a middle-class woman and her career as a writer. In her cookbooks, as Burgos writes to and about women, she writes about their responsibilities in the home and the impact those responsibilities have on the social body. But she writes very little about the food or the recipes in her cookbooks. More than any real concern about cooking and Spain’s modern or practical cuisine, what Burgos really puts on the table, I suggest in this section, is an argument for women’s relevance to public life in Spain generally and specifically her own relevance, not as the author of cookbooks, but as a modern female intellectual.
3.1 Carmen de Burgos and the Literary Marketplace

Born into a well-to-do family in Almería in 1867, Carmen de Burgos followed the traditional path for women of her social class by marrying at age sixteen and bearing four children, of whom only one daughter survived (Davies 118). She worked as a typesetter alongside her husband, Arturo Alvarez, an abusive spouse and a lazy journalist, at the newspaper owned by Alvarez’s father. Deeply unhappy in her marriage and constrained by her inability to support herself outside of it, Burgos began to study at home for a teaching qualification at Almería’s recently opened Escuela Normal. After passing exams for the primary school qualification in 1895 and the secondary school qualification in 1898, Burgos left Almería and her marriage in 1900, taking her daughter with her to Guadalajara, where she worked as a teacher at the Escuela Normal (Davies 119).7

In 1902, to supplement her teaching salary, Burgos began to contribute newspaper articles to El Globo and La Correspondencia de España. As a redactora working for the progressive newspaper Diario Universal, she wrote a daily column, Lectura para la mujer, that focused on everything from fashion and needlework to politics and feminism (Louis 4-5). Using the pen name Columbine, Burgos quickly established a public profile of herself as a woman writer engaged in the political and social issues of the moment who directed her writing to an audience of women. In the press release announcing her move from the conservative La

---

6 Most sources cite 1879 as the year of her birth; others cite 1878. Burgos frequently lied about her real age. Núñez Rey, citing the announcement of Burgos’s baptism at the Iglesia Parroquial de San Pedro, affirms that she was born in 1867 (26).

7 Burgos continued in the field of education even as she became more well known for her newspaper writing. In 1906, she took a position at the Escuela de Artes e Industrias. In 1909, she transferred to the Central Women Teachers’ Training College, and in 1911, she was a lecturer at the Escuela de Artes e Industrias in Madrid, earning 3,000 pesetas a year (Davies 119).
Correspondencia to the liberal newspaper Heraldo de Madrid (1906), she is described as “la notable escritora,” author of the permanent column Femeninas, which, the Heraldo's editors promise, would establish the newspaper as a peer publication to “los grandes diarios de Europa” (qtd. in Louis 5). During the early years of her writing career, Burgos provoked public scandal and debate, in addition to arousing widespread interest in her work, by publishing articles about divorce and female suffrage. Her series on divorce, “El divorcio en España” (1904), elicited a range of opinions from leading intellectuals and politicians, including Emilia Pardo Bazán, Francisco Silvela, and Miguel de Unamuno, whose letters were published in the newspaper column on successive days. From that episode, Burgos earned the nickname la divorciadora. By 1908, she was an established and well-known writer. She edited literary journals and hosted tertulías in her home, interacting with members of the literary establishment. During the Spanish-Moroccan War (1909-1925), she became the first Spanish female war correspondent. With Ramón Gómez de la Serna, her domestic partner from 1908 until 1928, she enjoyed one of the most productive literary relationships in Spanish literary history (Davies 120 qtd. in Louis 5).

---

8 Pardo Bazán responded, “Muy señora mía y de mi aprecio. No contesté a usted porque no tengo opinión alguna sobre el divorcio, y por lo tanto no me es posible emitirla [. . .]” (qtd. in Starcevic 44). Silvela wrote, “Muy señora mía: Recibí su carta y con mucho gusto complacería sus deseos enviándole algún artículo para su Diario, si no mediaran las especiales circunstancias en que me encuentro, y que me imponen como regla de elemental discreción ocupar lo menos posible a la prensa con mi nombre” (qtd. in Starcevic 44). Unamuno’s longer response reflects his personal disinterest in the topic: “Debo empezar por confesarle que, a pesar de ser casado, o tal vez por ello mismo, no ha logrado nunca interesarme la cuestión del divorcio ni he llegado a formarme opinión sobre ella” (qtd. in Starcevic 135). Unamuno compares divorce to adultery and asserts also his disinterest in feminism since “la mayor parte de los males de que las mujeres se quejan son males que padecemos también los hombres” (qtd. in Starcevic 136). Continuing his disquisition, he ventures the idea that “el divorcio es un arma contra la mujer,” but finishes his letter to Burgos with the confession that “como verá, mis opiniones a este respecto son de las más tímidas, de las más atrasadas, de las más aburguesadas y de las menos innovadoras que cabe. Lo reconozco, pero no he conseguido hacerme otras” (qtd. in Starcevic 136). The series was published in monograph form under the same title also in 1904.
Though Burgos published her first cookbook, *La cocina moderna*, in 1906 (the same year she became a teacher at Madrid’s Escuela de Artes e Industrias), her involvement with these texts was not limited to the early days of her writing career, as critics tend to imply. Burgos published her second cookbook, *¿Quiere usted comer bien?*, in 1916, and she released the third, *Nueva cocina práctica* (an expanded and revised version of *La cocina moderna* that included the recipes from *¿Quiere usted comer bien?*) in 1925 as part of her *Obras completas.* In the 1925 cookbook, she incorporates the 1906 introduction, weaving pieces of the earlier essay verbatim into the new one, but she expands it significantly, from seven pages to sixty-four. This essentially new introduction, which demonstrates Burgos’s ongoing involvement with her cookbooks, invalidates common critical understandings of her cookbooks as texts that she wrote early in her career. Furthermore, given that Burgos’s salary had increased from the 3,000 pesestas or so she earned per year as a teacher in the Madrid Escuela de Artes e Industrias in 1911 to what Davies describes as a “sizable salary” in the 1920s (121), it seems unlikely that Burgos’s writing of the 1925 introductory essay was motivated by economic need. Thus, the cookbooks must be read not merely as texts written out of a need to support herself and her daughter, but as significant texts in her *oeuvre* that stand in dialogue with her overtly feminist work.

That said, Burgos produced all of her writing, whether in her cookbooks and practical manuals or in newspaper columns, novels, novelettes, and essays, as part of a career on which she depended for financial support. In contrast to Emilia Pardo Bazán, who, as a

---

9 Scott remarks that Sempere’s *Obras completas* series was basically a re-issue of the practical manuals; the series did not include any of Burgos’s fictional work that Sempere had published (56).
member of the aristocracy, most likely depended on an inheritance to finance her household (Bieder in Scott 23), Burgos was a middle-class woman who left the relative financial security of marriage to earn a living in a way that few other women of her class and status did. Or, if they did, according to Margarita Nelken, they hid their labor as best they could from the public eye (Nelken 52). The economic realities of her life placed Burgos in an awkward position as a literary figure and as an intellectual. While the burgeoning literary marketplace in Spain’s transitional cultural scene made her career possible and gave her a readership, the commerciality of Burgos’s work combined with her gender gave critics an excuse to dismiss her as not truly an intellectual.

Burgos’s writing career was made possible by the fundamental shifts underway in the Spanish literary scene, changes which gave dominance to inexpensive newspaper-style texts as a way of circulating ideas and, consequently, imparted new prominence to writers who wrote for them. In *La Edad de Plata, 1902-1939*, José-Carlos Mainer analyzes the transition taking place in the literary market and details how the newspaper format began to dominate the Spanish literary market in the early twentieth century. According to Mainer, newspaper formats became an expedient way to circulate ideas among the bourgeoisie and the working class and within populations of readers aligned to both the left and the right. Though Mainer dates the growth of newspapers in Spain to the 1860s, when newspapers independent of political parties began to circulate—Mainer identifies *La Correspondencia de España, La Corres,* and *El Imparcial* as examples (60)—the format increased in importance in the twentieth century (66). The “esclavitud del artículo—o de los artículos—de cada día” was a way for writers to make “la tertulia de las redacciones acaloradas a altas horas de la noche” available quickly to a growing public of readers (66). Mainer also links intellectuals’ work in
newspapers to what scholars have described as the “carácter predominantemente ‘ensayístico’” of contemporary Spanish literature (67); writers like Unamuno, Baroja, Azorín, Pérez de Ayala, and Ortega y Gasset rehearsed their ideas for their “obras maestras” in article form and thus found wider audiences for them (67).

The newspaper format Mainer characterizes as “la modalidad profesional más renumeradora” also offered twentieth-century writers “nuevas formas de difundir sus obras de imaginación al márgen del libro” (71). In a process begun in the nineteenth century, according to Elisa Martí’s analysis of newspaper folletines, literary texts were becoming commodities.10 The most vibrant example of this commodification is evident in a series of ‘revistas’ or ‘novelas breves’ or novelettes that were inspired by the monetary success of “revistas gráficas” like Blanco y negro, Vida Galante, and Mundo (Mainer 72).11 Beginning in 1905, a raft of new novelette series appeared that shared characteristics with graphic magazines and newspapers alike: “Cada número, de 24 páginas, del papel couché, lo ocuparía una novela corta, inédita, ilustrada en colores y con la caricatura del autor en la portada. Nada más. Colaborarían en ella los escritores y dibujantes más reputados, y aparecería los viernes—precisamente, los viernes—al precio de treinta céntimos” (Zamacois qtd. in Mainer

10 Mainer indicates that fiction writing in formats that shared characteristics with newspapers was a twentieth-century invention. However, nineteenth-century folletines certainly shared many characteristics with this supposedly new genre of fiction. Martí’s study, Borrowed Words: Translation, imitation, and the making of the nineteenth-century novel in Spain (2002), shows that critics have tended to ignore the folletín genre, judging it too closely aligned with commercial interests. However, she correctly asserts that “all nineteenth-century novels shared the same publishing infrastructure that supported the folletín,” but that the commercial taint of the folletín has kept scholars from examining “the impact of capitalist publishing policies in the late-nineteenth-century Realist novels” (19).

11 Mainer identifies Eduardo Zamacois as the author who created the genre and invited a first group of known writers to write for them. His idea was that authors would benefit from the greater sums produced by the sales of novelette series given the popularity of graphic magazines. The term revista was Zamacois’s preferred name for these publications (72).
These novelettes were similar in size to books, but had the price and image quality of illustrated magazines and the publishing schedule of newspapers (Mainer 72). Although they were created for mass consumption, nearly all of the notable authors of the day wrote for the series at one time or another: Gabriel Miró, Ramón Pérez de Ayala, Valle-Inclán, Unamuno, Galdós, Baroja, Martínez Sierra, Dicenta, Marquina, Ruisiñol, Picón, Baroja, Benavente, Pardo Bazán, and Burgos. Old-guard writers not only published in the novelette genre, but they also saw as them a new outlet for serious literature. Pérez Galdós, for example, considered the writing published in the novelette series to be high-quality literature despite the imagined popular readership of them; he opined that the publication of popular literature in this form would create a public for highbrow literature (Louis 9).

In fact, these novelette series did attract a new readership to the works of these writers and to literary texts in general: members of the petty bourgeoisie and of the working class who were just becoming literate. Burgos’s publishers, Francisco Sempere and Ramón Sopena, were pivotal figures in the development of Spain’s new literary marketplace in the early twentieth century (Mainer 62), and their catalogs reflect this bridge between popular

12 Mainer quotes the 1920 description of *La Novela Semanal* published by its editors: “Ni soy libro, ni periódico, ni revista ilustrada. Y, sin embargo, tengo del libro casi el tamaño y es posible que también la densidad del contenido, de la revista, el precio, el cuidado en la presentación y los grabados, y del periódico, la intermitencia y la formal cualidad de la aparición a plazo fijo” (qtd. in Mainer 72).

13 The new popularity of this kind of work, among literary writers, Mainer implies, was due to two factors: first, the “crisis del relato naturalista” and growth of works of “introspección psicológica” and the “anécdota reveladora” made the short and intense form of the genre attractive; and second, industrial demand for short novels rewarded writers’ production in this genre (71).

14 The new novelette series published during this period include the following titles: *El cuento semanal*, 1907-1912; *La novela corta*, 1916 – 1925; *La novela semanal*, 1921-1925; *La novela de hoy*, 1922-1932; *La novel mundial*, 1926-1928. See Mainer p. 72-76 for a complete description of these publications and their collaborators.
and literary works.\textsuperscript{15} Both Sempere and Sopena created popular series to capture a growing public readership, but they also published more literary texts. Sempere made possible the diffusion in Spain works by Kropotkin, Nietzsche, Engels, and Nordau (Mainer 58); Sopena disseminated translations of works by Dumas, Scott, Dickens, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky (Mainer 58).

Among the ranks of new readers targeted by these magazine publishers were a growing number of women readers. In 1900, women represented over 50% of Spain’s population and the proportion was continuing to rise (Scott 30); the number of literate women was also on the rise, almost doubling from 2,395,839 in 1900 to 4,462,730 in 1920 (Botrel \textit{Libros} 309). As Scott notes, the growing population combined with their increasing literacy made women readers an important market for this new type of text. Mainer also identifies a new preoccupation with gender and the literary marketplace, citing, among others, Unamuno’s grumbling in his prologue to \textit{Tres novelas ejemplares y un prólogo} about the increasing number of women readers as an example of the increasingly felt presence of women as new consumers of literature. Unamuno “se irritaba contra esas asistencia del público femenino, no tanto de ‘mujeres’ como—decía—de ‘señoras y señoritas’ que se aficionan a leer las narraciones ‘que les dan sus confesores o aquellas otras que se las prohíben’” (Mainer 73).

\textsuperscript{15} Sempere published Burgos’s 1906 \textit{La cocina moderna} and the 1925 \textit{Nueva cocina práctica} as part of a series aimed at female readers. Sopena published the 1916 \textit{¿Quiere usted comer bien?}. Burgos’s relationship with Francisco Sempere’s Valencia-based publishing house extended beyond her publication of the 1906 and 1925 cookbooks and other practical manuals. Her lengthy collaboration with Sempere from 1905 to 1928 produced hardcover editions of Burgos’s short stories, novels, and versions of her speeches, in addition to the instructional manuals of the \textit{Biblioteca para la mujer} (Scott 38, 40, 70).
Yet, it was precisely the readership of the “señoras y señoritas” disdained by Unamuno that publishers of this new genre hoped to capture. It is to these women readers that Burgos directed much of her writing, both her fiction and her non-fiction, and it was in this periodical genre that she developed her career. Louis remarks that Burgos “took advantage for feminist purposes of one of the biggest publishing events of her lifetime, namely the conversion of fiction into an article of mass consumption [. . .]” (7-8). Indeed, Burgos’s first novelettes were published in *El Cuento Semanal: El tesoro del castillo* in 1907; *Senderos de vida* in 1908; *En la guerra* in 1909; and *El honor de la familia* in 1911. This latter publication, according to Mercedes Granjel, had print runs of between 100,000 and 200,000 copies (Louis 8).

In this context, it is clear that the generally accepted characterization of Burgos’s practical manuals as texts produced to earn money is correct; Burgos’s career profile conformed to the new logic of literature as a consumer-driven practice. Indeed, scholars already collapse the dichotomy between Burgos’s “serious” or intellectual work and her mass-market writing by reading her novelettes as some of the most important work for feminism created in Spain during the twentieth century. For example, Louis writes, “much of [Burgos’s] journalistic, essayistic, fictional and politically activist work shows Burgos’s endeavor to construct proximity and interaction between the intellectual debates of her time and women’s lived experiences” (10). Roberta Johnson, in *Gender and Nation in the Spanish Modernist Novel*, describes how the domestic problems at the center of Burgos’s plots “resonate with national concerns” and recreate “a national indwelling through the basic institution of civil society, where tradition is firmly rooted in masculine and feminine roles
within marriage” (234). In her representation of these masculine and feminine roles, Burgos portrays how sociopolitical factors, rather than biological ones, define the nation (234-235).

If in her feminist writing, essays, and mass-market fiction Burgos “constructs proximity and interaction between intellectual debates and women’s lived experiences” (Louis 10) and gives voice to Spanish national anxieties in a discourse ostensibly about domestic concerns (Johnson 234), why would Burgos abandon this practice in her cookbooks, as critics seem to claim she does? Why are the cookbooks and other practical manuals rendered insignificant by their money-earning function while her mass-audience novelettes, which also seem to uphold domestic ideology and earn her money, are seen as among Burgos’s most radically feminist work? This contradiction has yet to be resolved in the scholarship, and I contend that it is central to understanding Burgos’s work.

As a writer of literary texts and articles that both represent and examine women’s positions in a modernizing Spain, Burgos was doing two things in her writing—entertaining readers and presenting them with feminist arguments. She was also doing two things in her career—making money and attempting to build a place for herself in the intellectual life of early twentieth-century Madrid. This meant that she always had two audiences and two agendas, and this created tensions and contradictions in her work. She knew that, and she was nowhere more clear about it than in the “Carta-Prólogo” and in the essays that introduce her cookbooks.

In 1924, the year before she published Nueva cocina práctica, with its sixty-four page introduction, Burgos defended her cookbook writing in the prologue to another of her re-issued and most likely re-edited practical manuals, El arte de seducir, issued under the new title Tesoro de la belleza (arte de seducir). Her defense of her cookbooks comes near the conclusion of
what Davies describes as the most prolific and successful period of literary production in Burgos’s life, the years spanning 1915 to 1925 (123). This prologue, which Starcevic mentions as merely an example of Burgos’s “curiosidad universal” (48), reveals Burgos’s awareness of her tenuous role in Spain’s new literary marketplace and the contradictions between the two readerships for whom she imagined her writing. Addressing the women readers of the text, Burgos writes:

Cuando algún imbécil pretende hacerme de menos, me llama la ilustre autora de ¿Quiere usted comer bien? [. . .] Por cierto, puede usted decir que un fabricante de Algemesí incluía en los saquitos de arroz que vendía una receta tomada de mi libro culinario para hacer la paella. Me pidió permiso y se lo di. Y el hombre me obsequió con unos cuantos saquitos con lo cual estuve una temporada dedicándoles a mis amistades saquitos de arroz en vez de libros.

(qtd. in Starcevic 47-48) 

Burgos describes as imbécil[es] those who attempt to dismiss her writing career by identifying her as the author of the cookbook ¿Quiere usted comer bien?. Instead of trying to diminish the place of the cookbook in her corpus, Burgos reverses the description of her work by noting proudly that her paella recipe was so good that it was included with the rice packets sold by “un fabricante de Algemesí.” She continues her playful presentation of the episode by equating the bags of rice sold with her recipe to the books she dedicated to friends and acquaintances.

16 Since this volume is not available in libraries in the United States, I have been unable to verify if the ellipses Starcevik includes in the quotation are Burgos’s or not. The usted she addresses after the ellipses seems to invoke for her female readers the figure of one of the imbéciles who criticize her.
On the one hand, this quotation reveals Burgos’s awareness of the new literary marketplace in Spain and her role in it. Just as her recipe for paella circulated to the women who purchased bags of Algemesí rice, so her writing circulated in the weekly novelettes that targeted new readers and women. This logic of literature as a consumer product marks her comparison of her books to bags of rice and recipes. On the other hand, the tone of the quotation indicates that Burgos wants to treat the situation humorously. By refusing to take seriously her critics’ discounting of her intellectual status, she mocks those who might be tempted to do so.17

The dismissal to which Burgos responds is implicitly based on her gender; the sarcasm of the description “la ilustre autora de ¿Quiere usted comer bien?” ridicules Burgos’s work in other genres. Indeed, Burgos’s gender provoked critics’ questioning of her work even as her writing circulated in the same literary marketplace and often focused on similar themes as the works of famous male writers. For example, Burgos’s 1906 essay “La base de nuestra regeneración,” in which she links Spain’s regeneration to its education system and condemns the persistent influence of the Catholic Church for creating an anti-intellectual institution that stunts Spain’s capacity to modernize, was published in El Pueblo eight days

17 Scott notes that in the 1924 version of El arte de seducir (retitled Tesoro de la belleza) that even though Burgos uses adjectives like frívola and ligera to describe the texts, she asserts the importance of practical manuals to women readers: “Al comenzar ahora la publicación de mis obras completas, entre el gran número de novelas, de críticas, artículos y libros de viaje, no quiero dejar en el olvido esta serie de libros, de un interés especial para la mujer” (Obras completas Vol. 1, 5 qtd. in Scott 55). Unfortunately, these texts are not available in the United States in any edition.
before Unamuno published, in the same newspaper, his own article on the role of religion in Spain’s modernization, “La libertad religiosa” (Núñez Rey 163-164).  

Yet, because of gender and her social class, the male literary establishment repeatedly denigrated Burgos and belittled her work. In Volume One of his memoir La novela de un literato (1914-1921) Rafael Cansinos-Asséns describes Burgos as “¡La primera mujer periodista que hace reportajes y no es condesa ni beata como la Pardo Bazán!” (192). And yet, he insinuates the existence of sexual relationships between Burgos and both Republican intellectual Blasco Ibáñez and her editor, Francisco Sempere, among others: “Columbine, la dama roja, es la . . . bueno, la antigua de Blasco Ibáñez y dispone, como de cosa propia, de la Editorial Sempere” (191). Cansinos-Asséns makes a number of remarks in his memoir about scandals Burgos incited, all of which are, as Núñez Rey shows, inaccurate and based on “juicios insidiosos que difundían los maledicientes” (qtd. in Scott 65). Scott shows that the representation of sexual indiscretion created by Cansinos-Asséns and others tainted Burgos’s reputation in her day and served as the source for later writers’ descriptions of her and her work. For example, in Las máscaras del héroe (1997), novelist Juan Manuel de Prada describes Burgos as “una escritora sin gracia, partidaria acérrima de una república federal, sufragista y algo machorra” (qtd. in Scott 66). And even recently, in the bizarre Memorias de Colombina: la primera periodista (1998), Federico Utrera invents an autobiographical narrative voice for

18 In that same year, Francisco Sempere published Burgos’s first cookbook, La cocina moderna, and also released a hardcover edition of her internationally reported speech, “La mujer en España,” presented to the Italian Asociación de la Prensa on April 28th, in which she presents an exhaustive, well-researched portrait of the social situation of women in Spain (Núñez Rey 158-159).
Burgos that expresses, as if she said them, opinions about her originally written by Cansinos-Asséns (Scott 67).  


Burgos was not alone in being personally maligned by critics and intellectuals; she was among a number of female intellectuals to whom Modernist circles remained closed. In addition to Burgos, female intellectuals like Margarita Nelken, Federica Montseny, and Concha Espina, women whose writing remained outside the canon, triggered what Johnson characterizes as “works of backlash” from male writers such as Azorín and Unamuno (27).  

Unamuno’s Dos Madres (1920) and La tía Tula (1921) and Azorín’s Doña Inés (1925), for example, portray unflatteringly strong female protagonists who choose not to marry (Johnson 27). Maryellen Bieder, in “Woman and the Twentieth-Century Spanish Literary Canon: The Lady Vanishes” (1992), describes the disappearance of complex female protagonists, like those featured in the novels of nineteenth-century literary figures, and female authors from the canon of Spanish literature in the first third of the twentieth century. Bieder offers two explanations for this disappearance. First, although the men who wrote nineteenth-century literary histories and included women did so in order to control and monitor “the scope of female authorship,” the “remarkable abundance and fecundity of women writers in the [nineteenth] century” represented in those histories threatened the

---

19 In addition to Cansinos-Asséns’ criticisms of her works, three concurrent editions of the magazine Madrid Cómico, the section titled “Chismes y Cuentos,” made Burgos and her literary career the focus of their ridicule in 1910. Number 17, from the 11th of July, mocked her physically. The next editions made her a target due to her writing about cooking, insinuating that Burgos submitted a recipe for tortilla to the magazine instead of a poem of other type of literary text (Bravo Cela 144).

20 Roberta Johnson names Burgos, along with female intellectuals Margarita Nelken, Federica Monseny, and Concha Espina, as writers who explored not only the issue of female education, but also the new social roles women were in the process of assuming in the early twentieth century. These women argued for women’s legal and social equality.
male writers of the twentieth century (302). Second, the canon was formed in the early
twentieth century; the writers who participated in what became a closed circle of male
intellectuals determined the texts that formed the canon (including primarily texts that they
produced); the work of women writers was excluded from the canon as the women
themselves were excluded from Modernist circles.

On the one hand, many of these male writers accepted Burgos’s presence in Madrid’s
intellectual and literary circles, as indicated as early as 1903 by their responses to her survey
about divorce in Spain. Even Cansinos-Asséns participated in the tertulias Burgos hosted in
her home. On the other hand, they “attempted to turn women’s efforts to join the ranks of
high culture into a national joke [even as] the cautionary tales embedded in their fiction
indicated that they also [saw women’s efforts] as a serious threat to national stability”
(Johnson 28).  

These factors have conspired to ensure that Burgos’s oeuvre has remained absent
from traditional literary histories due to generalizing anecdotes about its lack of aesthetic
quality, anecdotes that circulated in her time and continue to be repeated today (Núñez Rey
21). Yet, in 1905, Burgos and Emilia Pardo Bazán were the first two women admitted to

21 Burgos’s radical ideas about the place of women and social injustice were dismissed by Azorín and
Unamuno; they also caused the banning of her complete works in the early days of Francisco Franco’s
dictatorship. Her books, articles, and essays, along with those of authors like Voltaire, Zola, Rousseau, and
Upton Sinclair, were prohibited; libraries could not circulate texts by these authors, bookstores were not
allowed to sell them, and publishing houses were prohibited from issuing new editions of them (Núñez Rey
10). Only in the 1980s did Burgos’s work appear in new collections, and they are still not widely available.
Núñez Rey describes this banning as “una medida tan eficaz y definitiva como el efecto de un volcán que
entierra bajo sus cenizas a una floreciente ciudad” (10); one of its most effective consequences was that
scholars completely neglected her work until Elizabeth Starcevic published her monograph, Carmen de Burgos:
Defensora de la mujer, in 1976.

22 Cejador y Frauca does not include Burgos in his 1922 Historia de la literatura even though, by the 1920s, she
was a well-known and established figure in Madrid’s literary circles (Davies 121).
Madrid’s Ateneo (Scott 47). Despite being made the target of rumors and jokes by male members of the literary establishment, Burgos was one of the most popular writers of the early twentieth century, whose work (thousands of articles, one hundred books, poetry, investigative journalism, travel books, practical manuals, and cookbooks) attracted a mass following—a phenomenon made possible by the literary market in which her writing circulated (Davies 123).

In fact, the dichotomous response to Burgos’s work is due, in part, to the nature of the literary marketplace. Precisely because both intellectual and popular texts all circulated together in the market, a process that began in the nineteenth century, the line between “serious” writing and “frivolous” writing became blurred. The “reproduced” nature of Burgos’s work in her practical manuals (Benjamin 219)—the recipes she includes in her cookbooks are largely borrowed from others, or, as Carmen Simón Palmer speculates, copied directly from French cookbooks (Scott 92)—reduced them in the eyes of some to “industrially produced [works] of consumer art” (Bernstein in Adorno 2), neither relevant nor worthy of acknowledgment in the national literary and political conversation. Burgos’s writing in the practical manuals cast a shadow over her writing in genres conventionally understood as “serious,” such as, for example, her 1927 essay *La mujer moderna y sus derechos* or her critical monograph about Larra’s life and work, *Fígaro* (1919). The mixing in the marketplace of all of these works presented male writers with fuel for their rejections of her intellectual work. Even today, the mixture continues to challenge attempts to classify her.

Burgos’s defense of her authorship of cookbooks reflects her understanding of the market in which her works circulate. It is a market that makes her writing in its varied forms—in cookbooks, novelettes, newspaper articles, speeches, and political essays—
available to middle-class women readers. It is the market that makes her career as a middle-class woman possible. And yet, the market is also one of the factors that gives critics license to dismiss her work as unimportant, mass-market, and frivolous. And yet, Burgos challenges the criteria by which her critics have attempted to classify her work. In her cookbooks, in texts that superficially comply with the representation of Carmen de Burgos that her critics use to “hacer[la] de menos,” Burgos does a curious thing. She uses cooking to show women how they can be relevant on their own terms to Spain’s public sphere. Writing in a cookbook about the history of cuisine in Spain gives Burgos a space to mount a very personal defense of her role as a writer and an intellectual and as someone whose work as a woman shapes the social life of modern Spain.

3.2 “Mi estimado amigo . . .”: Double Writing, Double Reading

As an intellectual writer, Burgos was threatening to the literary establishment; on the other hand, her writing in cookbooks and other genres with a primarily female readership rendered her unthreatening to that establishment. Writing about cooking, cosmetics, or homemaking (all topics Burgos addressed in her practical manuals) does not challenge the gendered hierarchy described by Maryellen Bieder. According to this hierarchy, as Maite Zubiaurre asserts, “Women [writers] were forced [by the male literary establishment] to remain outside the canon, and within the limits of popular culture and of certain publications ‘suitable’ for a female readership” (Zubiaurre 1). Paradoxically, this dismissal of feminine forms of writing creates a rhetorical space that Burgos uses in her cookbooks to advance an

---

23 Bieder develops this model of the female writer in the early twentieth century in her article “Woman and the Twentieth-Century Spanish Literary Canon: The Lady Vanishes.”
argument about women’s roles in Spanish public life even as she allays the fears of the male literary establishment by seeming to conform to generic expectations.

She does this through the creation of a double discourse, what Maite Zubiaurre describes as “double writing” (1) and Michael Ugarte sees as Burgos’s “cultural work” (80).24 In their focus on Burgos’s sentimental novels, Ugarte, Louis, and Johnson analyze how she conceals subversive ideas about women, their careers, and their social rights in fictional texts that, on the surface, pose no threat to the established order. This practice of “double-writing” is not an uncommon way of working for Burgos (Zubiaurre 1).

In her article, “Double Writing/Double Reading Cities, Popular Culture, and Stalkers: Carmen de Burgos’ El Persiguíador” (2003), Zubiaurre describes Burgos’s “double writing” as a practice made necessary by the “demands that the androcentric society of her time imposed” on women writers (1). In one article, Burgos advised readers about skin care or fashion, while planning another on divorce, only to follow the article about divorce with “an enchantingly frivolous article about the Spanish royalty” (3). “Double writing” was one of the tactics Burgos used “to speak meaningfully and to consistently undermine patriarchal beliefs, while at the same time faking harmless chatter” (3).

Similarly, in her cookbooks, Burgos offers her women readers a critique of the ideology of domesticity that confines them to their homes even as she appears to conform

24 Ugarte recognizes Burgos’s writings as examples of the “cultural work” that literature can do (80). According to Jane Tompkins, literary texts do “cultural work” when they attempt to redefine the social order in order to reflect “how a culture thinks about itself” (Tompkins in Ugarte 80). Tompkins refuses to exclude so-called “minor texts”—essays, pamphlets, and sentimental novels that supposedly lack aesthetic or thematic value—from an understanding of the cultural work performed by literary texts. Thus, analyzing “the ways in which the text is disseminated, the strategies it employs to win a specific readership, its construction of a dialogue with the established order” allows for an understanding of Burgos’s cookbooks in my study (and of her novels in Ugarte’s work) as one attempt to redefine gender roles in the social order in early twentieth-century Spain (Ugarte 80).
to generic expectations for cookbooks. She draws attention to her writing and her public career in a discourse supposedly about cooking and the practices of elegant women in their homes. Burgos’s letter to Sempere actually disputes the traditional model of femininity outlined in practical manuals and argues against the restrictions that limit Burgos, in her writing, and other women physically, to the domestic space. So, Burgos establishes two kinds of dialogue: one with her editor and a second one with her female readers.

Burgos’s interlocutor in the first dialogue is her male editor, Francisco Sempere, who functions as a representative of the literary establishment. This dialogue renders the cookbook unthreatening by demonstrating how the book and its author comply with conventional expectations for cookbooks. At the same time, in the second dialogue with her middle-class women readers, Burgos uses the form of the cookbook as a cover for a subversive questioning of the gendered spheres in Spain.

The form of the “Carta-Prólogo,” the primary vehicle of this double discourse, is identical in both of the volumes in which it appears, *La cocina moderna* (*LCM*; 1906) and *Nueva cocina práctica* (*NCP*; 1925). Presented as a letter to her editor, Sempere, the “Carta-Prólogo” is ostensibly an expression of her interaction as a woman with the established patriarchal order. Addressing Sempere with an obsequious yet warm formality, she describes him as both her *estimado* and *querido* friend (v) and closes the letter with a similar level of warm formality: “Y expresando á usted en estas líneas mi ideal sentir, acepto el encargo de arreglar el libro de cocina que me indica. Deseo que el público lo acoja con el mismo placer que los escribe su amiga y s.s.q.s.m.b., Carmen de Burgos” (vi). Burgos’s rhetoric in this last sentence expresses her obedience to Sempere’s request that she write the cookbook and acknowledges the gender-determined hierarchy that defines their relationship. This primary
dialogue reflects the established order between a powerful man and a less powerful female and works with the genre of the text (a cookbook) to support a conventional association between women and domesticity.

Burgos’s description of her imagined readership also appears to uphold the conventional associations between cookbooks, women, and domesticity. She identifies as the target consumers of the book women who strive to emulate the “muchas grandes damas y mujeres de buena posición” (LCM vi). These women, who have the means to purchase the book and the education to read it, are individuals for whom cooking may be an interest rather than a necessity; the price of the book, 1.25 pesetas, also meant that women at the margins of the middle class, women who aspired to an appearance of middle-class elegance, might have afforded it. Burgos writes:

Hay mucho de grato en proporcionar los placeres de la mesa á los que se ama, y esta satifacción la saborean muchas grandes damas y mujeres de buena posición, que si no manejan por sí mismas el soplillo y el mortero, saben dirigir desde el modo de montar y tener una cocina hasta el de hacer los platos más exquisitos y servirlos con elegancia. Nunca una señora que no sepa dirigir podrá estar bien servida. (vi)

This model of her reader as an elegant woman with time to take an interest in cooking serves as a prelude to one of the main themes of her introduction in both the 1906 and the 1925 volumes. She reassures her readers that their interest in cooking need not correspond to laboring in the kitchen like a servant: “si no manejan por sí mismas el sopillo y el mortero” (vi). Rather, knowing about cooking makes a woman a better director of her kitchen and her household; knowledge makes her capable of managing her servants, if she has them. Like
Pardo Bazán in *La cocina española moderna*, Burgos participates in a broader attempt to strengthen middle-class values in households at the margins of the middle classes. By using the example of the “grandes damas y mujeres de buena posición” as the model, Burgos presents her cookbook as a textbook that offers the knowledge to become one of those grand women. In the cookbook, readers may find
todos los detalles de la cocina y el comedor, la manera de hacer los guisos clásicos de España, [. . .] los principales platos clásicos de la extranjera, [. . .] y por último, las nociones de la higiene de los alimentos, los platos sin condimentos y el modo de preparar conservas, pastas y dulces; en una palabra, cuanto á la buena dueña de la casa pueda interesarle, y yo creo que le interesa todo. (vi)25

Furthermore, Burgos’s identification of her imagined readers as middle-class women or women who aspire to be upper class confirms to her editor, to whom the prologue is addressed, that the volume fulfills the conventional purpose of a cookbook or practical manual—to teach readers to run their kitchens well and prepare elegant meals.

However, within the primary dialogue with Sempere, which presents the cookbook as a practical manual for middle-class women with aspirations to upper-class elegance,

25 Like Pardo Bazán, Burgos describes the modest household of a worker:

Además de esto, la comida diaria requiere la variedad compatible con la modestia. El obrero no iría el domingo á la taberna en busca del plato de callos mal guisados si su mujer regulase todas las semanas su paladar con platos bien condimentados, servidos en mesa limpia, en estancia risueña y sazonados con amable conversación. (vi)

Burgos’s description of the worker who eats his *callos* in the bar rather than at home echoes Pardo Bazán’s description of the importance of “hacer grata la diaria pitanza al marido, al padre, habituándole á no andar por fondas y cafés [. . .]” (*Cocina española moderna* III). Although Burgos mentions the worker (the *obrero*) in this description, it is unlikely that wives of workers were the intended audience for her cookbook. It is more likely that the women she addresses are of the petty bourgeoisie.
Burgos creates a secondary dialogue with her readers that offers a different model of femininity than the angel of the house model that nineteenth-century practical manuals embraced. In this secondary dialogue, Burgos narrates her own response to the cookbook project as an illustration of the expectations that structure her relationship to Sempere and her role as a middle-class woman. Even in the first sentence of the “Carta-Prólogo,” she calls into question the expectations of Spanish society regarding women’s roles and capabilities, pointedly reminding her readers that the idea of the cookbook project did not originate with her. Rather, she characterizes her participation as a simple acceptance of Sempere’s *demanda*:

> Mi estimado amigo: Sorpresa grandísima me ha producido su última carta, y no porque en su demanda de escribir un libro de cocina realiza nada de extraordinario la que, trabajando como obrera, hace de la pluma aguja para ganar el sustento. (Burgos, 1906, v)

She reassures Sempere that his request that she write this cookbook is not an inappropriate one to make of a woman: “y no porque su demanda de escribir un libro de cocina realiza nada de extraordinario” (v). Clarifying that her interest in her own subsistence spurs her participation—“trabajando como obrera” and “para ganar el sustento” (v)—she emphasizes that the cookbook is her work. She is a worker (*obrera*), and her tool is her “pluma aguja” (v).

---

26 According to Catherine Jagoe in *Ambiguous Angels* (1994), conventional domestic advice and practical manuals like those published by nineteenth-century writers María Pilar Sinués de Marco and Faustina Saéz de Melgar direct an explicit message to readers about the “necessity of being submissive and subservient domestic angels, totally identified with the home and the family” (32).
In the version of the letter that appeared in the 1925 cookbook, this sentence differs in two words from the 1906 version. In 1925, the sentence reads, “[. . .] Sorpresa grandísima me ha producido su última carta, y no porque en *acceder a* su demanda de escribir un libro realiza nada de extraordinario [. . .]” (vi, italics mine). The addition of the verb *acceder* indicates Burgos’s acquiescence to the request and reflects, perhaps, a cynicism about their publishing relationship. This small change shifts the sentence from a commentary about the requests appropriately made of women—to write on topics related to domesticity—to a commentary about the requests made of Burgos specifically and the roles she fills as a public writer.

In both versions, Burgos’s rhetoric illuminates how she makes her intellectual credibility as a writer central to the project of cookbook writing at the same time that it acknowledges the public identification of cooking as a ‘natural’ part of women’s work. At the same time, Burgos works to denaturalize this association. She emphasizes her *arrangement* (*arreglar* in the 1906 version, *hacer* in the 1925 version) of the cookbook and her *writing* of the introductory essay, a choice that distances her from the recipes; she does not write them, but simply arranges them. Her role in the project is that of a writer, and her appeal to readers reflects that role: “[. . .] tenga usted paciencia para leer los párrafos que siguen como muestra elocuente de mi culinaria erudición [. . .]” (vi). In this phrase, she both requests the patience of her readers and defends her knowledge (“*muestra elocuente de mi culinaria erudición [. . .]*”) (vi).

---

27 Although the 1925 version of the letter introduces small but meaningful changes from the 1906 version, Burgos does not indicate anywhere that she edited or revised the letter.
A wonderful example of double writing occurs in the second sentence of Burgos’s letter to Sempere. Here, Burgos juxtaposes the surprised anger she could have felt at Sempere’s request, as an established writer asked to produce a relatively insignificant/minor/old-fashioned work—anger capable of damaging the relationship with her editor, whom she takes care to characterize in laudatory terms (rumboso, campechano)—with a different sort of surprise:

Fuera genio al uso, y mi sorpresa llegaría al enojo, capaz de romper la antigua y leal amistad, asombro de autores que no conocen editor tan rumboso y campechano: mi sorpresa ha sido de otro orden; me ha obligado a exclamar:

—¡Diablo de Sempere! ¿Cómo ha adivinado que guiso mejor que escribo?

( LC M, v)

She convivially acquiesces to the request since, she takes care to stress, Carmen de Burgos cooks even better than she writes. With the question “¿Cómo ha adivinado?” Burgos pretends not to see the gendered assumptions Sempere makes in asking her to produce the book. Her phrasing both confirms her culinary abilities and raises the possibility of a negative outcome to Sempere’s request, given Burgos’s status as a professional writer. In the 1925 version of the “Carta-Prólogo,” Burgos pushes the point a bit further, substituting “lo mismo” for “mejor”: “¡Diablo de Sempere! ¿Cómo ha adivinado que guiso lo mismo que escribo?” (NCP 5, italics mine). By comparing her cooking and writing skills, Burgos questions the assumptions that undergird Sempere’s request of her. Equating the skill of cooking with the skill of writing emphasizes that cooking and writing are both skills rather than qualities determined by gender. The comparison dismantles the idea that either practice inherently belongs either to men or to women and challenges the notion that women are de
facto good cooks. Furthermore, the assessment of her cooking skills as equivalent to her writing skills is an ironic comment about the publication of the cookbook, given that by 1925 her reputation as a writer was so established that Sempere was republishing her cookbooks as part of her obras completas.

Burgos also tells her female readers directly that her purpose in writing the cookbooks is to make them conscious of the artificial limitation of their social possibilities to the private sphere and its domestic chores and to encourage public engagement: “Yo no me opongo á que vayan al foro y al Parlamento” (LCM vi).28 By incorporating her comments about her other writing into her written reaction to Sempere’s request that she write the cookbook, Burgos keeps her intellectual status as an author central in the minds of her readers in order to push them to reassess their roles inside and outside of their homes. She makes an example of her career in order to question the rigid restrictions of domesticity and to show readers how to remake their roles in society.

Burgos goes on to invite her readers’ complicity in a secret that she confesses to Sempere: “Le confieso á usted en secreto que á veces dejo la pluma porque siento la nostalgia de la cocina” (LCM v, Burgos’s italics). Framing this confession as a secret is the most visible marker that Burgos has written something radical. By characterizing the kitchen, cooking, and domesticity as sites of nostalgia, she suggests that the idea of the domestic space as the place of women belongs to an old social configuration. Burgos may identify “ocupaciones caseras” as fundamental to women’s nature, but at the same time she casts doubt on the “naturalness” of this interest by describing it nostalgically as an inheritance from the past:

---

28 The 1925 version of the letter substitutes “deseo” for “no me opongo” (7).
“Largos siglos de herencia marcaron en nosotras sus huellas, y nuestra naturaleza nos inclina a ocupaciones caseras, del mismo modo que a buscar las alhajas y los encajes” (LCM v). In the present, for Burgos, cooking is optional, an object of nostalgia; it becomes part of the affective sphere of the home in which she participates in caring for her family. The tools of the kitchen do not replace her tools as a writer.

This rhetoric presents the fact of Burgos's work in the public sphere as routine; her description of cooking as something she does out of nostalgia takes for granted that her work in the public sphere is acceptable. This was a radical notion. In La condición social de la mujer en España (1919), Margarita Nelken reveals the strength of the dominant ideology in Spain regarding women's roles within the home and as workers. For Nelken, bourgeois marriage was a prison both for the woman who had to marry, or “venderse legítimamente,” and for the man who became financially responsible for his wife and any unmarried aunt, sister, or niece (50). And yet, work for middle-class women “aparece todavía, a la mayoría de las gentes, como una cosa insólita y que, no sólo no debe ser tomada en consideración, sino que debe ser ridiculizada, y esto sin que hayan sido siquiera examinados sus pros y sus contras” (51). This deeply entrenched attitude limited “la actividad de la mujer al círculo de los quehaceres domésticos” (51). The prejudice surrounding the idea of women’s work marked women who had to work as fallen women, cloaked in shame (Nelken 52-53). In the context of Nelken’s analysis, Burgos’s description of her own work makes activity in the public sphere seem not shameful, but an object of pride.

Burgos also reverses the dichotomy by bringing cooking into the public sphere in a redefinition that both legitimates her writing about cooking and establishes a social role for cooking: “Concedo á la cocina un gran papel social: ‘Dime lo que comes y te diré quién
Cooking also has a biological purpose: “[. . .] el organismo, la sangre, todo lo que construye nuestra imperfecta máquina, se sostiene con los manjares que la renuevan” (vi). Consequently, Burgos argues that women require formal training in cooking: “De aquí que no sea ocioso a la mujer saber un poco de higiene de la alimentación y conocer los platos sanos para los niños, los ancianos, los convalecientes y los estómagos delicados” (VI). In this conjunction of social and nutritional demands, Burgos makes women into actors who perform the professionalized task of cooking and makes them responsible for filling the social and biological needs of the community, a theme she explores further in her 1906 introduction.

Burgos also links cooking to the public sphere by connecting her own cooking to her public work as a writer. She compares public reactions to her writing to her family’s appreciation of her cooking, writing in the 1906 version, “Le aseguro a usted que, á veces, viendo el gusto y apetito con que los rebaña mi familia, he sentido el mismo asomo de vanidad que experimento cuando alguna persona que no los ha leído me elogia mis artículos” (LCM v, italics mine). As Pardo Bazán does, Burgos describes the pleasure she finds in cooking. But where Pardo Bazán seeks to convince her readers that her interest in cooking is genuine, despite her public profile as an androgynous woman or marimacho whose concerns are those of the masculine world, Burgos wants to keep her writing, and her work as a woman writer, on the same table with the dishes.

29 The second part of her sentence is a quotation from Brillat-Savarin’s *The Physiology of Taste* (1825).

30 The antecedent for “los” are the generic “platos nacionales y extranjeros” that Burgos describes in the preceding sentence (CEM v).
At the same time, Burgos reveals in this statement a cynical criticism of her public, expressed in the modifying clause “que no los ha leído,” which is omitted from the 1925 version of the letter. By describing the individuals who praise her as not having read her writing, Burgos nullifies the praise she attributes to her cooking and backhandedly criticizes Sempere for exploiting her public reputation to sell books, a reputation she earned first in 1904 as a consequence of her work on divorce. The disparagement of those individuals who know of her but neither read nor purchase the texts she writes also suggests the circumstances that make her publication of practical manuals like the cookbooks an economic necessity. Both interpretations make clear Burgos’s desire to be recognized as a writer even as they show how she grapples with the tension between her gender, her public career, and her dependence, at least in 1906, on the literary marketplace.

Near the conclusion of her letter, Burgos reminds her readers and Sempere that the most important part of the cookbook is not the recipes, but her introduction:

> Ahora, en apoyo de que el arte de la cocina es tan noble como necesario, tenga usted paciencia para leer los párrafos que siguen, como muestra elocuente de mi culinaria erudición y de mi deseo de que la mujer no desdeñe las ocupaciones del hogar, cualquiera que sean su intelectualidad y su posición. (vi)

By defining cooking as art, Burgos justifies the seriousness of her essay, and she uses this definition to establish her own intellectual credibility. Yet, her defensive phrasing and her

---

31 Simón Palmer speculates in a conversation reported by Lynn Scott that Burgos had no role whatsoever in writing or even choosing the recipes. According to Palmer, Burgos merely translated French cookbooks and made a few changes for the Spanish marketplace (Scott 92). Federico Utrera echoes that hypothesis in Memorias de Colombine: la primera periodista (1998).
plea for her readers’ patience indicate her anticipation of criticism of her intelectualidad in choosing to write cookbooks.

Burgos’s emphasis in the second part of the sentence—that her scholarly essay is an example of her “deseo de que la mujer no desdeñe las ocupaciones del hogar”—complicates conventional understandings of how domestic chores support the ideology of domesticity. It also complicates her subversive message regarding the artificiality of limiting women’s social possibilities to the private sphere and its domestic chores. With the example of her own career, Burgos challenges society’s structuring of women’s interactions with men, and she criticizes the social control exerted by an ideology of domesticity that restricts women from playing greater roles in the public sphere. At the same time, though, she argues for the importance of the domestic function. Identifying cooking as an art belonging to the “ocupaciones del hogar,” Burgos argues for both the biological and the cultural importance of cooking, presenting it as both the provision of needed nutrition and as a noble art form (vi). Thinking of cooking in this way makes it not merely another invisible household chore but a form of what feminist historian Gerda Lerner calls “practical knowledges,” bodies of knowledge that come into being when groups of individuals, like women, are excluded from institutional or structured power (12). The practical knowledge of marginalized populations is central to the social lives of individuals and their communities; the “ocupaciones del hogar” of cooking and childrearing are critical for the life of the community (LCM vi). In other words, it is the fact of women’s confinement to the home and to domestic roles to which Burgos objects, not the domestic tasks women perform.

So, Burgos encourages her women readers to imagine themselves in the foro and in the Parlamento, but tempers her call for a radical reorganization of women’s roles by also
emphasizing women’s kitchen responsibilities: “¡Yo no me opongo á que vayan al foro y al Parlamento [. . .] después de haber dispuesto la cocina en su casa!” (LCM 1906, vi); “¡Yo deseo que vayan al foro y al Parlamento [. . .] después de haber dispuesto la cocina en sus casas!” (NCP 1925, 7). The *foro* is for after the cooking is done.\(^\text{32}\) In another example, Burgos suggests that women can balance their responsibilities within the home with careers outside of it: “Porque yo, querido amigo, creo y practico que la mujer puede ser periodista, autor y hasta artista, sin olvidar por eso los pequeños detalles del hogar para su acertada dirección, guarda de la salud, la paz y sosiego de la familia. ¿Por qué negarlo?” (LCM v). She does not tell her readers that the things women do in their homes are unimportant. On the contrary, these two examples demonstrate the importance she places on those tasks. Rather, she believes that women should not be limited to these tasks, but should be able to contribute in the public sphere as legal and social equals to men.

### 3.3 “Escuela y Despensa”: Public Education, Cooking, and Regeneration\(^\text{33}\)

The double dialogue initiated in the “Carta-Prólogo” is continued in the introductory essays included in each of the cookbooks. In the introductory essay for *La cocina moderna* (1906), Burgos furthers her argument about the artificiality of women’s restriction to the private sphere with examples of powerful women, for example Catherine de Médicis, whose interest in cooking affects their nations’ political lives.\(^\text{34}\) Suggesting an expansion of culinary

---

\(^{32}\) The change in verb choice from “no me opongo” to “deseo” strengthens this sentiment even as Burgos maintains her tempering of the phrase by asserting the priority of women’s responsibility to their homes.

\(^{33}\) Boyd quotes Joaquin Costa (43).

\(^{34}\) The seven-page essay, titled “Importancia del arte culinario,” is organized in four parts: the introduction; a brief history of the importance of cuisine to culture from Biblical times through Antiquity, the Middle Ages,
education for women in Spain, Burgos moves cooking outside the home in a way that implies that Spanish women’s activities can also have an impact on their nation.

In 1906, women and their roles in a modernized Spain were very much in the public eye. After 1898, intellectuals focused with renewed vigor on identifying Spain’s distinctiveness—its national soul, intrahistoria, or tradición eterna, in Unamuno’s terms—in order to forge a Spanish national identity that would suppress insecurities about Spain’s failed empire. Intellectuals, especially male Modernist authors, looked to Golden Age literary texts for an embedded national tradition (Johnson 22). By constructing a literary canon with these Golden Age texts at their center, nation-building intellectuals distilled a host of national “types” that represented Spain’s essential being (21). The wave of introspection that spurred intellectuals to identify Spain’s essential being also extended to the family, marriage, and women as “a microcosm for the nation and a barometer for measuring its health” (10).35 Classical texts such as Tirso de Molina’s plays, La celestina, Lazarillo de Tormes, and Cervantes’ Don Quijote provided material for nation-building and, according to Johnson, provided guidance for dealing with the working classes and women in a new Spain (21). However, in contrast to male nation-builders, who promoted a social role for women that made them, along with the working class and the peasantry, guarantors of Spain’s essential traditions and Spain’s Golden Age; a catalogue of aristocratic women in Europe who took an interest in cooking and cuisine; and finally, a four-paragraph argument about the benefit of cooking education for modern Spanish women.

35 Johnson dates to the 1860s the interest of social theorists (Krausists, primarily) in women and their roles in society. Enríquez de Salamanca, Jago, and Blanco date to 1840s male intellectuals’ obsessive interest with the category of “woman” (15).
(Johnson 20), women intellectuals of the early twentieth century worked “to find their own place in the national order through feminist discourse and activity” (13).

Burgos was an active participant in this debate. In 1906, she explicitly questioned in a variety of venues the place of women in the new social and political order of a regenerating Spain. In a speech delivered to the Italian Asociación de la Prensa in Rome on April 28th, she presented “un análisis exhaustivo, poblado de datos, de la situación de la mujer española de la época” (Núñez Rey 151) and placed her analysis of the situation of contemporary women in Spain in context with her hopes for Spain’s future:

Yo no puedo por mi exagerado patriotismo ocultar defectos cuando se espera oír la verdad de mis labios; pero me complazco en hacer notar que tenemos el espíritu sano, vibrante, que hay géneres de vida, de engrandecimiento. Toda la tarea consiste en saber dirigir y aprovechar nuestras fuerzas. No somos un pueblo decrépito y gastado; somos más bien un pueblo infantil, a propósito para llegar a una juventud potente. (qtd. in Núñez Rey 159)

Additionally, in a series of articles published in the Valencia newspaper El Pueblo, Burgos linked Spain’s regeneration to its educational system and condemned the persistent influence of the Church for creating an anti-intellectual institution that stunted Spain’s capacity to modernize:

36 The speech, titled “La mujer en España” (published by Sempere in 1906/1907), was attended by international media, Spanish dignitaries from the embassy, and Spanish and Italian intellectuals, including Concepción Jimeno de Flaquer.
Ya se sabe cuál es el ideal de la educación monacal: aplanar la voluntad, sujetar el vuelo de la inteligencia, hacer de todas las criaturas una masa que se pueda medir con el mismo rasero; todos empastados en pergamino; que nadie descuelle, que nadie eleve el pensamiento más allá de lo que a sus fines conviene. (Burgos “La base de nuestra regeneración” qtd in Núñez Rey 163)

The 1906 articles for her column in the Heraldo de Madrid highlighted “las actividades que en toda Europa desarrolla la mujer. Escritoras, artistas, científicas, con sus asociaciones, todas de dentro y fuera de España, y también las obreras, las mujeres en el hogar, los niños, su educación” (Núñez Rey 162). And, in light of the first victory of the women’s suffrage movement in Finland,37 Burgos solicited participation in a survey, titled “El voto femenino,” about the preparedness of Spanish women for voting rights for her November 25th Heraldo de Madrid column.

The newspaper published seventy responses to the survey, in which 4962 individuals participated: 922 of respondents were in favor of women’s suffrage in Spain and 3640 were against it. Burgos remarked about the results:

[El] pueblo español, comparado con el de otras naciones, sufre un notable atraso; es aún mayor el peso de los atavismos que la fuerza del progreso que lo impulsa. La mujer necesita en España conquistar primero su cultura; luego sus derechos civiles, puesto que en nuestros Códigos no la conceptúan en muchos casos persona jurídica, y después hacer que las costumbres le

37 In her cookbook Burgos identifies Finland’s progressive culinary education. Finnish women were granted voting rights on June 1, 1906.
concedan mayor libertad, más respeto y condiciones de vida independiente. Entonces estará capacitada para conquistar el derecho político. (Burgos “El voto femenino” qtd. in Nuñez Rey 167)

Although Núñez Rey indicates that this comment reflected more Burgos’s analysis of the survey results than her own assessment of the preparedness of women to vote, in all of these discourses Burgos links Spain’s regeneration to education and, most importantly, to the education of women (167). She is quite clearly defining her own place as an advocate for female education as an essential part of Spain’s modernization. Given the scope of her work in a variety of media in 1906 that focused on women’s education and their roles in modern society, the fact that Burgos wrote a practical manual ostensibly to direct women’s activity in their homes is jarring.

“Bellas elegantes” and double writing

In the introductory essay to La cocina moderna, Burgos practices the same double-writing I previously identified in the “Carta-Prólogo.” She begins in the first paragraph of the essay by inviting the male establishment to understand her work in the introduction as trivial:

Quiero fijar la imaginación en salsas y condimentos; [. . .] por maldito resabio literario, aparece entre mi pluma y las cuartillas la sonrisa burlona de mi adorado poeta Henry Heine, que se burla graciosamente de esta manera de retrotraer las cuestiones más baladís á su origen bíblico y seguirlas cuidadoso al [sic] través de las edades. (LCM 7)
In naming Heinrich Heine, Burgos displays her own erudition at the same time that she uses his figure to invoke the image of the literary establishment who might read her work in this cookbook introduction and make fun of her as she traces the most insignificant issues to their biblical origins. She disparages her work in the cookbooks in three different ways: she uses two variations of the word *burlarse* (*burlona* and *se burla*), and she categorizes her subject as one of “cuestiones más baladí” about which she traces a history (*LCM* 7). She makes a target of herself and, at the same time, says that the subjects about which she will write are slightly ridiculous. Furthermore, she states that she would renounce working this way if the topic was any other: “De otra cosa tratase, y yo renunciaría á transcribir lo que de su historia hubiese llegado a mi noticia” (7). She insinuates to the male establishment that because she writes for the aspiring “muchas bellas elegantes” in the cookbook introduction, that she chooses to maintain this way of presenting material—“esta manera de retrotraer las cuestiones más baladí á su origen bíblico”—since it will be most appealing to what she insinuates is an unsophisticated female readership (*LCM* 7).

Burgos uses a recognizable model also employed by María Pilar Sinués de Marco, the nineteenth-century author of women’s conduct manuals, to make her prologue sound conventional and consistent with ideas about the “frivolous” texts middle-class women find entertaining. She begins the essay by explicitly calling attention to her decision to structure the essay around historical figures whose histories “pueden ser útil[es] en el presente, y eso de ver reyes, príncipes y grandes señores cocinando como cualquier simple mortal, contribuirá á decidir á imitarlos á muchas bellas elegantes” (*LCM* 7). Her phrasing suggests that examples of royal figures will easily impress her women readers. By naming aristocratic women as models, Burgos appeals to stereotypical notions of women’s interests that are
coherent with one definition of *cursilería* as “a form of imitation based on class (the middle classes aping the aristocracy)” (Valis 16). Burgos suggests that her women readers mimic the behavior of these women and take a greater interest in cooking and the kitchen. In doing so, she insinuates, her middle-class readers will come closer to becoming “bellas elegantes” (*LCM* 7).

By aligning herself with those who might criticize the text and its purpose, Burgos employs a tactical move that renders the contents of the introduction unthreatening. In these first two paragraphs, Burgos aligns herself with her editor and the male establishment, who control the publication of the cookbook, and what she assumes to be their conventional expectations of women’s writing. She warns them not to take the contents of the introduction seriously; instead, they should join her in making fun of the introduction and its uninspired organization. She shows readers models of women they can emulate, and reassures her editor (and the literary establishment) that the contents of the essay are trivial. This writing indicates that the cookbook and its introduction are not inconsistent with the social control imposed by domestic ideology and the prescriptive texts, in the form of practical manuals, that uphold it.

But, the disarming tactic of following the convention for prescriptive texts by creating models of behavior for women readers to emulate masks two twists that weaken the domestic ideology that the cookbook supposedly upholds. First, Burgos focuses not just on the practice of cooking within the household, but also on the necessity of culinary education.

---

38 Noël Valis, in *La cultura de cursilería* (2002), offers this definition, drawn from part of Carlos Moreno Hernández’s analysis of *cursilería* in *Literatura y cursilería* (1995). She finds fault with Moreno Hernández’s definition since he conflates *cursilería* with kitsch and suggests that *cursilería* constitutes “an almost exclusively negative category” (17).
And second, she makes examples, not of women known for their elegance, but of public political figures who happen to be female and whose culinary innovations make cooking into a public discourse with political stakes for their nations.

Burgos begins the body of the essay by historicizing the role that cooking and food have played in the West, a move that contradicts the mocking tone of the introductory paragraphs. She sketches the importance of cooking throughout history, from the consumption of the “frutas de paraíso” (7) that motivated Adam and Eve’s fall from grace to the “héroes de Homero reunidos alrededor del carnero ó del puerco entero” (8), Roman banquets (8), through the Middle Ages in which “fatuosos señores de Génova, Venecia, Florencia y Milán conservaron las tradiciones de la cocina fatuosa [. . .]” (9), and the sixteenth century, when “la cantidad se apreciaba más que la calidad; el lujo de la mesa consistía en el número de platos [. . .]” (9). Burgos places Spain into this history by comparing the excess of Louis the IV’s court to the Bodas de Camacho episodes in Don Quijote: “Algo de esto significa el festín de las bodas de Camacho, que con tanta galanura nos describe Miguel de Cervantes, mientras los pobres hidalgos, que se pasan los días de claro en claro, comen la mayor parte de ellos salpicón y ponen en su olla algo más vaca que carnero” (9).39

Accordingly, when Burgos transitions from describing the role of cuisine in western history to naming the “bellas elegantes” of Europe who take an interest in cooking, she casts these women in a historical-political light. She indicates at the beginning of the essay that she lists these women because they will impress her women readers. Yet, more than

39 Phrases in italics in this quotation indicate Burgos’s quotations from Don Quijote.
merely elegant, the examples she lists—the mistresses (Madame Dubarry, Madame de Pompadour), queens or royal spouses (Catherine de Médicis, “María de Inglaterra,” Madame de Maintenon), and other aristocrats (Madame de Sevigné) she names for her readers to emulate—are powerful women with political roles in the public sphere. Burgos links the influence of these women and their interest in food to some of the most influential changes in how food is thought about in the West. For example, Catherine de Médicis “fué la primera mujer que se interesó oficialmente por el arte culinario y la que divulgó el uso de los tenedores” (10). Madame Dubarry and Madame de Pompadour invented dishes, “los filetes de truchas” and “los filets de volaille” (11). Madame de Sevigné and Madame de Pompadour collaborated with famous chefs of the day (Mouthier, “padre,” and Vatel) and played a part in the conversion of chefs into representatives of “el renombre culinario de Francia” (11). Burgos continues citing examples of contemporary women: “Las soberanas modernas no desdeñan ocuparse de cocina” (12). The empress María, widow of czar Alexander III; Alexandra and the deceased Queen Victoria of England; the empress of Germany; and the queen of Italy all knew how to cook, prepared food themselves, and in the case of Queen Victoria, took an interest in nutrition and hygiene.

Burgos makes their interest in food preparation public by relating to her readers the culinary activities of these very public women. Her examples of high-profile women demonstrate that female political figures participate in a meaningful social practice, food preparation or direction of the kitchen and cuisine, that traditionally belonged to women of a different social class as part of their domestic labor. Paradoxically, a discourse that would seem to normalize the idea of women laboring in the kitchen by making examples of high-status women instead converts cooking into a social practice that shapes politics. For
example, after listing the culinary activities of women of the past Burgos writes, “La cocina francesa fué un Napoleón que conquistó el mundo: hoteles de todas las naciones, y hasta las misma cortes, comen con arreglo á sus preceptos” (11). She reinforces the point more directly by quoting French gastronomer Jean-Anselme Brillat-Savarin: “Concedo a la cocina un gran papel social. Dime lo que comes y te diré quién eres” (LCM v, NCP 6). In opposition to Spain’s domestic ideology, Burgos redefines cooking as a female activity that has consequences for the public sphere.

By demonstrating how women’s culinary practices impact the public sphere, Burgos weakens the public-private binary of the ideology of separate spheres and weakens the cult of female domesticity. In their introductions to Constructing Spanish Womanhood: Female Identity in Modern Spain, historians Victoria Enders and Pamela Radcliff acknowledge the enduring strength of the public-private binary in Spain, where it persisted well into the twentieth century (Enders and Radcliff 20). Even though working-class women, peasant women, and women of the petty bourgeoisie did cross the boundaries between the public and private spheres, a separate spheres discourse developed as a parallel to the modern rhetoric of individual citizenship and continued to support the notion that women counted only as keepers of the home, and not as citizens.40 This impulse was reinforced in the work of nineteenth-century hygienists like Pedro Felipe Monlau, who made housekeeping the

40 Fray Luis de León’s sixteenth-century prescriptive text La Perfecta Casada linked domesticity to the sacred mission of women. The nineteenth-century ideal of the “angel of the house,” a common trope throughout the West, made women the affective center of the home. Julián López Catalán defined the angel of the house in 1877 as “an angel of love, consolation to our afflictions, defender of our merits, patient sufferer of our faults, faithful guardian of our secrets, and jealous depository of our honor” (qtd. in Nash “Uncontested” 28).
‘natural’ domain of women; in his 1861 Nociones de higiene doméstica y gobierno de la casa, Monlau wrote:

The government of a home naturally corresponds to women, to the housewife, the mother of the family and in many cases and due to various circumstances, to the eldest daughter. Without a mother, daughter, housewife or housekeeper, a family cannot prosper, be it poor, of medium resources or opulent. Thus it has been said that women are those who make or ruin a home. (qtd. in Nash “Uncontested. . . .” 28)

In the 1920s and 1930s, physician and intellectual Gregorio Marañón argued for the equal social status of men and women, stating the women were not inferior to men (33). But his efforts as a physician to modernize gender discourse merely substituted a biological essentialism for women’s ‘nature.’ Marañón made reproduction the primary responsibility of women and argued that activities outside the home were permissible only as long as they did not interfere with childbearing and childrearing. Thus, he upheld the two-spheres binary in concert with a modernizing agenda: “You, woman, will give birth; you, man, will work” (qtd. in Nash 34).41

Describing the social control exerted by Spain’s gendered spheres, Mary Nash, in her essay “Un/Contested Identities,” describes how the “notion of the ‘natural’ was constantly evoked to justify the separation of public and private spaces. By attributing certain ‘natural’ traits to women, it determined their aptitude for motherhood in the home while contending

41 Marañón's position “converged with traditional nineteenth-century discourses on domesticity in that it legitimated [. . .] the sexual division of labor and the construction of female identity through motherhood. However, it also maintained biosocial thought as the theoretical foundation for a modern, scientific, gender discourse” (Nash “Uncontested. . . .” 34).
that men’s natural biological and psychological capacities geared them towards activities in the public arena” (29). Any challenge to these ideas implied defying nature, which indicates the power and pervasiveness of domesticity as a mechanism of social control (30).

As a household task, everyday cooking had little relevance outside of the private sphere of the home until the notion of cuisine began to circulate as a meaningful cultural code. By characterizing cooking as a field in which women should be educated, Burgos marks it as a meaningful cultural code. And her examples of powerful women who are interested in cooking illustrate one process by which cooking becomes relevant as a public discourse. In emphasizing the interest of these aristocratic, publicly powerful women in cooking and demonstrating that cooking as a discourse has an influence outside of the home—French cooking “conquistó el mundo” (LCM 11)—Burgos implicitly challenges the entire construct of ‘women’s nature.”

In Accounting for Taste, Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson identifies this transition when she defines cuisine as the “cultural construct that systematizes culinary practices and transmutes the spontaneous culinary gesture into a stable cultural code” (3). This cultural code “enables societies to think with and about the food they consume” (3). Parkhurst Ferguson highlights the interdependency between words and food that makes cuisine possible; in the notion of cuisine, food becomes a discourse that enters the public domain as a text (19). Parkhurst Ferguson’s analysis of how French cuisine was invented, exported abroad, and converted into one of the platforms for French national identity underscores the processes at work in making the practice of cooking meaningful and converting it into a public discourse. Following Parkhurst Ferguson, for cooking to be meaningful in the public domain, it must be practiced by individuals who think of it in words as well as in practices. The cooking that words convert into the cultural code of cuisine must be practiced and thought about by literate (middle-class) women rather than servants. Making cooking education one of the responsibilities of the state converts household cooking into a public cultural construct, cuisine, that represents the values esteemed by the nation and the state.

According to Roberta Johnson, Burgos deconstructs biological definitions of marriage, family, and domesticity in favor of social ones in her fiction writing, as well. Johnson argues that Burgos’s work “coincides in part with what today would be called ‘the social construction of gender,’ pointing at every turn to legal practices that privilege men and disadvantage women with no basis in fact” (228). The domestic plots of Burgos’s novels show how the relationships within the home echo Spain’s national concerns (Johnson). Furthermore, Burgos eschews the biological determinism present in her contemporaries’ writing (Unamuno, Azorín, and Baroja) and suggests instead that “sociopolitical rather than biological factors define the nation,” and by extension the rights and status of its citizens (Johnson 234). Her essay, La mujer moderna y sus derechos,
**Culinary education in Spain: The household outside the home**

Burgos brings her descriptions of powerful aristocratic women into conversation with her work in other media by underscoring the role of education in developing the culinary interests of those contemporary women she lists: “Como todas la hijas de la reina de Dinamarca, la zarina había recibido una educación sólida y estaba acostumbrada a conocer los mil pequeños detalles de la vida doméstica. [. . .] Todas las princesas hijas de Eduardo VII han seguido cursos completos de cocina en las escuelas fundadas por el príncipe de Gales” (*LCM* 12). She links the examples of these foreign women and their culinary educations to the need for culinary education for women in Spain: “Estos ejemplos han hecho conocer la necesidad de que se atienda al arte culinario” (12). In noting the culinary education of her exemplars and in suggesting that Spanish women should be educated in cooking, Burgos makes public education, part of the apparatus of the State, a mechanism by which women acquire knowledge that, according to domestic ideology, women ‘naturally’ possess. The notion that women should require education in cooking further denaturalizes women’s portrayal as domestic cooks.

Burgos’s description of the cooking education women in Spain require closely resembles efforts by feminist women in the United States to define the field of Home Economics. In *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession*, Sarah Stage and Virginia B. Vincenti describe the evolution of the idea of home economics from Victorian addresses this issue directly, describing how women are circumscribed and omitted from Spain’s social and political spheres.
notions of domesticity into a mode of scientific management that allowed middle-class women to assume a professionalized role outside the home:

Home economics constitutes a classic case of the interplay of politics and domesticity in women’s history. At the turn of the century home economists politicized domesticity by urging women to use their skills in ‘that larger household in the city.’ [...] home economics moved women into public policy under the rubric of social and municipal housekeeping. Much more than ‘glorified housekeeping,’ home economics began as part of the broader movement for progressive reform. (Stage and Vincenti 3)

Similarly, making cooking part of education reform for women is one way in which Burgos can assert the right of women to form a professionalized workforce.44 Cooking instructors would form “un cuerpo especial de profesores, tan bien considerados y bien retribuídos como los de las otras materias” (LCM 12).45

Additionally, like the American home economists, cooking instructors, as employees of state educational institutions, would make cooking and nutrition part of Spain’s social policy, for example by improving “las condiciones materiales de la vida de la clase popular” (13). In this context, cooking becomes, more than a domestic chore and an art form that

44 Burgos addresses the rights of women as workers more directly in La mujer moderna y sus derechos.

45 Since 1870, there had existed a private initiative to prepare women for public-sphere jobs organized by the Asociación para la Enseñanza de la Mujer as part of Krausist Fernando de Castro’s Ateneo Artístico y Literario de Señoras. The Asociación did open the door to the creation of educational institutions that prepared women for professional life in other fields in addition to teaching. It created the Escuela de Institutrices, the Escuela de Comercio para Señoras, and the Escuela de Correos y Telégrafos, and other professional schools were planned. These attempts to professionalize a female workforce were not successful due to the scarcity of jobs available for women (Scanlon 34-35). These initiatives developed for women’s professional training were not sponsored by the State.
requires training; it becomes a social practice with relevance to Spain’s national health. Providing women a culinary education, Burgos argues, will improve the nation’s public health and hygiene and ameliorate the social concerns presented by Spain’s working class:

No permanece España indiferente á este movimiento importante de iniciativa privada; hay ya algunas clases de cocina, y el Estado, reconociendo su necesidad, ha dado los primeros pasos, fundando en la Escuela de Artes é Industrias, [. . .] la clase de Economía y Arte culinario, que tan gran importancia tiene para la dirección del hogar y la salud de la familia, comprometida con una alimentación malsana, y para mejorar las condiciones materiales de la vida de la clase popular. (LCM 13)

At first glance, Burgos seems to be advertising for the Escuela de Artes e Industrias, where she accepted a lecturer position in 1906. At the same time, the reference to the role of women in what Stage and Vincenti call “that larger household in the city,” the venue of national public health and hygiene, represents Burgos’s attempt to connect her cookbook to a major political concern in Spain in the early twentieth century (3). Burgos outlines in the introductory essay to her cookbook the role of a culinary education as one part of an education program that will enable women to “conquistar su cultura” in order to overturn the ideology that denies them the “derechos civiles” accorded to male citizens, including the vote (Burgos “El voto femenino” qtd. in Nuñez Rey 167). Burgos creates in her cookbook

---

46 According to biographer Blanca Bravo Cela, Burgos was in charge of creating the curriculum in “economía doméstica” at the school, which led to her development of the cookbook, but Bravo Cela provides no references or documentation to support her claim (45).
introduction not so much a manual about how to prepare Spain’s modern cuisine as a blueprint for her readers’ participation in Spain’s regeneration.

Nutrition, in fact, was a major element in the liberal campaign for reform and modernization in Spain following 1898; Joaquín Costa, a progressive liberal, Krausist, and member of the Institución Libre de Enseñanza, acknowledged the importance of food and nutrition in creating a modern Spain when he endorsed the slogan “Escuela y despensa” to describe the reforms necessary to make the popular classes into industrious democratic citizens: by educating peasants and the working class out of illiteracy and feeding them out of starvation, Costa’s reforms promised “to improve national productivity and technical competence [as part of] a broader program of state-sponsored political and economic modernization, or Europeanization, as Costa and other regenerationists usually called it” (Boyd 43). Krausist philosophers (including, for example, Fernando de Castro) had seen women as a key element in any modernization since the 1860s; education for women was seen as a necessity for Spain’s modernization, since women were the formative agents of the future citizens on whom the nation’s progress would depend (Johnson 15).47

However, as Geraldine Scanlon shows in *La polémica feminista en la España contemporánea, 1868-1974*, the curricula for female education, designed in the nineteenth century, lagged miserably behind those developed for men due to the “indiferencia oficial

---

47 Krausist Fernando de Castro, rector of the University of Madrid, organized Sunday lectures on the necessary elements of women’s education in 1869; topics ranged from religion, hygiene, morals, medicine, domestic economy, and the arts to jurisprudence, literature, and physical sciences (Johnson 16). That said, the public education system in Spain during the nineteenth century was a shambles despite legislative support for creating a more comprehensive system. Just as elites were not interested in having more popular political engagement, there was also little interest in creating a more educated population. The small but growing middle class was the target demographic for public education reforms, but Conservative political elements favored the continuing influence of the Catholic Church in providing basic and secondary education, a circumstance nurtured by the continued influence of the Church on members of the middle class (Boyd xiii-xviii).
por el deplorable estado de la educación [. . .] de las mujeres [. . .].” (41). Household chores were a major focus of girl’s state-sponsored education; state laws in 1816 and 1825 specifically called for education in domestic tasks as an essential part of the education of young girls.48 Even the teacher-training programs (the Escuelas Normales) created in 1858 covered “los principios de higiene doméstica y labores delicadas” as part of their curriculum (qtd. in Scanlon 18).49 Domestic competence was considered a priority to prepare women for their ‘careers’ as wives and mothers (18). By 1906, little had changed in women’s education. The nineteenth-century educational model still prevailed despite politicians’ and activists’ awareness and work for reforms.

Burgos supports the position that women’s education should cover domestic tasks. And yet, she portrays the domestic chore of cooking as a practice relevant to the public domain. Her references in this passage to nutrition (“una alimentación malsana”), the state of the working class (“las condiciones materiales de la vida de la clase popular”), and the example of North American women, who “se intentan en muchas partes las cocinas ambulantes para llevar la enseñanza á los pueblecillos rurales,” suggest that women’s role in the modern nation transcends their roles as mothers and caretakers in the home and influences political policy (LCM 13). The domestic skill of cooking has a very public face and a very real role in the future of Spain. By mentioning the possibility that culinary education for women would improve the nutrition and material conditions of the working

---

48 The 1825 Plan y Reglamento de la Educación defined “las asignaturas domésticas” as “la parte esencial de la educación de una niña” while skills like reading and writing were given less importance (Scanlon 17).

class Burgos frames culinary education as a way to influence Regenerationist political policy. And, she expands the scope of women’s education, placing it in parallel with the courses organized in 1906 by the Centro Iberoamericana de Cultural Popular Femenina to give women of all social classes the skills to make them more employable (Johnson 19). Both Burgos’s description of the possibilities that a culinary education offers to women and the Centro Iberoamericano initiative had as their goals to give women the skills to function outside their homes and outside of the private sphere.

Burgos suggests that women’s involvement with cooking education both influences public policy and gives women the skills to function in the public sphere; it also suggests a gradual transition from women’s duties in the home to greater public roles. To garner support for her idea for women’s culinary education in Spain, Burgos points to programs that exist outside of Spain. She praises the culinary education women receive “en Inglaterra, Suiza, Bélgica y Escandinavia, [. . .] en Francia, muy especialmente en París, [donde] se multiplican las escuelas” (LCM 13) and in the United States, Denmark, and Finland (12). The “cursos de cocina más ó menos completos” offered in these countries to “todas las discípulas de las escuelas públicas [. . .]” sets up the classic parallel between Spain and its already modernized neighbors (12). It also highlights those states’ investment in the education of women, an investment that was lacking in Spain and still contentious as an issue in 1906, as Johnson demonstrates by highlighting male novelists’ reactionary responses

50 Other positions in the debate included the idea that “women should receive a different education from that of men because of their biological inferiority and their particular responsibilities” and Pardo Bazán’s argument, expressed in a speech published in 1892 under the title “La educación del hombre y de la mujer. Sus relaciones y diferencias,” for absolute equality for women and men in education and in access to jobs (Johnson 17). See Scanlon, La polémica feminista en la España contemporánea, 1868-1974, for a description of the limited educational curriculum offered to girls in the nineteenth century.
in countering new roles for females with traditional ones (19). Moreover, by presenting England, Switzerland, Belgium, Scandanavia, and especially Finland as models, Burgos brings the greater support for women’s rights (voting in Finland) in these countries into conversation with cooking and education, which strengthens her position that Spain’s modernization requires creating a public social space for women.

3.4 From Culinary Erudition to Literary Respect

In the *La cocina moderna* of 1906, Burgos encourages her women readers to embrace the opportunity that a (culinary) education would allow them as citizens in Spain’s modern nation. By the time Sempere published Burgos’s *Obras Completas* in 1925, a series that included a new edition of *La cocina moderna*, retitled *Nueva cocina práctica*, Burgos enjoyed a reputation as one of Spain’s most prominent intellectual figures. The Academy of Sciences in Lisbon had recognized her work by appointing her as a member, and she also earned a sizeable salary (Davies 121). Burgos increased her political activity in the 1920s, founding the Cruzada de Mujeres Españolas in 1921 and becoming president of the Liga Internacional de Mujeres Ibélicas e Hispanoamericanas in 1923.51 In contrast to her earlier emphasis on female education, during these years, the focus of her feminist activism was primarily women’s voting rights. She and others went to the streets to distribute pamphlets and had their photographs circulated in the press. Her activism during the 1920s, until her sudden death in 1930, made her one of the protagonists of “el amanecer de un serio movimiento feminista” (Concha Fagoaga qtd. in Louis 6).

51 Davies specifies 1923. Louis dates it to 1921.
Burgos’s literary engagement with the feminist movement culminated in her 1927 text *La mujer moderna y sus derechos*. In this work, Burgos both theorizes the goals of feminism in Spain and criticizes the legal system’s oppression of women. She writes about how Spain’s laws, instead of responding to social changes in Spain, conspire to limit women and their rights under the constitution. She also addresses the social functions of the family and the “preterición de la mujer en todas las esferas” (*La mujer moderna* 11). One of the foundations for this work is laid, however improbably, in the “Carta-Prólogo” and the introductions Burgos wrote for her cookbooks. Both the “Carta-Prólogo” and her introduction to *La cocina moderna* playfully flirt with conventional expectations of practical manuals, cookbooks, and prescriptive texts written for women while offering readers a set of representations that interrogates and undermines those conventions.

She continues this practice of undermining conventional expectations of practical texts in the introduction to *Nueva cocina práctica* (1925), titled “De re coquinaria.” In this introduction, Burgos expands her defense of her role as a female writer, using cooking as a discursive symbol for her writing work as a middle-class woman. Though Burgos weaves much of the text of the 1906 essay into the new introduction—the examples of powerful women who take an interest in cuisine, for example—she deviates significantly from the original material, which was designed to offer her middle-class readers an alternative to restrictive conventional ideas regarding their roles in the public sphere. Instead, in 1925 Burgos mounts a defense of her own public role, connecting the women’s work of cooking to her work as a woman writer and intellectual.

Burgos creates this connection between writing and cooking in the 1925 introduction, making women responsible for developing cuisine as a discourse, a process
that involves moving from the practice of cooking to its textual representation as cuisine (Parkhurst Ferguson 3). Given that the practice of cooking is seen as women’s work, the production of the cultural text of cuisine must begin with women, whose participation in cultural discourse is limited by their confinement to the home. The result, Burgos argues, is an impoverished historical cuisine:

En España faltó más el gusto que el dinero. Un escritor autorizado en coquinaria afirma que en España el abandono e indiferencia en materia de alimentos y el ocuparse sólo de política origina el atraso [. . . .] Gran culpa de esto es el haber hecho que las mujeres desdeñen el ocuparse de la cocina, creyendo que es una cosa inferior. (NCP 62)

By linking the priority given to politics, Spain’s *atraso*, and the attitudes women were conditioned to assume, Burgos insinuates that the practice of marginalizing women from the discourses that shape the nation is the reason for Spain’s backwardness and, by extension, Spain’s slow modernization. Relatedly, according to Burgos, “Lo que desde luego se puede asegurar es que la cocina tiene gran influencia en la suerte de los pueblos. Los pueblos que comen mal son pueblos tristes y faltos de energías, de inventiva, que se empobrecen y degeneran” (NCP 34). Thus, the poverty of Spain’s cuisine is a contributing factor to Spain’s degeneration as is the marginalization of those individuals responsible for creating it—women.  

52 The passive construction, “es el haber hecho que,” indicates that the generators of this position toward cooking were not the women themselves (NCP 62).

53 At the same time, Burgos distances herself from her middle-class female readers by criticizing the Catholic Church, an institution that continued to depend on middle-class women for support. Burgos blames the Church for imposing the culinary sobriety she sees as characteristic of Spain’s cuisine: “El error proviene del
Approaching the topic of cuisine in a scholarly way, Burgos combats any notion of the frivolity of her writing about cuisine by putting her own erudition on display. Expanding on the work begun in the much shorter 1906 essay, she traces the development of cuisine throughout Western history and demonstrates its centrality in Spain’s canonical literature. Though somewhat chaotic in its organization, the essay is well researched and her argument is thoroughly based on textual evidence from other sources from which she makes a clear case for cuisine as an intellectual and productive field. For example, she describes the history of “refinamientos romanos” (NCP 12) and the medieval “fatuosos señores de Génova, Venecia, Florencia y Milan” who preserved the “tradiciones de lujo de las comedas en la pagana Italia” (NCP 14) and the “antigua cocina francesa” (14-18).

The result is a depiction of Spain’s historical lack of engagement with the development of a cuisine. Burgos demonstrates this at a number of junctures. At the end of her lengthy description of the influence of French cuisine in the courts throughout Europe, including Spain’s, she quotes part of Un Cocinero de su Majestad’s 1876 letter lamenting the Spanish monarch’s preference for Parisian preparations over products from Spain. In response to the teachings of the Church, believers “se privaba[n] de la buena cocina y habíala que renunciar a los bocados selectos, los platos delicados y los dulces y golosinas” (37). And she accuses Church leaders of hypocrisy for preaching privation while enjoying alimentary excess: “La buena mesa quedaba reservada para los grandes y los príncipes de la Iglesia, que no se privaban de nada, hasta el punto de que, aun hoy día, cuando se quiere elogiar a algún manjar exquisito, se le llama bocado del cardenal” (38). Burgos extends this criticism to Sancho Panza from Don Quijote, whom Johnson would call one of Spain’s national “types” (Johnson 21). Burgos sees in the figure of Sancho, the representative of the pueblo, how quantity of food substitutes for quality: “Se observa que cuando al pueblo le falta calidad la suple con cantidad. La característica verdadera de nuestra cocina fué la abundancia, sin preocuparse mucho de la delicadeza” (40).

---

54 According to Un Cocinero, “[l]as aldeanas manchegas y extremeñas no corren ya al paso de la corte con sus blancos corderos, sus pichones torcaces, sus tarros de miel, sus orzas de escabeche y la sencilla ambición de que
Elsewhere, she compares Spain’s fourteenth-century manuscript of recipes, “Sent Soui” [sic], or Sent Soví, which documents the ways of eating in the territories belonging to the Crown of Aragón, to the better-known culinary manuscripts created in France where “se ha desenvuelto este género más [. . .] porque en ninguna [otra] encontraron un ambiente tan apropiado” (24). Not until the nineteenth century, Burgos argues, did writers in Spain make food and cooking a primary interest. She dates the development of Spanish gastronomical writing to late-nineteenth-century essays by writers like Fernanflor, Ossorio Bernard, Dr. Thebussem, Angel Muro, Adolfo de Castro, and Francisco María Montero who wrote in the “secciones gastronómicas” of magazines like La Época, El Liberal, Blanco y Negro, and La Ilustración Española y Americana.55 Additionally, Burgos extends her analysis of the history of cuisine to both “Los grandes cocineros” in France and Spain’s own mostly unknown historical chefs, “Roberto de Nola, Juan Cano, Francisco de Ardit y Carlos Cuesta” (24).

Demonstrating further her mastery of Spain’s culinary and gastronomical history, Burgos quotes Cervantes, Mesonero Romanos, Larra, and Menéndez y Pelayo in order to illustrate that Spain’s prominent literary figures “se ocupaban de la cocina” and represented the foods and cooking of people during their particular time periods (40). For example,

sólo lo suyo sea lo que se coma S.M.: los reyes pueden creer que en todo su reino se come y se bebe lo que en París y como en París” (qtd. in Burgos NCP 18).

55 Burgos establishes that any idea of a Spanish cuisine is an incontrovertibly modern phenomenon rather than one with a lengthy history (30). Writing about food, eating, and possibly cooking becomes the focus of public interest precisely at the moment in which defining the “taste” of the Spanish nation and society becomes an intellectual and political concern. In this sense, Burgos’s quotation of Brillat-Savarin’s analysis of the identical nature of food and literary metapors affirms one of the central premises of Pardo Bazán’s culinary project: identifying a nation’s cuisine and its literature depend on similar ideological practices.
according to Burgos, Juan Ruiz’s *El libro de buen amor* tells readers about “las comidas españolas del siglo XIV, las confituras y golosinas de las monjas y todos los guisos populares” (40). Cervantes, in *Don Quijote*, “nos hace una pintura tan exacta de su época, no podía dejar de ocuparse de las comidas” (44). Not only does Cervantes catalogue the regional specialties of Spain—“perdices de Morón, gansos de Lavajos, queso de Tronchón y garbanzos de Martos”—but he also illustrates how social class determined what people ate (44). Additionally, Burgos mentions *La Lozana Andaluza* as the literary text that gives “noticias de lo que era la cocina popular en el siglo XVI,” and identifies poet Baltasar de Alcázar as another who “ha dejado su nombre unido a las tradiciones culinarias,” in addition to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Góngora (48). Just as other nation-builders of the early twentieth century looked to literature to understand the soul of the nation and construct a representation of its essential nature, Burgos examines canonical literary texts to show how foods are central to any representation of Spain’s essential being.

The pages and pages of detailed exploration of the history and literary representation of cuisine and cooking in Western and Spanish history not only indicate the importance of cuisine as a discourse, but they also demonstrate the breadth and depth of Burgos’s erudition. According to Ugarte, Burgos engages in a similar display of intellect in *La mujer moderna y sus derechos*. In that study, she traces women’s issues through

56 “[P]astores, arrieros y peregrinos tenían como comisa tasajos, queso de oveja, migas, leche, nata y requesones”; “el labrador jornalero cenaba olla, y en ocasiones empedraba los huevos de torrenzno o los acompañaba con buenas magras entomatadas”; “Los hidalgos pobres y los clérigos los pasaban peor, con sólo *sota, caballo y rey*, o sea caldo, las verduras y la carne” ; “Los burgueses se comían bien, y la aristocracia mostraba su esplendidaz con numerosos platos [ . . . ]”; “El mayor lujo se reserva para los grandes festines, donde abundan la nacional olla podrida, las empanadillas, de conejo, la ternera en adobo, las albondiguillas, el manjar blanco, las manos de vaca cocidas y el salpicón con cebolletas” (44).
Greek and Roman mythology, theology, science, legal codes, art, literature, philosophy, and even military issues. She renders ideas on these questions both readable and controversial by synthesizing the work of prominent writers and thinkers in these fields, and by commenting on them as a prominent woman: as Columbine her writerly persona. (Ugarte 88)

While Ugarte regards this display of erudition in *La mujer moderna* as a way for Burgos to assert her prominence in a text easily accessible to women readers, the practice takes on a different function in her cookbooks. Working this way becomes, for Burgos, a defensive mechanism to be engaged long after she should no longer need it. By 1925, when the revised essay was published, she was a well-known author and intellectual whose books sold well and a member of the Ateneo. That she still feels the need to mount such a display at this point in her career is a telling indication of the pervasiveness of the resistance to women moving into positions of public authority. Each time she writes, she must assert her intellectual authority in order to overcome the personal and professional maligning of her work and her reputation as a middle-class woman seeking a place in the public sphere without the cover an aristocratic background would offer her. Only by putting her knowledge on display so exhaustively (in a sixty-four page cookbook introduction!) can she hope to combat the continual criticism of her and her writing.

Unlike Pardo Bazán whose aristocratic status awarded her authority in the public sphere and among the intellectuals of her day, Burgos, as a middle-class woman, lived the
shift symbolized by the model of the “nueva mujer moderna.”57 As I describe above, she was
the target of masculine resistance to women’s increased access to public activity and
participation as writers and intellectuals.58 Critics like Cansinos-Asséns insinuated that any
professional relationships she maintained with her editor, Sempere, and friends, like Blasco
Ibáñez, were of a sexual nature (188-189). Furthermore, according to Shirley Mangini in Las
modernas de Madrid, “durante décadas, la única fama que tuvo Carmen entre sus
contemporáneos masculinos era la derivada de sus relaciones con Ramón Gómez de la
Serna” (63). The criticisms leveled at Burgos as a woman writer were manifest, too, in a
literary phenomenon that Bieder describes, citing Manuel Machado, as “reinscribing
[women] into well-worn attitudes and spaces” (304-305). A woman could be a “Pecadora,
traidora y santa y heroína, / que ama las nubes, el dolor y la cocina,” but not an intellectual
escritora (Machado qtd. in Bieder 304-305).

Near the end of her introduction, Burgos offers an the outrage incited by a French
escritora’s “receta ridícula” for bouillabaisse: “Hace poco tiempo que todos los periódicos del
Midi acometieron a una escritora que en L’Arte de cuire trató a la divina bouillabaisse con
desenvoltura, dando una receta ridícula” (NCP 69). Some critics, Burgos reports, objected to
the words the escritora used to describe the dish: “Los gourmets no podían tolerar que definiera

57 Nash describes the model of the “nueva mujer moderna”: “This redefinition of women in terms of
modernity was an effective symbolic device for adapting women to new social, political, economic, and
demographic contexts. The shift from the old traditional model of femininity to the innovative Nueva Mujer
Moderna allowed women to adjust to the process of modernity. It accommodated more restrictive gender roles
toward the new needs of the labor market and society. The readjustment was, in fact, a very functional
mechanism which allowed women access to specific areas of public activity such as education, culture, social
welfare, and new sectors of the labor market” (“Uncontested...” 32).

58 See Mangini, Las modernas de Madrid, for an analysis of the misogyny characteristic of male attitudes toward
female intellectuals. Mangini explains that even the most liberal intellectual publications, such as the Revista de
Occidente, published essays defending the “inferioridad intelectual de la mujer” (111) and the “deficiencia moral”
of women (Mora qtd. in Mangini 111).
la bouillabaisse como ‘una especie de sopa que agrada a los provenzales y que no es, en realidad, ni sopa ni ragoût’ [ . . . ]” (69). Others attacked her for changing the steps of the recipe and committing the blasfemia of suggesting that bouillabaisse “se puede hacer con peces de agua dulce” (70).

Ostensibly, Burgos mentions this incident as evidence of “la importancia de los platos regionales” to France’s and other nations’ cuisines (NCP 69). At the same time, Burgos draws attention to the fact that a French escritora’s recipe provoked commentary and debate in “todos los periódicos del Midi” (69). Burgos reports, “Resulta gracioso el escándalo de los marselleses. Unos le preguntaban por qué en vez de envolver a todos los peces juntos en muselina no les hacía un traje para cada uno. Otros le preguntaban si se podría hacer la bouillabaisse sólo con nabos” (70). These suggestions show the ridicule directed to the recipe that the French escritora creates and, at the same time, they show that it is this woman’s writing about food that provokes critical debate and attention.

The discussion of the incident surrounding the French woman’s recipe leads to one of the very few comments Burgos makes about the recipes that are the occasion for the book. The comment provides an example of the ways in which Burgos masks in her writing about cooking an ironic commentary about the criticism she endures and a defense of the importance of women’s writing.59 According to Burgos, just like a good bouillabaisse, a “buena Paella es una especie de poema sinfónica en el que han de estar bien afinados todos los instrumentos para producir el gran acorde, deleite del paladar y conforto del estómago” (70).

59 Scott analyzes a more direct example of Burgos’s defense of her writing and gender, in the prologue she wrote for the 1924 Obras completas version of El arte de seducir (Tesoro de la Belleza. In that essay, Burgos asserts “that it is her obligation to ‘deshacer el prejuicio de que la mujer que se instruye, lucha y trabaja, es un ser aparte, y el sentimiento y el cultivo del Arte y la sencillez de la vida’” (Burgos qtd. in Scott 99).
A *paella* and its recipe are works of art, just like a poem or a symphony. Commenting about the reactions of others to her recipe for *paella*, Burgos writes:

> Yo confieso que he tenido el mismo asomo de vanidad que cualquier bas-bleu laureada por la Academia haya podido sentir, cuando los grandes arroceros de Algemesí, señores Ferragud y Compañía, me pidieron permiso para poner en sus sacos la receta de Paella que di en la primera edición de este libro, y que ahora reproduzco. (71)

Burgos equates the vanity she feels at having her *paella* recipe praised by “Ferragud y Compañía” to the vanity any bluestocking might feel upon receiving admission to the Real Academia Española. The direct comparison establishes a link between her recipes and her writing about cooking and her intellectual work. It also makes a veiled, ironic reference to the fact that, as of 1925, neither Burgos nor any other woman writer had been admitted to the Real Academia. In this context, any vanity Burgos might feel as a result of the Academia’s approval must be illusory; the only lasting vanity left to her, as a woman writer, is that of the *arroceros* who recognize her recipe for *paella* as a work of art, even if the literary establishment refuses to give her intellectual work as much credit.

**Conclusion**

A dynamic presence in the literary world of the early twentieth century, Carmen de Burgos was marginalized as a direct consequence of one of the most basic and most revolutionary things she did: she made a public career as a woman writer and she flaunted the tenets of domesticity that limited women to modest roles within the home. Yet, she also

---

60 Not until 1978 did the Real Academia admit its first woman member, Carmen Conde.
wrote cookbooks. In *La cocina moderna* (1906) and *Nueva cocina práctica* (1925) Burgos exhorts her readers to recognize how women have influenced cuisine, which she shows to be a powerful discourse in the West, and to embrace culinary education, which countries like Finland with more progressive social policies (for example, women’s suffrage) have identified as important. Suggesting this role for her women readers thus becomes a tactic by which Burgos and her women readers can destabilize domestic ideology.

The fact that Burgos provides this feminist message to her readers in a cookbook is *coherent* with the logic of literature as a consumer object, a logic that propelled the expansion of Spain’s literary marketplace in the early twentieth century. Cookbooks were an efficient medium with the potential to reach a great number of women readers. At the same time, embedding a feminist message in a practical manual is *contradictory*, since even Burgos’s cookbooks offer models of behavior and rules to follow so that readers can cook elegant meals and manage their kitchens.

Given that Burgos does not attempt to invent, define, or archive Spain’s cuisine—she demonstrates little interest in actual recipes or emblematic national dishes—, her demarcation of cuisine as a feminine field of influence for Spain’s national reputation takes on a different meaning, especially in the greatly expanded introductory essay she writes for the 1925 *Nueva cocina práctica*. Burgos writes about cooking to write about her writing, her career, and her credibility as an intellectual. Her question to the male literary establishment and her female readers in 1906—“¿Cómo ha adivinado que guiso mejor que escribo?” (*LCM*, v)—and the shift in meaning generated by her modification of that question in 1925—“¿Cómo ha adivinado que guiso el mismo que escribo?” (*NCP* 5, italics mine)—require double reading. These questions may pass for examples of Burgos’s “harmless chatter”
(Zubiaurre 3); yet, what she challenges with them is the patriarchal public that requires her to mask a defense of women’s writing and intellect within a discourse about their private-sphere cooking.
4. *La cocina de Nicolasa*: Gregorio Marañón and Spain’s (Culinary) Modernization

Since its opening in 1912, Basque chef Nicolasa Pradera’s restaurant, Casa Nicolasa, has been the home of what food critics today call “traditional” Basque cuisine. Specific preparations and ingredients local to the physical space of the Basque Country have long made the foods prepared and consumed in this territory distinct from those dishes featured in other regions of Spain. Indeed, anyone who attempts to define “Spanish cuisine” identifies regional diversity as its hallmark. When Manuel Vázquez Montalbán asks, “¿Existe una cocina española?” it is precisely to this regional diversity that he refers to even as he questions the ideological imperative that encourages nationalist co-opting of cuisines, literatures, and landscapes. In fact, there is diversity even within the field of Basque cuisine. Pradera’s restaurant, located in San Sebastián’s old quarter, is known and praised for its preservation of the traditional *cocina vasca*, in contrast to the avant-garde *nueva cocina vasca* practiced by the internationally famous chefs who have sparked Spain’s twenty-first century gastronomical revolution, among them Juan Mari and Elena Arzak.¹ The restaurant’s current head chef, José Juan Castillo, credits Nicolasa Pradera’s 1933 cookbook, *La cocina de Nicolasa*, with the codification of traditional Basque cuisine. By naming Pradera as the foundational figure of Basque cuisine, Castillo links her cooking and her cookbook to one of the traditional foundations of Basque identity. In this context, it is surprising to discover that

---

¹ Arthur Lubow describes the transfer of haute cuisine across the Pyrenees from France to Spain in his 2003 article, “A Laboratory of Taste,” in *The New York Times Magazine.*
Pradera’s cookbook, and its prologue by liberal intellectual and physician Gregorio Marañoń, offer her work as an articulation of a Spanish nation rather than a Basque one.

**Pradera and Marañoń**

The cookbook brings together two characters: Nicolasa Pradera and Gregorio Marañoń. We know relatively little about the woman, Pradera. We know a lot about the man, the famous endocrinologist, intellectual, and statesman of the Second Republic, Marañoń. According to Javier Mardones Alonso in *Bibliografía de la gastronomía vasca 1800-1959* (1997), Nicolasa Pradera was born in 1870 in the Vizcayan village of Markina, located approximately ten kilometers from the Vizcayan coast. She died in 1959 in Madrid. Pradera was employed at a young age by the Gaitan de Ayala family, who gave her a position as an “ayudante de cocina” (Mardones Alonso 96). When the daughter of the family married into the Londaiz family of San Sebastián, Pradera moved with her to their new household in San Sebastián to take charge of the kitchen. According to José María Pisa, a contemporary publisher of classic gastronomy texts, Pradera was formally trained under Ignacio Doménech, a well-known Catalan chef from the early twentieth century, but Mardones Alonso mentions nothing about her training. Instead, he speculates that Pradera met her future husband, Narciso Dolhagaray Picabea, the owner of one the most prestigious *carnicerías* of San Sebastián, through her daily shopping. They married and opened Casa Nicolasa in 1912. The strong and growing tourism industry in San Sebastián during the early 20th century.

---

2 An alternate spelling is Gaytán de Ayala. José María de Orbe y Gaytán de Ayala, named the Marqués de Valdespina in 1891, was a Carlist supporter in the third Carlist War and became involved in Carlist politics in the first decades of the twentieth century (Wikipedia).

3 Mardones Alonso makes no note of Pradera's age. He only mentions that she was young when first employed.
twentieth century helped make Pradera’s restaurant successful; the restaurant was “en pleno auge y éxito” in 1930/1932, the year Pradera sold it to María de Urrestarasu (Mardones Alonso 96-97). After the sale of Casa Nicolasa, Pradera opened the restaurant Andia in San Sebastián with her children and another restaurant, Nicolasa, in Madrid in 1940 (97).

Gregorio Marañón was born in 1887 in Madrid, one of five children in a bourgeois professional family originally from Navarra. His father was a contemporary and friend of Madrid’s intelligentsia, including writers Benito Pérez Galdós, José María de Pereda, and Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (39-44). As a child, Marañón had access to his father’s extensive library; given the “ambiente literario en que [vivía],” his family and friends were surprised when he opted to pursue a career in medicine instead of law or literature (Gómez Santos 39, 45-46). He earned his licenciatura in medicine in 1908 and the Doctorado in 1910, also in medicine. Marañón was a medical researcher and clinician who studied human sexuality, emotion, and temperament. He also belonged to a cohort of scientists, physicians, and intellectuals who applied scientific modes of understanding (specifically Darwin’s theory of evolution) to art, history, and literary criticism (Keller 1). Other members of this cohort included Ricardo Jorge, José Goyanes Capdevila, Gonzalo Lafora, and José M. Sacristán.

4 Mardones Alonso specifies that the sale occurred in 1932. José Juan Castillo, the current chef, specifies on his website that the sale took place in 1930.

5 Yet, too, as his biographer Gómez Santos emphasizes, Marañón “lucha[aba] en las trincheras de la prensa nacional en defensa de los
Politically, Marañón identified as a liberal. In the early years of his career, he remained distant from the practice of politics, preferring to concentrate on his work as a physician and scientist, until 1922, when he visited Las Hurdes with the king (Laín Entralgo 43). Although Marañón seems to have viewed Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship as merely one of the phases Spain had to pass through in the restructuring of its society and politics, Laín Entralgo identifies Marañón’s month-long imprisonment, for his alleged participation in the 1926 Sanjuanada political coup against Primo de Rivera, as the catalyst for his direct engagement with political life (50).

It was in his prologue writing that Marañón began to develop his political direction. In prologues to J. Castrillo Santos’ Las rutas de la libertad (1928), F. Villanueva’s Obstáculos tradicionales (1928), Marcelino Domingo’s ¿A dónde va España? (1929), and J. Sánchez Guerra’s El pan de la emigración (1930), Marañón “defiende, desde su proclamada y evidente condición de no político, su derecho de escribir de política; más aún, su deber de hacerlo” (Laín Entralgo 51). Marañón viewed his political engagement in the late 1920s and early 1930s as a necessary act “por su patria” (51). When Marañón, alongside José Ortega y Gasset and Ramón Pérez de Ayala, created the Agrupación al servicio de la República in 1930, their purpose was “hacer una obra de educación del pueblo, para adaptarle al futuro régimen”

---

6 Even as Marañón maintained contact with the most elite circles of political and intellectual society in Spain, his research and his clinical interests put him in contact with individuals from the poorest classes in Spain. In his 1910(?) article “Sobre la represión de la mendicidad,” Marañón criticized the state’s treatment of the poor and infirm, which consisted of isolating them in “campeamientos de desinfección” and refusing them even the most minimal care (120). He traveled with Alfonso XIII to Las Hurdes in 1922 to chronicle the poverty and illness endemic to the severely underdeveloped region.

7 See Marañón’s Cuatro comentarios sobre la revolución española (Madrid 1931) for his description of the roles of the “fuerzas intelectuales” and the “fuerzas sociales” in Spain’s modernization (Laín Entralgo 49).
(Marañón, “Caída de la Monarquía” in *La Nación* 1938, qtd. in Laín Entralgo 52). Marañón’s writing and his participation in the Agrupación reflected his growing belief that Spain’s intellectuals needed to play a more direct role in the nation’s political future.

Marañón’s political evolution was congruent with a wider shift in Spain’s political scene, emblematized by the restructuring of the Republican party in the late 1920s. Carr identifies “a desire for renovation [and] for citizenship in a modern, European state” as a central element in the platform that motivated the revival of the Republican party and reenergized the intellectuals’ support for the party (Carr *Modern* 111). Republicans had begun to organize publicly in 1926, even while Spain was still governed by Primo de Rivera. The renovated Republican party, in an alliance that linked “new” Republican intellectuals and Radical Socialists,8 won widespread support in large towns, as became evident in the returns for the April 12, 1931 municipal elections. Those results ended the monarchy of Alfonso XIII, who went into exile on April 14th, clearing the way for the installation of the Second Republic (111).

Marañón’s role in this political shift was that of a facilitator. Responding to the election returns, Alfonso XIII, the Conde de Romanones, and Niceto Alcalá Zamora met in Marañón’s home on April 14, 1931 to coordinate the king’s exile from Spain and the installation of the Second Republic’s provisional government. Though Marañón in later years de-emphasized his role in making the Republic possible (Laín Entralgo 53),9 party leaders

---

8 The new Republican alliance that formed in 1930 included Lerroux, who had become a representative of the middle-class, “new” Republicans like Azaña and other intellectuals, and Radical Socialists, who saw an opportunity to capture working-class support (Carr 111).

9 Marañón had been given the nickname “Partero de la República” to which he responded in “Caída de la Monarquía,” “fui sólo un testigo presencial del parto” (Laín Entralgo 53).
nonetheless viewed him as a candidate for party leadership. They approached him about becoming a candidate for the presidency; they offered him the ambassadorship to France; and they also suggested him for a number of ministerial positions (Gómez Santos 335-336). Marañón turned down all of these offers; commenting about the diplomatic position, he asserted, “[. . .] creo que en estos días decisivos para la patria el dejar de servirla tiene la misma gravedad que emboscar a en tiempos de guerra [. . .]” (qtd. in Gómez Santos 336). Instead, he opted to run for election as a diputado to the Cortes Constituyentes. In that office, he helped create the 1931 Constitution and served in the Cortes until his resignation in 1933.

As a diputado in the Cortes from 1931 until 1933, Marañón felt keenly the responsibilities of his role as an intellectual and a citizen responsible for charting Spain’s new political and social future. Yet, he gave up his political position relatively quickly; Marañón announced on November 1, 1933 that he would not stand for re-election, citing as the reason for his withdrawal the Ley de Incompatibilidades, which specified that one could not work as a catedrático (he held the Catedrático de Endocrinología) and also as a diputado (Gómez Santos 374). The public reason aside, Gómez Santos’s analysis of Marañón’s letters indicates that he was also motivated by a growing fatigue with the intrigue of politics and a desire to return more completely to his clinical work and research.10

In addition to his political work in the Agrupación and later as a statesman, Marañón maintained his clinical and research work throughout the 1920s and 1930s, even while directly involved in politics as a diputado. He added to those responsibilities an “obra colosal”

---

10 In a letter to Unamuno, dated February 28, 1934, Marañón writes, “Yo no quiero hablar de la política, porque si hablara acaso sería escandaloso lo que dijera en relación con ese gran saco de piedras que lleva uno a la espalda y que se llama ‘los antecedentes’” (qtd. in Gómez Santos 374).
of written work including *Gordos y flacos* (1926), a monograph on diet and nutrition; sixteen other book-length texts; “cuatro centenares de artículos publicados durante esos años en diversas revistas médicas”; and numerous prologues to the books of others, including Nicolasa Pradera’s cookbook (Laín Entralgo 44).\(^{11}\)

Marañón’s writing about cooking and gastronomy is not limited to his introduction to Pradera’s cookbook and *Gordos y Flacos*. He is the author of a number of essays and texts on the subject, including a prologue to Eduardo García del Real’s\(^{12}\) *Cocina española y cocina dietética* (1929), titled “Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española”; a number of book-length works, among them *La regulación hormonal del hambre* (1937),\(^{13}\) *Cátedra de vino*,\(^{14}\) and *Sobre la composición química de los alimentos*;\(^{15}\) “Ensayo apologético sobre la cocina española,” published

\(^{11}\) Marañón began contributing prologues to others’ books in 1915 with his prologue for Roldán Cortés’ *Influencia de la literatura moderna en las enfermedades mentales*. According to Gómez Santos, Marañón’s prologues converted what once was understood as “texto de complacencia hacia un autor que se inicia como publicador” to an essay that served as a useful platform during times of dictatorship: “La generosidad de Marañón para prologar libros ajenos ha sido posible por su facilidad asombrosa para el manejo de la pluma. Y porque el hecho de aceptar estas propuestas, suponían, en tiempos de dictadura, una plataforma desde la que podía manifestar libremente su pensamiento” (91-92). Marañón authored 220 prologues in his lifetime and Laín Entralgo devoted the entirety of the first volume of Marañón’s *Obras completas* to them.

\(^{12}\) Eduardo García del Real’s wife, Matilde, is listed as the author of the cookbook in various web resources, but the Biblioteca Nacional attributes the book to Eduardo. Marañón, in the “Breve ensayo,” describes the author of the cookbook as female: “[. . .] en este libro se ha preocupado su ilustre autora de recoger innumerables recetas tradicionales; no todas, como ella misma se lamenta [. . .]” (“Breve ensayo” 20).

\(^{13}\) In *Historia de la endocrinología española* (1999), Antonio Orozco Acuaviva describes this text as a speech Marañón gave at the Ministerio de Sanidad Público in Montevideo on March 18, 1937. The title is similar to another speech Marañón gave on March 12, 1932, titled “El factor humoral del hambre,” later published in the *Anales* of the Real Academia Nacional de Medicina (Obras completas, Vol 2, 271).

\(^{14}\) Gómez Santos lists this work in his description of the texts Marañón wrote about food and nutrition, but he gives no publication date and the text is not catalogued in the Biblioteca Nacional.

\(^{15}\) Gómez Santos attributes this text to Marañón and neglects to provide a publication date. Elsewhere, Marañón is listed as the author of the prologue with the author of the text, given as José Vázquez Sánchez; these sources list the book as published in 1932 by Gaceta Médica Española.
in El alma de España (1951); and Elogio medico de la naranja (1932/1961). He also included a series of essays about cuisine, “Cuatro meditaciones sobre la cocina española,” in the essay collection Meditaciones (1933).

In 1933, then, the year in which Marañón wrote the prologue to Nicolasa Pradera’s cookbook, he was still deputy to the Cortes. He had been named Catedrático de Endocrinología in the Madrid Faculty of Medicine in 1932 and elected to the Real Academia Española in 1933. At the same time, he maintained his clinical responsibilities, continued to publish research (more than 70 articles in 1933 alone [Gómez Santos 364]), and gave speeches both in the Cortes and to other professional organizations like the Real Academia Nacional de Medicina. Given the sum of these professional responsibilities, why would Marañón choose to write a prologue to a cookbook of recipes by a female chef? His decision to write for Pradera’s cookbook seems even more of a mystery when we realize that in this prologue, Marañón explicitly abandons his scientific role as a doctor advising Spaniards about the importance of diet and nutrition, a role he describes in his “Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española” (1929) as entirely incompatible with the art of cooking and enjoyment of food for its flavors.

In fact, the prologue—like much of Marañón’s other writing on cuisine—falls in line with his larger political concerns. His discussion of cuisine in the representation of Spain works to advance the goals articulated by Second Republic planners and politicians to integrate Spain into Europe. In the prologue to Pradera’s cookbook and in a 1929 essay, Marañón explicitly abandons his scientific role as a doctor advising Spaniards about the importance of diet and nutrition, a role he describes in his “Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española” (1929) as entirely incompatible with the art of cooking and enjoyment of food for its flavors.

In fact, the prologue—like much of Marañón’s other writing on cuisine—falls in line with his larger political concerns. His discussion of cuisine in the representation of Spain works to advance the goals articulated by Second Republic planners and politicians to integrate Spain into Europe. In the prologue to Pradera’s cookbook and in a 1929 essay, Marañón explicitly abandons his scientific role as a doctor advising Spaniards about the importance of diet and nutrition, a role he describes in his “Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española” (1929) as entirely incompatible with the art of cooking and enjoyment of food for its flavors.

16 This text likely appeared with Dionisio Pérez’s (Post-Thebussem) Naranjas. El arte de prepararlas y comerlas. The Biblioteca Nacional lists only “19?” as the publication date for the volume published by the Unión Nacional de la Exportación Agrícola. Manuel Martínez Llopis, in his Cuadernos de gastronomía profile of Marañón, lists a 1932 publication date (12).
“Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española,” Marañón identifies as barriers to that integration the **leyenda negra**, a long-standing representation of Spain that emphasized the country’s brutality and backwardness, and the **casticismo** that both Marañón and Pardo Bazán identify as alienating to outsiders. The prologue offers Nicolasa Pradera and her cuisine as an alternative representation of Spain that appeals to foreigners, in the form of tourists, and Spaniards alike. As we will see, in order to achieve this, Marañón has to reinvent Pradera by ascribing nineteenth-century gender roles to her, and by distorting her class status. He also presents a contradictory vision of Spain, at once modern and premodern, and simultaneously Spanish and Basque. And, at the same time that he constructs Pradera as a representation of a still-authentic Spain that can promote Spain’s modernity to outsiders, Marañón’s writing attempts to mask, for a foreign market and Spaniards alike, the tumult wrought by Spain’s modernization processes in 1933, a tumult that would fuel the **leyenda negra** rather than diminish it.

I will begin by examining how Marañón’s creation of Nicolasa Pradera is allowed by the absence of any evident effort on Pradera’s part to create any narrative for herself or generate a relationship with her readers, which forces readers to depend on Marañón’s depiction of her. Marañón takes advantage of this circumstance to misrepresent Pradera as both a representative of the **pueblo** and a representative of Spain’s progress. I will examine how Marañón’s rhetorical suspension of his scientific self in describing the effects of Pradera’s cuisine creates support for the contradictory framing of Pradera as a figure both of tradition and of Spain’s progress. In the third section, I examine why this contradiction is necessary and how it allows Marañón to rearrange the components that comprise Spain’s “authenticity.” And finally, I will argue that what is at stake in this process of repackaging
Spain’s representation has to do both with the Second Republic’s embrace of tourism as a mechanism of Spain’s economic modernization and with promoting a version of Spanishness that helped mask the political instability in the first years of the Republic, the same instability that provoked Marañón’s withdrawal from politics.

4.1 Nicolasa Pradera: Successful Modern Entrepreneur or Sacerdotisa of Spain’s Traditions?

Nicolasa Pradera published the first edition of La cocina de Nicolasa with the Madrid-based Rivadeneyra publishing house in 1933, following the sale of Casa de Nicolasa in 1930/1932 to her business partner, María Urrestarazu, for 40,000 pesetas. Since then, the cookbook has been reprinted at least twenty times, according to the catalogue of the Biblioteca Nacional, most recently in 2001. Each of the editions listed in the Biblioteca Nacional’s catalogue includes the original prologue by Gregorio Marañón. Marañón, whose 12-page prologue introduces 328 pages of recipes organized by course and type of preparation, is listed as the “autor secundario” of the text.

Marañón’s fame makes Pradera nearly invisible in historians’ and culinary critics’ descriptions and analyses of the cookbook. In their culinary histories, which describe the most prominent cookbooks and gastronomical texts produced in Spain, neither Néstor Luján nor Manuel Martínez Llopis write about Pradera. Although Mardones Alonso in the

In comparison, a schoolteacher earned 2,800 pesetas per year (Mangien 136). Founded in 1912, Casa Nicolasa was described by José Juan Castillo as both a “sencillo comedor” and, somewhat contradictorily, as the site of meals eaten by “prácticamente todo el mundo político, financiero y cultural de Donostia-San Sebastián” (web Castillo). Pradera’s restaurant has to be sencillo because its supposedly rustic nature guarantees the authenticity of its characterization as a founding site of the Basque Country’s traditions.

The cookbook is divided into sections for caldos, sopas, purés, macarrones, huevos, tortillas, fritos, pescados, caldos de carne, asados de carne, ave, y caza, fiambreras, compotas, helados, dulces, and repostería. Compared to the organization of Pardo Bazán’s cookbooks, in both of which cocido was among the first recipes, Pradera catalogues recipes for the emblematically Spanish cocido y potajes toward the end of her text.
Bibliografía, and historian Luis Haranburu Altuna praise Pradera’s work and cuisine, they offer little information about her career or her personality, and Mardones Alonso provides only the briefest of sketches describing how she became a cook and found the means to establish her own restaurant.

Haranburu Altuna provides the most detailed information about the cookbook and its place in establishing a Basque cuisine in his monograph *Historia de la alimentación y de la cocina en el País Vasco* (2000). According to Haranburu Altuna, Basque cuisine arose from the combination of French culinary methods and practices with ingredients autochthonous to the Basque country (*barbarines, angulas, cabrachos, arraingorri, chimbos, alubias rojas, bacalao*). The arrival of railroads to the Basque country in 1864 ended the region’s culinary and socioeconomic isolation. Plentiful sources of olive oil, wheat, and Riojan and Navarran wines made possible the development of emblematic dishes like the *pil-pil* and *verde* sauces and sped the decline in consumption of cider and *txacoli*. Biarritz had been a destination for tourists from cities throughout Europe since the early nineteenth century, which resulted in French cookbooks attaching the label *basquaise* to popular dishes. According to Haranburu Altuna, *La cocina de Nicolasa* and the 1930 cookbook *El Amparo: sus platos clásicos*, by sisters Ursula and Sira Azcaray, codify the Basque and Vizcayan cooking that resulted from the

---

19 Haranburu Altuna’s monograph presents a general history of cooking and nutrition in the Basque Country from prehistory through modernity. The structure of the book and its framing of cuisine in the geographic area of the Basque country reflects Haranburu Altuna’s idea that a series of practices, preparations, and uses of ingredients that distinguish a Basque “cultura culinaria diferenciada y diferenciadora” have developed throughout history (300) and ascribes to the people of the region a prehistoric consciousness of Basqueness, a proto-Basque identity. By asserting cuisine and cooking as a “rasgo identificador y diferenciador de su cultura” (300) and contending that “La cocina vasca es pues, un rasgo particular de la identidad vasca” (300), Haranburu Altuna engages a circular argument that reveals the nationalistic and ideological framing of his history. That said, his research into the social and culinary landscape of the region is useful.
application of French techniques both to ingredients native to the region and to ingredients that were newly available due to increased agricultural trade with neighboring regions. This combination guaranteed the “éxito y buen gusto” of the recipes contained in the books due to their reflection of French technique (262), while the ingredients the recipes call for indicate their link to the Basque “dieta popular” (263).20

Haranburu Altuna’s history indicates that Pradera’s cookbook was successful not only due to its famous prologuist, but also because of the reputation of Pradera’s cooking at Casa Nicolasa; he describes her as “la feliz cocinera” who “consiguió justa fama entre los donostiarras y los cortesanos que veraneaban en la capital guipuzcoana en compañía de los reyes de España” (264). Yet, Marañón’s “authorship” of the cookbook so overshadows Pradera’s that critics and culinary historians, with the exception of Haranburu Altuna, focus on his prologue to the exclusion of Pradera’s recipes. The journal Cuadernos de Gastronomía y de cultura alimentaria, (1995, numbers 11 and 12), for example, devotes three articles to Marañón’s gastronomical writing and lists Pradera’s cookbook among his culinary texts.21

20 The Azcaray family ran the restaurant Amparo, which opened in Bilbao in 1886 and closed in 1918 and, like Pradera’s Casa Nicolasa in San Sebastián, served an elite clientele that included members of the nobility and the growing middle class, artists, bankers, and politicians. The Azcaray cookbook was developed from two manuscripts that the sisters’ brother, Eduardo, presented to the Casa de Misericordia of Bilbao, which undertook the publication of the text to benefit the patients at the Casa de Misericordia. The cookbook contains emblematic recipes for dishes identified as Basque and Vizcayan, for example “bacalao a la vizcaína y en salsa verde” and “pista a la bilbaína” (262). Like Pradera’s cookbook, the recipes in both of these books point to the purchasing power of San Sebastián’s bourgeoisie. For example, the number of recipes for egg dishes reflect the diet of a relatively well-to-do clientele and readership since eggs are not part of the typical working class diet (Haranburu Altuna 263). In contrast, working-class cooking and eating habits more closely corresponded to foods consumed in the Txacoli de Larrazabal and similar taverns and bars where members of the working class congregated, ate, and drank (Haranburu Altuna 257-259). In 1883, Sabino Arana Gori spoke to a crowd of friends and politicians (of the “partido liberal-fuerista” of Bilbao) about the ideas contained in his text Bizcaya por su independencia at Txacoli de Larrazabal.

21 The journal, now inactive, also includes Marañón’s prologue to Eduardo (Matilde) García del Real’s 1929 cookbook, Cocina española y cocina dietética, which I mention at the end of this chapter.

However, just as those who have written about Pradera’s cookbook do not write about her, Pradera herself offers little in her own writing to give readers a sense of who she is. Susan Leonardi, in her article “Recipes for Reading: Pasta Salad, Lobster à la Riseholme, Key Lime Pie” shows how cookbook writers use paratextual elements—forwards, introductions, or epilogues—and other devices to construct an “embedded discourse” that tells readers how to use the recipes and offers some personal connection to the author (126). In her close reading of Irma Rombauer’s *The Joy of Cooking*, Leonardi demonstrates how a writer develops a relationship with a community of readers through narrative. For instance, Adriana de Juaristi, in her 1928 cookbook, *Cocina*, addresses the “Mujercita” in her “Prólogo” and invites the reader along with her on a trip to the market as the starting point for their cooking instruction. In the introduction to her cookbook, Rombauer uses a story about a handyman with a wooden leg to emphasize to readers that “correct preparation, cooking and time of food” should concern them more than a dish’s appearance and gives credit to her daughter for suggesting an introduction (Rombauer qtd. in Leonardi 127). The details a cookbook writer gives about her life (Rombauer has a daughter who becomes a co-author of the book with her), her commentary about the recipes, and her views on cuisine make a cookbook more than just a list of depersonalized instructions.
Searching Pradera’s cookbook for such a narrative or embedded discourse reveals little that would draw readers into a relationship with the author of the recipes. Indeed, it’s just the opposite: only rarely does Pradera write an authorial persona directly into her recipes. Her contributions, hints for easing preparation or suggestions about ingredients, are frequently enclosed in parentheses, making them seem an afterthought or an aside rather than an integral part of the recipe that would serve to build a relationship with the reader. These parenthetical comments most often take the form of a suggested variation for the recipe; in her recipe for “Cola de merluza rellena,” Pradera advises “Cuando esté hecha se saca a una fuente y se adorna con las almejas que se han quitado la media cáscara, las ronchas de patata que se han asado con el pescado y unos champignones (si se quiere)” (130). Or they acknowledge the flexibility of that recipe: “En el jugo de la tartera se le añaden dos cucharadas de tomate y un par de cucharadas de nata (si hay) [. . .]” (same recipe 130). On other occasions she specifies minute details of her own preparation. For example, the parenthetical note in the recipe for “Lengua rebozada,” “(Naturalmente, se sirve en salsera),” tells readers how to present the dish while serving it, and in the recipe for “Lengua en salsa de tomate,” where she specifies one set of instructions for Calasparra rice and another for other types of rice, she also notes “(Yo empleo el Calasparra)” (165).

By placing her comments in parentheses, Pradera both makes the text of the recipe and the dish itself central and renders her commentary absolutely peripheral in a way that minimizes not only her authorship of the cookbook, but also her ownership of the recipes she catalogues. The parentheses, presented as an afterthought, enclose not only a few helpful comments, but also her expertise as a chef and the knowledge she has gained in the experience of preparing these dishes. Without these comments, the recipes are simply a list
of steps that take readers through a dish’s preparation, reflecting little relationship with an imagined readership. Pradera’s spare writing style reduces her contribution to the text to a depersonalized list of instructions.

This authorial distance stands in stark contrast to Pardo Bazán’s lengthy prologues and introductions to each section of her cookbooks or Picadillo’s anecdotes and witty sketches of the people whose recipes he includes in *La cocina práctica*. Similarly, chef Teodoro Bardají, working in the same period as Pradera, writes extensively about himself in his cookbooks, as do middle-class, intellectual cookbook authors like Adriana de Juaristi and María Mestayer de Echagüe (the Marquesa de Parabere).22 Beyond merely detailing how to prepare certain dishes, these authors create discourses about themselves, their training, and their ideas about the intended readership of their books; re-editions of their texts include critics’ assessments of their work (culinary and literary). Their recipes are embedded in a social discourse that involves their readers in a conversation about the imagined community they share.

Comparing Pradera’s profile as a working chef and authorial persona to her peer, Bardají, illuminates the full extent of her authorial invisibility. In an illustrious career, Bardají, who authored the cookbooks *Índice Culinario* (1915, 1925) and *La cocina de ellas* (1935), worked as the chef to the Duques del Infantado (Pisa 8), as a member of the “brigada de cocineros del Real Palacio en Madrid” that prepared Alfonso XIII’s wedding feast, as the “jefe de cocina” of the Zaragoza Hotel Europa, and in the aristocratic households of the marqueses de Aldama and duques de Uceda (Fris in Bardají, *La cocina de ellas* 960). In the prologues to

---

his cookbooks, Bardají emphasizes his role as a cultural culinary figure who publishes literary
texts on cooking and cuisine; he informs his “queridas lectoras”: “Las explicaciones de
recetas están hechas con verdadero lujo de pormenores; aun a trueque de repeticiones
machaonas, he querido escribir fórmulas de cocina y no artículos literarios” (Bardají 953).
Furthermore, he directly acknowledges that his contribution to the cookbook comes in the
form of the role he assumes as the teacher of women readers who might not grasp the
“tecnicismos oscuros” of the recipes he includes:

He procurado, en la medida de lo posible, huir de tecnicismos oscuros desconocidos para gran parte de mis lectoras. En conseguir este propósito he puesto a contribución de mi voluntad; es lo único mío que tiene el libro.

(953)

For Bardají, the cookbook is a manifestation of his role as a teacher of women readers. The
focus of the text is his authorial persona since, as he states, “[l]o demás, las fórmulas en sí,
todas son conocidas y están consagradas por la práctica en las cocinas mundiales” (953).

Bardají also describes his collaboration with the professional trade publication Unión del Arte Culinario, a magazine that publishes recipes from Spain’s “jefes distinguidos y colocados ya a tal altura que están muy por encima de juicios insidiosos” (Bardají, Índice Culinario 11). Critics,
whose prologues and reviews of Bardají and his work are included by contemporary editors in re-editions, give his writing at least as much praise as they accord his cooking and his recipes. For example, literary gastronomist Dionisio Pérez raves:

Teodoro Bardají, uno de los mejores cocineros que tiene España, es fácil escritor además y singular autoridad en materia coquinaria [. . .] Es uno de los iniciadores del renacimiento y glorificación de la cocina nacional. No se
Bardají’s cookbooks, writing, and reputation as a chef establish his credentials as a skilled professional and the author of a meaningful discourse about food and cooking in Spain. More than a mere practitioner of cooking, Bardají creates an image of himself as a creative professional.

In contrast, Nicolasa Pradera tells her readers nothing about herself, either as an author or as a cook. There are no messages from the author, no “Al que leyere” dedications, nor does she indicate her professional training or her imagined purpose for the cookbook. Instead, the only information about her career and her cuisine is provided by Gregorio Marañón in his prologue. Because Marañón provides the context that frames Pradera’s recipes, and the image of Pradera herself, he controls the meaning of her project for the cookbook’s readers. Essentially, Marañón creates the persona of Nicolasa Pradera.

_Marañón’s creation of Nicolasa_

Marañón controls the representation of Pradera for both critics and readers of the cookbook, and his writing about her is the reader’s only orientation as to the significance of her project. With no countering narrative from Pradera herself, Marañón is free to shape Pradera’s persona to fit his own political and ideological agenda. The result is that he acknowledges her as an artist, but he uses the facts of her gender and her Basqueness to essentialize her both as a maternal figure and as a representative of the Basque pueblo.

Accomplishing this shift requires a fundamental contradiction; Pradera must be both an artist of Basque Cuisine—“Con much gusto escribo estas líneas de introducción al libro...
de Nicolasa, gran artista de la cocina vasca” (7) —at the same time that he erases the fact of her social class, encouraging readers to understand her as a member of the popular class. He fosters this impression with a number of strategies. First, he identifies Pradera by her first name throughout the prologue, which immediately indicates to readers that her social status is inferior to his. This level of familiarity would not be employed with a woman of Marañón’s intellectual or social class; Emilia Pardo Bazán is never “Emilia”; she is “Doña Emilia” or “la Condesa.” In the prologue itself, Marañón refers more formally to other women and their cookbooks. The nineteenth-century author of Libro de Cocina apropiado para la Mesa Vizcaína (1890) is “la señora viuda de Uhagón” (14); the Azcaray sisters and their mother are “doña Felipa Eguileor” and the “señoritas Ursula y Sira de Azcaray y Eguilor” (15). Marañón’s use of the title “señorita” indicates these women’s status as members of the middle class.

By identifying Pradera only as “Nicolasa,” Marañón obscures the fact that, at the time she wrote the cookbook, Pradera clearly belonged to the middle class, as a small-business owner, having acquired control of the products of her labor—the restaurant and the cookbook—and married carnicería-owner Narciso Dolhagaray Picabea.

Marañón compounds this impression about Pradera’s social class in his description by suggesting a contrast with the Azcaray sisters and their cookbook. He praises the fact that

23 According to Javier Mardones Alonso in Bibliografía de la gastronomía vasca, 1800-1959, the sisters to whom Marañón refers were three: Vicenta, Ursula, and Sira. Their parents Sebastián and Felipa transformed what was a simple tavern into the famous restaurant, El Amparo, which became “uno de los más famosos restaurantes de principios del siglo en Bilbao” (47). The restaurant closed in 1918 on the occasion of Vicenta’s death. Mardones Alonso hypothesizes that the success of the restaurant was due to the training the sisters received in France (he only speculates that they were trained in France) combined with the instruction they received from their mother. The sisters’ brother, Enrique, donated “dos gruesos cuadernos manuscritos” to the Casa de la Misericordia in 1930, and the first two editions of the cookbook bear a 1930 publication date.
the Azcaray cookbook was created and sold as an act of charity to benefit the Casa de Misericordia of Bilbao. The cookbook was

legado por voluntad testamentaria a la Santa Casa de Misericordia; y cito este dato porque es también representativo de la dignidad social que alcanza en una gran ciudad un libro de cocina cuando se considera como fuente de ingresos para la caridad oficial. (Marañón in Pradera 16)

This act of charity is also a marker of class; although the restaurant Amparo had closed, this family can afford to donate their culinary wealth to charity. Marañón makes an implicit comparison between Pradera and these sisters; he praises the Azcaray sisters’ for their act of charity, but he refuses to acknowledge Pradera’s role in creating a financially successful restaurant. Marañón states that only in a modern city would a cookbook generate enough income to make a notable charitable donation. He writes nothing, however, about how a modern city would enable a female chef to create a successful career for herself.

Pradera clearly does not fit the model of the middle-class woman that Marañón has as a frame of reference. Marañón expresses in this prologue a commonly held set of standards about women that neither acknowledged the rapid changes in women’s roles taking place in Spain nor the debates that engendered those changes. According to Mary Nash, despite Spain’s increasing modernization and industrialization, the social roles available to women remained static and bound to tradition. The 1931 Constitution enacted under the Second Republic awarded women the right to vote and divorce, but Nash’s study reveals that even into the 1930s male and female writers from across the political spectrum
supported an ideology that prescribed only traditional roles for women (Nash “Estudio preliminar” 13).²⁴

The social and economic factors that constructed the private sphere as a feminine domain stem from Spain’s transition from an agricultural society, in which women’s labor was included as part of the productive labor of a household, to an industrialized society. When productive work moved from within the home to factories or other places of business, women were restricted from participating in productive life. Fray Luís de León’s sixteenth-century *La perfecta casada* was a precursor of the ideology of domesticity that, in the nineteenth century, flourished throughout Western Europe, including Spain and Victorian Great Britain, where it was embodied in the figure of the “angel of the house.” According to this domestic ideology, women belonged in the private, domestic life of the home and homemaking; men functioned in the public productive and political sphere. Women were idealized in their roles as mothers (biological production) and as nurturers (future citizen production), and the home otherwise became a place of consumption (Nash “Estudio Preliminar” 40-44). Although this ideology functioned best in bourgeois families, it was adopted by working-class families. The resulting double subordination, due to gender and class, helped weaken class consciousness among women, ensuring these working-class

women would transmit these values to their children, passing on to the next generation a compliance with that ideology (Matilla 90-94).  

The first decade of the twentieth century marked the beginning of a slow emergence of women as a visible part of the public labor force. According to Nash, declining birth rates, later marriage ages, and increasing levels of illness among female workers at home drove an increasing need for women to work in the productive sphere to support themselves and their families. The rising levels of female employment created anxiety among male workers that the increase in women’s participation in the labor market would reduce salaries for everyone. Public female labor was acceptable in situations of absolute necessity, but preferably only in jobs aligned with women’s supposedly natural abilities—“en cosas y artículos de uso de las mujeres” (Nash “Estudio Preliminar” 46). Conservatives and the Church characterized women’s labor outside the home as threatening to the “sublime misión de madre y ‘angel del Hogar’” (45). Not only did working outside the home subvert the natural order of the family, but female economic independence threatened the authority and dignity of the male spouse (45). Furthermore, political conservatives persisted in viewing female public work as a way to support frivolous activities, such as smoking. Even though some leftists viewed female paid labor as a human right (José Francos Rodríguez), others, for example María Pi de Folch, also theorized that paid work would cause home life to deteriorate (47).

---

25 See Matilla for examples of the testimonios of working class women “sobre la dureza de la vida de ama de casa de las clases populares” (95).

26 Nash cites the work of Joan Gaya in “Les dones al treball i els homes en atur.” Catalonia social (July 1936), and Francesc Tusquets in El problema feminista (1931).
As a restaurant owner and cookbook writer, Pradera is outside of the purely domestic sphere represented by traditional notions of women’s place and their obedience to the ideology of domesticity. The Azcaray sisters fit into that ideology because Marañón frames their work as done for charity, a type of public presence seen as appropriate for middle-class women beginning with the work of reformers like Concepción Arenal in the nineteenth century. It is significant that Marañón praises the Azcaray sisters for their charity work, but makes no comment about their participation in creating the reputation of their restaurant. The selective mention indicates his endorsement of public roles for women as long as they conform to models that do not contradict domestic ideology; in other words, working in public is fine for women as long as it is done to benefit charitable causes. Marañón’s description of middle-class women and their cookbooks, together with the fact that middle-class women in Spain worked outside the home only in circumstances of dire economic necessity, places Pradera outside of the traditionally defined middle class.

Marañón’s familiar treatment of Pradera in his prologue, especially in contrast with his way of referring to other women, reveals his discomfort with a woman who breaks with both traditional gender and class roles. Pradera is not an example of a middle-class woman who, as Margarita Nelken describes in La condición social de la mujer en España (1919), attempts to present her work so that it “no parezca un medio completo de vivir” (52). Nor is she a “trabajadora que no quiere que se sepa” (52). She is, rather, an example of the incipient “nueva mujer moderna.” By the 1930s, the model of the “traditional” woman whose work in

27 Though it must be acknowledged that cooking in a restaurant is an extension of a domestic activity, just as teaching young children was.
the home nurtures her family and the future citizens of the nation-state was being challenged by the new model. According to Susan Kirkpatrick’s definition, this new woman was “independiente e intrépida y, [. . .] con su cabello a lo garçon y su falda corta, se negaba a aceptar las restricciones tradicionales que mantenían a la mujer española fuera de las universidades, las profesiones y los espacios públicos donde se desarrollaban los negocios de los hombres” (9).28 Nash, in her chapter “Un/Contested Identities” (1999), views the “nueva mujer moderna” model as a “symbolic device for adapting women to new social, political, economic, and demographic contexts” (32). It also served a functional purpose in that it “allowed women access to [. . .] education, culture, social welfare, and new sectors of the labor market” (32). Although it is unlikely that Pradera dressed or acted like the model Nash describes, the “nueva mujer moderna” exemplified a broader trend that made Pradera’s career possible. Yet, even though Pradera was a formally trained, skilled chef who established, operated, and eventually sold a restaurant that to this day bears her name, Marañón makes no effort to link her success as a restaurateur and cookbook writer to the greater opportunities available to women, symbolized by the model of the nueva mujer.

Instead of representing Pradera either as a middle-class woman or as a nueva mujer, Marañón constructs her as a figure outside the middle class who has, through her culinary skills, a privileged link to the tastes and culture of the popular classes:

28 In her monograph Mujer, modernismo y vanguardia en España (2003), Kirkpatrick studies Carmen Baroja, Rosa Chacel, Emilia Pardo Bazán, María Martínez Sierra, and Carmen de Burgos as examples of women who epitomized and helped create the prototype of “la mujer moderna.”
Y aún supera a este momento culinario, dentro de la literatura, el libro de Nicolasa que ahora aparece para delicia de la Humanidad; y los supera por la reunión feliz que se da en la autora de la tradición popular con la propia creación y por la extensión y eclecticismo con que se trata la delicada materia. (16)

He essentializes Pradera’s racial characteristics as a Basque woman, further sustaining her link to the popular. For Marañón, Basque women, Pradera included, are the sacerdotisas of a cuisine with a long tradition (8):

Claro es que la cocina cuidada y sapiente tiene, no hay duda, tradición centenaria en estas provincias; porque no se improvisa en pocas generaciones la profunda disposición (casi específica de esta raza) que para el arte gastronómico tiene las mujeres vizcaínas, guipuzcoanas y navarras; mujeres hechas de elementos nobles y antiguos, entre los que coloco esta admirable actitud cocineril. (10)

Marañón’s use of terms like sacerdotisa and numen—“Nicolasa es el numen actual más significado [. . .] A tal cocina y a su sacerdotisa quiero dedicar estos breves comentarios”—classifies these women as primordial beings with culinary skills arising from an ancient wellspring of noble knowledge (8). “Noble” for Marañón becomes a type of shorthand for a “Basque pueblo,” to which he refers when he attempts to create a parallel between Pradera and his childhood nursemaid, a peasant from the Basque town of Munguía. Marañón’s reference to essentialized “mujeres hechas de elementos nobles y antiguos” invokes the definition of pueblo that Derek Flitter describes in Spanish Romanticism and the Uses of History (2006). Marañón’s nursemaid belongs to the group of Basque women who over many
generations developed “la profunda disposición (casi específica de esta raza) que para el arte gastronómica tienen” (Marañón in Pradera 10). Marañón casts these women and Pradera in the “reassuring role of historical guarantor for Volksgeist” (Flitter 130). And the cuisine these women were able to produce because of their shared race and class inspires Marañón’s nostalgia:

Yo, que tuve a mi lado, desde que nací hasta que ella murió de vieja, a una noble mujer, campesina de Munguía, llevo unidos a mis recuerdos primeros—ya hace años de ello—el sabor de las angulas, del pimiento en sus formas más variadas, del bacalao con sus diversas salsas, del agrio chacolí y de casi todo el repertorio de la eminente escuela culinaria que comento. (10, italics mine)

Marañón alludes to a sensory memory that links the foods he mentions to the nurturing and maternal care he received from his nursemaid: “llevo unidos a mis recuerdos primeros—ya hace años de ello—el sabor de las angulas, [del] pimiento en sus formas más variadas [. . .]” (10). The flavors Marañón recalls create a visceral, sensual link between his contemporary self and his nostalgic childhood. His campesina nursemaid and Pradera preserve those flavors through time, passing them from mother (or mother figure) to child.

Marañón’s association of certain dishes with the childhood nurturing he received from his nursemaid conceals the labor of household food production by framing it as part of the practice of mothering, which Marañón, like the twentieth-century social scientist Nancy Chodorow describes in The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender (1978), understands as instinctual “emotion work” (14). Chodorow writes,

What seems universal is instinctual, and [. . .] what is instinctual, or has instinctual components, is inevitable and unchanging. Women’s mothering as
a feature of social structure, then, has no reality separate from the biological fact that women bear children and lactate. These social scientists reify the social organization of gender and see it as a natural product rather than a social construct. (14)

Since Pradera is indisputably female and must conform to Marañón’s essentializing understanding that females bear children and “mother,” Marañón draws a parallel between Nicolasa Pradera and his nursemaid to reframe her professional work in the language of nurturing and motherhood. That parallel also conceals the class dynamics at play; the nursemaid he remembers in the same breath with Nicolasa Pradera was a servant.

Marañón both obscures Pradera’s class and links her work to that of a traditional figure of domestic femininity, that of a nursemaid. The effect is to re-package her artistry and career in terms that are coherent with tradition.

Mothers, nurturing, modernity

Although Marañón advocated for Spain’s modernization, in misrepresenting Pradera’s social class and her role as a restaurateur, he is attempting to control one of the first effects of Spain’s modernization—women’s rights. Over a span of more than 55 years, from 1875 to 1931 and after, intellectuals from across the political spectrum grappled with how motherhood complicated any greater involvement of women in the public sphere.29 According to Nash, Marañón considered women fundamentally different from men, biologically equipped for different societal functions. A woman can perform duties and

---

29 Nash identifies the Restoration as the period that “determinarí[a] la condición social, política, laboral y familiar de la mujer española durante el periodo contemporáneo” (“Estudio Preliminar” 9).
undertake responsibilities belonging to men during circumstances of need or duress, but, for Marañón, her “función primordial es la de ser madre y esposa, y cualquier otra actividad queda limitada por esta condición previa” (Nash “Estudio Preliminar” 15).30

However, Nerea Aresti argues that Marañón’s ideas about women in Spain are not so easily classifiable. On the one hand, feminists criticized his ideas for being antifeminist since he worked to secularize traditional ideas about women’s roles by glossing with scientific authority existing opinions about women’s social functions, specifically their biological functions as mothers (Aresti 235). On the other hand, feminists like Carmen de Burgos defended Marañón’s work since he “con gran espíritu de justicia, no habla de superioridad de un sexo sobre otro, sino de necesidad de diferenciación” (Burgos31 qtd. in Aresti 239). Most feminists in Spain during the 1920s and 1930s favored a definition of feminism that recognized women’s unique strengths, which were not the same as those of men, but that elevated her moral and material condition, in contrast to a different feminist discourse centered on women’s equality to men.32 Aresti writes, “Ellas partieron de una percepción de las mujeres como seres radicalemente distintos a los hombres y determinados por su capacidad para ser madres” (236).33 This view was not at odds with Marañón’s theory of sexual difference, which privileges women as mothers.

30 Nash bases her observation on Marañón’s Tres ensayos sobre la vida sexual, “Texto 3” in Nash's Mujer, familia y trabajo en España (92-94).
31 In her work, La mujer moderna y sus derechos, p. 27.
32 Carmen Moreto y Díaz Prieto, a teacher and collaborator with the magazine Sexualidad, supported a feminist discourse based on equality and equal rights under the law. In 1919, Nelken argued that any support feminism received in Spain during the early twentieth century was based on an economic feminism, which would allow women to support themselves more equitably as workers.
33 Influenced by Marañón, Lucía Sánchez Saornil (an anarchist) and María Cambrills (a socialist) theorize explanations of biological difference that separate the roles available to women from those of men. Cambrills...
Nurturing and food are inextricably linked, and connected to mothering, even today. Not a single paper presented at the 2003 Oxford Symposium on Food (its topic, “Nurture”) questions the role of the mother as the de facto home nurturer. Indeed Pia Lim-Castillo, in her paper, “The Business of Food: Preserving Culinary Traditions Keeps the Family Fed in the Philippines,” describes the unequivocal coupling of motherhood and home cooking:

Many of our food memories and culinary learning experiences are connected with our mothers. Mothers determine our food culture. They not only decide on the food we eat, but by cooking it, decide on its particular nuances or register of taste. It is their example of daily unspoken devotion that becomes the model for their daughters [. . .]. (180)

Food in the home is by definition a task that belongs to mothers; its provision is a (biological) nurturing practice, and it structures how mothers socialize and shape the tastes of their children.

The maternal relationship Marañón describes between the middle-class viuda de Uhagón and her daughters, for whom she writes her cookbook, reinforces Marañón’s representation of a maternal bond centered on food. Their cookbook, Libro de Cocina apropiósito para la Mesa Vizcaína, contains recipes for dishes that Marañón lists—“angulas, determines that women are psychologically more suited to the private sphere than the public sphere due to the predominance of “los sentimientos, el afecto, la sensibilidad, la dulzura, la intuición, la pasividad y la abnegación” (Nash “Estudio Preliminar” 16, commenting on Cambrils “Texto 5,” included in Mujer, familia y trabajo). Even well-known Catalan feminist Carmen Karr de Lasarte finds it difficult to imagine women working in a context outside of one that requires her to act as a caring mother; she prescribes as “otra alternativa digna para la mujer soltera: dedicarse a otras personas [. . .] dar a todas las criaturas aquella su alma que no ha podido consagrar a otra alma” (Carmen Karr cited in Nash 17-18).
chipirones, bacalao, etc”—and which he describes as “guisos excelentes que hoy son honor
de esta cocina y regalo de buenos comedores” (15). Furthermore, he extols the Uhagón
cookbook:

En este catecismo sin desperdicio, que ha sido durante muchos años
depósito y oráculo de la ciencia gastronómica del país, hay un prologuillo,
que la autora dedica a su propia hija, en el que, en palabras sencillas y tiernas,
está encerrada toda la filosofía y toda la moral del arte culinario: ‘una buena
ama de casa—escribe la autora—debe entender el arte del cocinero para
preparar a su esposo y familiar el bienestar confortable que le haga preferir la
comida sencilla de su casa a los mayores festines fuera de ella.’ (15)

By invoking religious (*catecismo*) and mythological (*oráculo*) terminology to describe the
significance of cuisine to Spain, Marañón makes Uhagón’s *catecismo*, the cookbook that
reflects the affective bonds between mother and children, the model for all culinary arts in
Spain. His use of *prologuillo*, instead of the more straightforward *prólogo*, denotes the
tenderness of Uhagón’s act of writing recipes for her daughters. He extends this notion to
the nation as a whole by making women’s domestic roles central to Spain’s culinary
excellence; women who work in the private sphere as *amas de casa*, whose work encompasses
the “emotion work” of nurturing, shoulder “toda la filosofía y toda la moral del arte
culinario” (15).34 Thus, Marañón makes it clear not only that cuisine in Spain is feminine but

---

34 The viuda de Uhagón’s message for her daughters, that “una buena ama de casa [. . .] debe entender el arte
del cocinero para preparar a su esposo y familia el bienestar confortable que le haga preferir la comida sencilla
de casa a los mayores festines fuera de ella” (Uhagón qtd. in Marañón 15), is repeated by Sinués de Marco in *La
dama elegante* (1880), by Carmen de Burgos in the “Carta-Prólogo” to her 1906 and 1925 cookbooks, and by
Pardo Bazán in her 1913 and 1914 cookbooks.
that the foundation of Spanish cuisine lies in the maternal relationships that women have with their children (Uhagón) or with the children they are paid to nurture (the nursemaid).\textsuperscript{35}

Marañón not only makes the domestic sphere and the nurturing relationships women have with their children central to Spain’s cuisine, he also measures Spain’s progress according to this dynamic. He continues,

\textit{Pocas cosas dan idea del grado de progreso de un pueblo como el que las señoras encopetadas piensan y hablen así; y además que califiquen de “sencillas comidas” a las suculentas descripciones que siguen al prefacio que comentamos.} (15)

By making domesticity and the culinary arts born of housewives’ nurturing the sign of a pueblo’s progress, Marañón erases the social changes happening for women in Spain during the 1930s. Instead, he expresses a preference that Spain measure its progress in terms of the strength of its middle class and the adherence, of women in particular, to an archetype of behavior that has its roots in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Also significant is the fact that Marañón is commenting on Uhagón’s \textit{writing}, not her cooking. Rather than describe the recipes that Uhagón authors as part of her racial and genetic makeup, as he does with Pradera, Marañón focuses on the fact of her discursive production. This is another signal of Marañón’s perception of both Uhagón’s class and Pradera’s.

\textsuperscript{36} The suffragist movements taking root in more industrialized countries such as Great Britain and the United States in the nineteenth century found few allies in Spain due, in large part, as Nash illustrates, to the continuing influence of Catholic doctrine. The feminist movements developing in the Basque Country and Catalonia were of a Conservative slant and they had little interest in challenging the domestic ideology of separate spheres for men and women. As a result, the idea of the traditional Spanish woman elaborated in fray Luis de León’s sixteenth-century \textit{La perfecta casada}—the ideal woman is an “esposa sumisa y madre perfecta” dedicated “exclusivamente a las tareas del ámbito doméstico” (Nash “Estudio Preliminar” 40)—maintains its cultural currency despite Spain’s increasing urbanization and industrialization and the models from elsewhere that would make greater possibilities for women in the public sphere acceptable.
Marañón’s redefinition of cuisine as a maternal construct represents a discursive attempt to contain women during a period in which they acquired new rights such as voting (1931) and the right to divorce (1932). This focus on the home and cooking as a response to changes in women’s social roles was not unique to Spain. In her article “Just Like Home: ‘Home Cooking’ and the Domestication of the American Restaurant,” Samantha Barbas describes U.S. restaurants’ embrace of “home cooking” during the 1920s and 1930s when U.S. women were moving into the public workforce. The “domestication” of the restaurant was motivated by two primary factors: an increase in the production of industrialized food that moved food preparation from the home kitchen to the factory and the increasing employment of women whose labor was no longer restricted to the home. Just as women began to divide their work between paid employment and traditional family concerns, restaurants were evolving from “greasy spoons” serving primarily male workers to mixed-sex, middle-class eating establishments. Although the “home cooking campaign” reached its peak in the 1920s and later gave way to other restaurant industry promotions, “restaurants would continue to woo customers by promising to retrieve middle-class domesticity” (43). “Home cooking,” even that prepared in restaurants, supposedly retained a personal connection to the woman who made it. In contrast to the artificial flavors associated with factory food, home cooking had “distinctive flavors” and reflected a regional tradition borne out by the supposed individuality of the woman who made and served it with “loving care” (Barbas 48). Proponents and consumers overlooked the fact that the home cooking prepared in restaurants often contained the industrial ingredients supposedly inimical to the notion of home cooking. Barbas attributes the appeal of recreating home-like domesticity in the public
restaurant to the changing social roles of women and the modernization that makes these new roles possible.

Similarly, Marañón, by identifying Spain’s progress with women who nurture in their kitchens, is responding to fears that women might disappear from that role. Like Pardo Bazán, Marañón reifies the idealized pueblo who incarnate “popular” traditions in an attempt to create a stable image of the working class. By reinscribing Pradera and the women creators of Basque cuisine into the fabric of the domestic, Marañón creates a representation of her that erases the social conditions that made possible her professional training as a chef, focusing instead on the author as a maternal guarantor of culinary tradition.

4.2 Marañón Suspends his Scientific Self: A Foundational Contradiction

In order to construct Pradera as a traditional, maternal figure, Marañón misrepresents her as a “noble” Basque woman whose Basque race makes her part of the nameless and faceless pueblo and as a nurturing mother. To construct Pradera in this way and to frame the effects her cuisine has on those who consume it, Marañón tells his readers that he suspends his scientific mind when writing about Pradera, adopting instead the perspective of a Spanish everyman. Yet, in his prologue to Pradera’s cookbook and in the “Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española” that he authored in 1929 as the prologue to García del Real’s Cocina española y cocina dietética, Marañón only rhetorically abandons the scientific position that he applied to his analyses of everything from social issues to literature and the literary figure of Don Juan. Marañón actually uses the authority his reputation grants him to promote Pradera contradictorily, not just as a representative of tradition, but as a representative of tradition that proves Spain’s capacity to modernize.
Marañón’s anxiety over the ability of his country to overcome the *leyenda negra* and join modern Europe was shared by many. After 1898, Spain’s degeneration, which had once referred to spiritual concerns, acquired a biologic and organic definition. Fears that Spain’s backwardness indicated an inborn deficiency of the Spanish people that made it incapable of modernizing led to the development of a eugenics discourse that overlapped with politics (Nash “Social Eugenics” 742). For example, writers like radical republican Martínez Vargas, in *En defensa de la Raza* (1918), attributed Spain’s degeneration to the fact that the Spanish race had lost its “national vitality” (742).

This discourse also informed perspectives on the poor and converged in a practice/theory of social hygiene in which Spanish intellectuals, mostly socialists (such as Juarrós, Sanchis Banús, Jimenez de Asúa), but also liberal progressives (Marañón, for example) and conservatives (Severino Aznar), framed poverty in biological terms and proposed its eradication through state policy (Richards 824). In this vein, representations of the situation in Las Hurdes, including Buñuel’s film, released in 1933, and Marañón’s and others’ reports of the 1922 trip there with Alfonso XIII, focused on the spectacle of diseased bodies supposedly genetically predisposed to poverty. Rather than attribute the poverty in Las Hurdes to the complete absence of a transportation and communication infrastructure and insufficient agricultural production to feed the population, these reports framed the

---

37 Republicans and liberals in Spain were concerned with the links between social justice and hygiene. Richards describes Catholics and later ultra-rightists as more interested in moral hygiene than in social justice (Richards 824). Yet, Mary Nash, in her article “Social Eugenics and Nationalist Race Hygiene in Twentieth Century Spain,” insists that “there is no clear divisory line within the eugenics movement in Spain and indeed right/left categories are inadequate interpretative schemes for such complex movements that transcend such classifications” (745).

38 Unamuno, for example, documented his own trip to the area, commenting, “¡que los hombres casi ladran, que se visten de pieles y huyen de los [. . .] civilizados!” (qtd. in Gómez Santos 169).
poor as biologically inferior organisms and carriers of that genetic predisposition. These professional intellectuals, Marañón among them, according to Mary Nash, “became key leaders in the consolidation of social eugenics as a prominent social-reform movement in the late twenties and early thirties, as part of the organization of society by corporations of professionals: social engineering, Spanish style” (Nash “Social Eugenics” 744).  

As a physician-scientist and one of the leading intellectuals of the twentieth century in Spain, Marañón, like the individuals named above, inherited the task of nineteenth-century medical reformers who had worked to improve the living conditions of the working class and poor. According to Jo Labanyi, they did this in order to discourage class uprisings and protests.  

In Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel, Labanyi shows how the working-class home became the target of reform. Female “improvers” entered the private homes of the working class in an attempt to monitor and impose “family values” in poor households (86). Labanyi equates this “social medicine” reform process, or “política familiarista,” to an alternative form of state-sponsored policing. Institutions like the Sociedad Española de Higiene (founded in 1882) planned to improve agriculture and foment industrial development while also documenting the private lives of individuals and families, effectively masking surveillance mechanisms with the cover of social improvement. By focusing on poverty and the living conditions of the working class, social reformers were able to frame

39 The eugenics movement in Spain focused on the perceived degeneration of the Spanish race and eschewed the racial arrogance characteristic of eugenics discourses that circulated elsewhere in Europe (Nash “Social Eugenics” 743), for example Rassenhygiene, an offshoot of the Latin eugenics movement based on race, that circulated in France, Italy, and Latin America or Nordic eugenics, popular in Britain and Germany, that followed Mendelian “laws of inheritance” (Richards 829).

40 Marañón’s 1910(?) article “Sobre la represión de la mendicidad” denounced the government of Madrid for imprisoning the homeless in “campamentos de desinfección” and neglecting the groups of impoverished people whose illnesses threatened the health of the entire community (Gómez Santos 120).
the social problems of Spain, and its slow modernization, in terms of physical illness (Labanyi 86).  

Marañón and others like him, then, were following an established scientific tradition in attempting to diagnose the illnesses of Spain’s society in order to cure them. In applying his scientific mindset to Spanish social issues, the human body, literature, and the arts, Marañón sought to foment Spain’s modernization. This kind of scientific work was, according to José Ortega y Gasset in his essay Meditaciones del Quijote (1914), a necessary development in the process of modernization. As the “man of science who best represents Ortega’s cultural ideal,” Marañón would liberate Spanish culture from its “pre-scientific stage of development, bound to a pre-theoretical, sensuous conception of reality” to a “genuine Spanish culture” cultivated with the “rigor, precision, an discipline of the sciences” (Mermall reading Ortega y Gassett 168).

Marañón’s monograph about nutrition and the body, Gordos y flacos (1926), does not deviate from this perspective. In Gordos y flacos, Marañón makes nutrition and the body’s well-being part of the scientific discourses that attempt to diagnose, understand, and correct Spain’s social problems. The monograph describes organic inheritance, psychic inheritance

---

41 Reading anarchist magazines from Valencia and Catalonia, Richard Cleminson explains, in Anarchism, Science and Sec Eugenics in Eastern Spain, 1900-1937, that in Spain, as in other European countries, social hygiene surfaced in the late eighteenth century in a state-directed attempt to improve living conditions and increase the population through reproduction. This medicalization of society was not a linear process since Catholic doctrine impeded the secular practice of medicine until intellectuals like Pedro Felipe Monlau i Roca, for example, combined state-directed social policy and Catholicism to develop a medical discourse with a Catholic moral bent. His books, Higiene del matrimonio o Libro de los casados (1853) and Higiene privada (1846), outline a model for a healthy Catholic marriage with the idea that healthy Catholic marriages would produce a healthy vigorous nation: “My dear Sirs, nations do not decay or perish through lack of talent or genius, but rather through lack of physical and moral robustness” (Monlau qtd. in Cleminson 66). Monlau also outlines a nutritional regimen in his guide to healthy marriages and households. In Elementos de higiene privada, he lists over 35 pages of food items; details their chemical composition and Latin names; describes various species; and specifies where each grows or can be cultivated, fished, or hunted.
(dependent on the interaction between social and organic), and social inheritance (wealth, science, trade, communication, and cooperation) as the elements that form and shape individuals, their body types, and their propensity to be slim or fat. This argument makes diet and nutritional hygiene an aspect of the biological determinism at the center of philosophies of Spanish eugenics and social hygiene, arguing that the genetic makeup of individuals bears responsibility for difference in ways that religion and race do not.

For example, in the Prólogo to *Gordos y Flacos*, Marañón writes that the division between skinny and fat individuals is a fundamental identifying distinction:

> Hombres de raza diversa, de distintas religiones, de edades diferentes, pueden ser casi idénticos en su moral, en su psicología y en sus hábitos. Pero un gordo y un flaco, coetáneos y feligreses de la misma parroquia, se diferenciarán por caracteres esenciales inconfundibles (11).

In this passage, Marañón dismisses an entire historical organization that makes a shared race, religion, or historical moment responsible for individual differences in morals, psychology, and habits, substituting instead a genetic argument.

> He continues, “[...] la palabra ‘gordo’ resume multitud de conceptos de herencia, de costumbres, de carácter, de modalidades de la sensibilidad y de la inteligencia; que son exactamente el inverso en el ‘flaco’” (12). Marañón reduces the entire range of human potential to a biological predisposition to be fat or slim. Any number of organic characteristics or social circumstances (social class, for example) can account for an individual’s weight, diet, and nutrition. Yet, Marañón’s example of how being fat or slim
determines an individual’s character, intelligence, and other characteristics erases the effects of social factors such as class, education, and environment.\textsuperscript{42}

However, Marañón does not extend the same perspective to his work on cuisine. In "Breve ensayo sobre la cocina española," Marañón argues that cuisine and nutritional hygiene require fundamentally different measures and vocabularies. Hygiene and cocina are "palabras irreconciliables" ("Breve ensayo" 13).\textsuperscript{43} On the one hand, “El higienista calcula, con sus tablas en la mano, la ración conveniente; fija las calorías necesarias para que la máquina humana dé su rendimiento máximo y no se deteriore por las escorias del exceso de combustible [. . .]” (13). By contrast,

El cocinero—la cocinera, sobre todo—atiene a la satisfacción de los sentidos. No posee otra ciencia que ese empirismo milenario que ha ido depurando, de generación en generación, las combinaciones más sutiles de las especias, el grano preciso de la sal o de la pimienta; el tiempo justo de la cochura. [. . .] Y, en fin, ese trance de dar el ‘punto’ al alimento, en el que toda ciencia desaparece para dar un paso a un arte de los más delicados y subjetivos. (13)

\textsuperscript{42}To be clear, a biological perspective did inform the work of Spanish eugenicists like Marañón; it “stressed the link between racial fitness and national efficiency” (Nash “Social Eugenics” 743). However, Nash explains that nurture was also important: “the notion of nationhood was linked with population vitality, public health, and social welfare but not with a biological homogenous nation” (743).

\textsuperscript{43}In his 1933 collection of essays, Meditaciones, many of the same ideas and identical paragraphs from the “Breve ensayo” reappear in three essays titled “El cocinero, el higienista y el médico” (although in the first paragraphs he asserts that it is more accurate to write about cocineras); “La mala fama de la cocina española y sus causas”; and “La grandeza sensual.” The editors of the journal that reprinted Marañón’s “Breve ensayo” describe the piece as “fragmentos que pertenecen al prólogo” of García del Real’s book (“Breve ensayo” 13).
The female cook’s expertise centers on the senses while the male hygienist calculates and measures. There are some similarities in the languages of hygiene and of cooking; for example, chefs monitor the “grano preciso” of ingredients, while the scientist calculates (calcula). However, the skills that tell the cocinera when she has arrived at the “punto” of a dish’s doneness belongs to an “empirismo milenario,” a type of knowledge passed from one individual to another and rooted in the experiences and practices of individuals. The hygienist who creates a “cocina dietética,” which Marañón describes as “frialdad en las sensaciones, sobriedad, reglamentación, higiene,” (13), has no place in the world of cuisine, while the cocinera has no business designing “regímenes dietéticos” (13).

Marañón completely abandons his usual scientific focus in his argument for the importance of Pradera’s cuisine. He actively avoids the rational, theory-based discourse of science, deliberately placing her work outside of science and rationality out of deference, he says, to the author: “Ahora sí sería ocasión de repetir mis críticas austeras contra el abuso de las salsas. Pero ello sería hacer traición a la autora de este libro” (17).44 Where he uses the logic of biological determinism to interpret individuals and their mentalities in terms of their tendencies to be slim or fat in Gordos y flacos, in his writing about Pradera’s cuisine, Marañón abandons the “rigor, precision, and discipline” Ortega y Gasset identifies as a requirement for Spain’s modernization. Yet, somewhat contradictorily, he defends cuisine, a “pre-theoretical” and “sensual” practice, as an important requirement for Spain’s modernization.

44 However, he does address “anti-hygienic” cooking in his prologue to García del Real’s cookbook, due to the fact that the cookbook focuses on “cocina dietética.”
Marañón accomplishes this move in two steps. First, he draws a comparison between Pradera’s work as a chef and his work as a physician to illustrate that they both work to better the reputation of Spain:

Quien ha hecho, como ella, gratas tantas horas de la vida de muchos seres humanos; quien, como ella, ha contribuido a que centenares y centenares de extranjeros contemplen a España, a través del vaho transcendente de sus guisos, con admiración y con optimismo, bien merecido este homenaje, de quien no tiene otra misión que la de aliviar, cuando puede y con métodos menos agradables que los de la autora de este volumen, el dolor de sus semejantes. (7)

In his “homenaje,” he presents his public work and Pradera’s as two sides of the same coin; Marañón deals with the ugly parts (starvation in Las Hurdes, for example) and Pradera offers a sensual experience, the pleasure of a tasty meal. Marañón attempts to alleviate through his dual practice of medicine and politics the underdevelopment of the country’s inhabitants, while the “vaho transcendente de [Pradera’s] guisos” communicates optimism to foreigners about Spain’s possibilities. Marañón sees their two roles as two kinds of caretaking.

Secondly, Marañón rhetorically abandons his scientific authority to show readers how he falls under the influence of Pradera’s cooking. He begins by acknowledging the posture his career would seem to require of him in writing about Pradera’s cooking:

Y ahora tal vez estaría en su lugar que me acordase de mi sacerdocio de médico y abordarse el estudio de estas comidas suculentas desde el punto de vista de la higiene. Ahora sí sería ocasión de repetir mis críticas austeras contra el abuso de las salsas. (Marañón in Pradera 17)
In describing his professional role as “mi sacerdocio de médico,” he repeats the terminology he uses earlier in the prologue to describe Pradera, when he presents her as a sacerdotisa of cuisine (8). The repetition of the word allows Marañón to place his career in parallel to Pradera’s, linking their undertakings as similarly engaged in the drive for modernization. This language also allies Marañón rhetorically with Pradera; they are both priests or priestesses of their respective undertakings.

Yet, Marañón shows his readers how he rhetorically steps away from his role as a physician/scientist. He continues:

Pero ello sería hacer traición a la autora de este libro, y prefiero terminar estas palabras como las empecé; no como técnico y sacerdote, sino como simple pecador y como español amante de las glorias nacionales. Porque hoy la cocina de España—hay que repetirlo—es una de las mejores del mundo y uno de los blasones más auténticos de su progreso. (17)

By choosing not to criticize Pradera’s cuisine (his phrase “críticas austeras” connotes a position of power and discipline), Marañón only seems to abandon his position as a medical expert. Although he acknowledges his public profile in order to downplay it, by mentioning his “sacerdocio de médico” in one sentence, noting his “críticas austeras” as a physician in a second sentence, and repeating his position as a “técnico y sacerdote” in the third sentence, he actually draws greater attention to his reputation as a physician and scientist. To apply the critical framework of a scientist to Pradera’s cookbook, Marañón claims, “sería hacer traición a la autora de este libro” and Marañón prefers the more humble, ordinary role of an appreciative “simple pecador y como español amante de las glorias nacionales” (17). Rather than downplaying his status, this ostentatious attempt to distance his cookbook prologue
from his work as a physician and public health expert actually draws attention to Marañón’s role as a powerful adjudicator of health and taste in Spain. Furthermore, his reputation provides support for the rhetoric. It is the force of Marañón’s status as a técnico and sacerdote of Spain’s modernization that gives authority to his final assertion that “hoy la cocina de España—hay que repetirlo—es una de las mejores del mundo y uno de los blasones más auténticos de su progreso” (17).

Most importantly, this assessment goes to the heart of the contradiction at the center of Marañón’s construction of Pradera: Not only is Pradera’s cuisine one of Spain’s “glorias nacionales,” but that cuisine, one of the most authentic representations of Spain’s progress, is the work of a woman whom Marañón identifies as the incarnation of Basque tradition.

The contradiction: Spain’s progress represented by Basque tradition

Marañón unequivocally identifies Pradera’s cuisine as representative of Spain, not of a Basque heritage. Nor does he see Pradera as representing the growing political concerns of Basque nationalists. Nonetheless, Marañón wants it both ways: Pradera’s cuisine maintains its ties to Basque traditions, but not Basque nationalism, at the same time that it embodies Spain’s progress: “Quien ha hecho, como ella, gratas tantas hora de la vida de muchos seres humanos; [. . .] y hacer resaltar, en cuantas ocasiones se le presentan, los progresos y excelencias de su patria” (Marañón, Pradera 7, italics mine). According to Marañón, Pradera’s food is part of the “primera línea, el auge de las cocinas regionales, que han dado gracia, modernidad y suculencia a la vieja y tradicional cocina castellana, también excelente, pero más propicia para paladares rigurosas e indígenas que para ser gustada por las gentes extranjeras” (8). Basque cuisine contributes its “gracia, modernidad y suculencia” to the “tradicional cocina
castellana” (8). Thus, Marañón’s position is identical to that of nineteenth-century folklorists like Antonio Machado y Álvarez who catalogued regional practices and traditions as a representation of Spain’s people; Basque cuisine is an element of Spanish cuisine that demonstrates the variety and wealth of the latter. It is also a viewpoint Marañón shares with other twentieth-century intellectuals, like Unamuno, Baroja, and Maetzu, who saw the Basque Country as inseparable from and constitutive of the Spanish nation (Fox 90).

This perspective ignored the growing political activity of Basque nationalists. The Basque nationalism that developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries embraced a reactionary traditional identity and rejected the changes that accompanied the Basque Country’s industrialization with the development of mining, steel, and shipbuilding industries and their accompanying industrial bourgeoisie. In contrast, Marañón links the very existence of Nicolasa Pradera’s cuisine to the industrialization and modernization of the Basque country, implicitly rejecting its identification with the Basque nation.45 On the one hand, Marañón does pay tribute to the political and historical differences fostered by the Basque Country’s language and foral politics:

No he de cometer la ligereza de dar mi opinión sobre la antigüedad del arte culinario en las provincias del país vasco español. Esta región, tan orgullosa de su historia, tiene sus eruditos específicos, que seguramente han estudiado a fondo tan importante problema. (8-9)

45 The Second Republic would reluctantly grant autonomy to the Basque Country in October of 1936, after the Civil War had already begun, just a few years after Marañón authored this prologue (Carr Modern 141). Various coalitions had presented autonomy proposals to the Cortes in 1931 and again in 1934, but they were rejected. Catalonia was granted a statute of autonomy in 1932 (Jackson 77).
On the other hand, however, he argues that the development of Basque cooking like Pradera’s is a recent phenomenon: “Con todo respeto para ellos, pues, si me equivoco, quiero exponer aquí que la sospecha de que el auge actual de esta cocina—que creo sin lisonja para ellos ni menosprecio para las demás regiones, la primera de todas las de España—es relativamente moderno” (8-9). Pradera’s cuisine belongs to what he describes, two pages later, as a “tradición centenaria” (10), not to an ancient tradition.

By claiming that the prominence of the Basque cuisine he praises as the best in Spain is a relatively recent phenomenon, Marañón removes any association with Basque nationalist ideology that insisted on a pre-industrial Basque identity. Instead, he attributes the modernity of Pradera’s cuisine directly to the industrialization of the region: “No obstante, parece evidente que su cocina haya evolucionado—como pasa siempre—al compás del desarrollo económico de Vasconia, durante los últimos decenios” (10). Furthermore, Marañón credits San Sebastián’s tourism industry with the refinement and diffusion of Pradera’s cuisine: “Mas su afinamiento y difusión corresponden, a lo que creo, al crecimiento de San Sebastián y Bilbao, merced a la moda del veraneo y al progreso de las industrias locales, a partir de la segunda mitad del siglo” (10). By linking the economic development of the Basque Country and the growth of tourism in the region to Pradera’s cuisine, Marañón further distances Pradera from any association with Basque nationalism, both because the industrialization of the Basque Country was bitterly opposed by Basque nationalists and because the

---

46 Of course, Marañón disputes the accounts of nineteenth-century and earlier travelers who disparaged the region. He asserts instead that the travelers who wrote about their discomfort simply neglected to visit the right places: “Los viajeros que atraviesan Vizcaya y Guipúzcoa, hasta el siglo XIX, describen el pais como pobre, retrasado y poco confortable; sin razón, desde luego, por lo menos para las poblaciones de alguna importancia” (Marañón in Pradera 9).
development of Pradera’s cuisine was shaped by the Spanish tourists whose summer visits to
in San Sebastián were made possible by industrialization in the form of railroads.

Isabel II’s first visit to San Sebastián in 1845 put the city on the map, and the
construction of the rail line between Madrid and France, which passed through the city,
made it a tourist destination. In 1909, city officials promoted San Sebastián’s “buen trama
urbana y una brillante plástica arquitectónica” as representative of Spain as “un país
agradable, rico y sano” (Castells 330). Following the model of Biarritz, political and financial
leaders made elite tourism their goal, seeking to attract the spending power of well-to-do
travelers by playing on the city’s “tono distinguido” and the bourgeoisie’s attraction to the
image of the aristocracy, members of which had summered in San Sebastián since 1887
(332). Consequently, the city developed a strong service sector, and it cultivated a strong
professional, liberal bourgeoisie comprised of bureaucrats, lawyers, physicians, architects,
and engineers, who became the clients of restaurants like Nicolasa Pradera’s. The “culto”
reputation of the city (356) and propaganda about it being one of the healthiest cities in the
world (355) contributed to San Sebastián’s image as the “imagen de una ciudad moderna”
(352).

By asserting that the economic development of San Sebastián was a necessary
prerequisite to the development of Pradera’s cuisine and its success, Marañón identifies
Pradera as an unequivocally modern phenomenon. Her cooking would not be possible in the
absence of the economic and infrastructural changes brought about by the Basque Country’s
development, nor would her restaurant, which depended on the service economy that
developed as a result of the Basque Country’s industrialization. In this sense, Marañón
embraces for Spain Calinescu’s definition of modernity as “a stage in the history of Western
Civilization—a product of scientific and technological progress, of the industrial revolution, of the sweeping economic changes brought about by capitalism” (Calinescu 41). In his description of Pradera’s cooking and the industrialization that made her cuisine and culinary success possible, Marañón extrapolates the development that gave rise to Pradera’s cuisine and supported her restaurant to the modernization occurring throughout Spain.

As an example of this link between cuisine and modernization, Marañón offers the dissemination throughout Spain of Basque preparations for fish and the changing attitudes among the Spanish toward fish dishes as a result of the development of a network of roads in Spain. Highlighting the “art” of Basque fish dishes, a defining ingredient of Basque cooking due to the coastal geography of the region, he writes, “Y si quisiéramos ahora fijar en una esquema breve cuáles son las características de la cocina vasca, lo podríamos enunciar así: exaltación del pescado y suculencia y arte ligero en su preparación” (Marañón in Pradera 12). Due to Spain’s poor transportation infrastructure, which made transporting fresh fish from the coast to the interior a challenge, fish had been historically reserved for days of “mortificación y vigilia” in the interior of Spain; it was a “castigo del cuerpo en los días de cuaresma, pero no regalo de los sentidos” (13). By 1933, the “dificultades de los caminos y la rudimentaria pobreza de los medios de transportes” that previously made it impossible that “una gran variedad de pescados, tal vez los más exquisitos, llegasen hasta las ciudades del centro” had been replaced by an improved system of roads constructed in the 1920s under Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship (13). With the modernization of the roads system, fish could be transported throughout Spain. As a result, fish dishes that once indicated “[l]a valoración del pescado como alimento exquisito, de lujo para el paladar” in the interior regions acquired new meaning, according to Marañón, as symbols of Spain’s “buen comer español” (12). In
this way, the evolution and dissemination of regional cuisines to produce a national culinary tradition was catalyzed by Spain’s modernization. Marañón’s description of this process shows how Basque fish dishes could become part of Spain’s national cuisine when they could be consumed in all of Spain, a consequence of the country’s development.⁴⁷

Marañón’s writing about Spanish cuisine in 1933 takes for granted the existence of a Spanish cuisine, an attitude similar to that of folklorist Machado y Álvarez and Pardo Bazán, for example, who in the late nineteenth century transcribed and collected the songs and practices of Spain’s regions to present them in textual form in a collection of Spain’s popular traditions, *Folk-Lore: Biblioteca de las tradiciones populares españolas* (1883). Similarly, Pardo Bazán’s writing on Spanish national cuisine (1905, 1913-1914), for example, makes a case for the existence of a Spanish cuisine by describing the recipes in her *La cocina española antigua* as relics of a continuous tradition, collected like folklore traditions from throughout Spain. Pardo Bazán attempted to invent a tradition of Spanish national cuisine at a time when the lack of infrastructure in Spain made one unlikely, but by 1933, when Marañón writes his description of fish dishes, the roads system he alludes to did make a national cuisine plausible. And Marañón presents Spanish cuisine, specifically Pradera’s, as an important characteristic of the reputation of *pueblos*: “Y no son de los menos significativos estos de la hispánica cocina. En otro lugar he estudiado la importancia que el buen comer tiene en la reputación de los pueblos” (Marañón in Pradera 7-8). The “otro lugar” in this quotation refers to Marañón’s “Breve ensayo,” where he asserts, “No por descuido, sino

---

⁴⁷ At that point, Basque fish dishes represent both “el buen comer español,” and the significant expense of transporting fish to the interior via the roads system makes its consumption a symbol of bourgeois acquisitive power.
deliberadamente, incluyo, como es natural, la cocina entre los rasgos psicológicos de nuestro pueblo; y de todos los pueblos” (Marañón, “Breve ensayo” 16-17). Thus, Marañón adds cuisine to the literary and artistic texts that, according to Inman Fox, “se expresan configuraciones del mundo que definen el espíritu del pueblo” (12).

For Marañón, Basque and other regional cooking styles enhance and give variety to an already-existing Spanish national cuisine; Marañón enumerates “la andaluza, la levantina y la vasca” among the “admirables cocinas regionales de ahora” (Marañón in Pradera 14). These regional cuisines are constitutive of a Spanish cuisine that, at its core, is castiza and suited best for native palates. Marañón writes,

[l. . .] las cocinas regionales han dado gracia, modernidad y succulencia a la vieja y tradicional cocina castellana, también excelente, pero más propicia para paladares rigurosos e indígenas que para ser gustada por las gentes extranjeras, que son las que elaboran la reputación buena o mala de las cosas en el mercado de la opinión internacional. (in Pradera 8)

The tradition represented by the “mesa castiza” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 19), according to Marañón, is not appealing to “gentes extranjeras” (in Pradera 8). Casticismo refers to the native Spanish models of the Middle Ages and Golden Age that Romantic literary theorists and historians re-claimed as “as a pure and authentic representation of the country’s imaginative identity” in reaction to the eighteenth-century, French-imposed, “Age of Reason” literary styles that “had disparaged Spain’s national cultural tradition” (Flitter 162). So, when Marañón describes the taming influence regional cooking, like Pradera’s Basque cuisine, has over the “tradicional cocina castellana” (8), he reveals the stakes of his promotion of Pradera as both an essentialized, popular figure of Basque tradition and the
author of a cuisine that trumpets the “excelencias y progresos” of Spain (3). Representing Spain’s modernity through Pradera’s cuisine allows Marañón to adjust what constitutes Spanish “authenticity” to better promote a modern vision of Spain to foreigners—“el mercado de la opinión internacional” (8).

4.3 Does Being Authentically Spanish Preclude Spain’s Modernization?

When Marañón describes Pradera’s cuisine as one of “las glorias nacionales” and “uno de los blasones más auténticos de su progreso” (17), he is attempting to shift the paradigm framing Spain’s modernity, by linking the progress inherent in her cuisine to a depiction of Pradera as traditional and “authentic” due to her deep ties to the popular (national) practices of Spain. Marañón’s construction of Pradera as both modern and traditional is essentially and necessarily contradictory, because Spain’s “traditions,” the elements that comprise its national identity, are fundamentally anti-modern; they are rooted in the sixteenth century, were retrieved in the 1840s in reaction to the French-imposed models of the eighteenth century, and become the central issue in the early twentieth-century debates about Spain’s regeneration. This tension between Spain’s “traditions” and its modernity is encapsulated in the leyenda negra that circulated the (casticista) image of Spain abroad to the “mercado internacional” that Marañón describes.

Spanish journalist Julián Juderías formulated the phrase leyenda negra, or the “black” legend, in 1912 to refer to Europeans’ image of Spain as a country characterized by ignorance, intransient Catholicism, and superstition, and as absolutely incapable of becoming a modern nation (Greer 1; Jacobson 396). Although this anti-Spanish sentiment is rooted in late sixteenth-century Protestant hostility, Juderías’s writing about it in 1912 and
1914 attests to its lingering influence and to twentieth-century intellectuals’ concerns about the very possibility of Spain’s modernity following 1898 and Spain’s final loss of its empire.

At the same time, the prospect of Spain’s modernization had long troubled Spanish intellectuals who feared that the processes wrought by modernization, which implied an imitation of a modernity rooted outside of Spain, would dilute Spain’s authenticity, a paradox explored by Jesús Torrecilla in *La imitación colectiva* (1996). According to Torrecilla, intellectuals like Mesonero Romanos, Larra, Cadalso, Valera, and Unamuno, among others, subscribed to the notion that Spain’s authenticity belonged to another time period (the Siglo de Oro), while the modernity of the nineteenth and early twentieth century belonged to France. Although the *leyenda negra* is an exaggerated and negative representation of Spain, it encapsulates the *casticista* elements considered to be authentic and essential to Spanish identity that were perceived to be in danger of being lost in a modern Spain. That pessimism about Spain’s ability to modernize, according to Torrecilla, came from the belief that Spain could not change without imitating France (17). This complex about imitating the French made even the idea of progress a suspect issue, since it provoked an inescapable comparison to *lo extranjero* and a suspicion that anything produced that was modern could not be Spanish. To be modern, then, was to be inauthentic; to be authentically Spanish precluded modernity. This paradox made Europe a figure in the tension between Spain’s “authentic” traditions—rooted in the sixteenth century—its backwardness—also rooted in the sixteenth century and manifest in the still-pervasive *leyenda negra*—and its ability (or inability) to modernize.

So, when Marañón invokes the “mercado de la opinión internacional” as the imagined public for the representation of Spain’s modernity in the figure of Nicolasa Pradera, he confronts the existential tension at the heart of Spain’s drive to modernization.
Marañón writes about how tourists to Spain—the international market for Spain’s reputation—function as a mechanism of Spain’s development.

Eugenia Afinoguénova and Jaume Martí-Olivella, in their introduction to Spain is (Still) Different (2008), describe how “[t]ourism has long maintained a reputation as a cultural practice which ought to be fostered and supported because of its ability to circulate abstract configurations of natural phenomena - climate, landscape, history, identity—as commodities [. . .]” (xii). Tourism circulates identity as a commodity to a marketplace of consumers, and state support of the circulation of Spain’s identity, history, and landscape would promote Spain’s development. Yet, according to Marañón, for tourism to work as a development project, the tourist’s experience of Spain must be a good one, not one that continues to reinforce the leyenda negra. But altering the experience tourists have of Spain runs the risk of altering what is truly Spanish; the elements that make the tourist experience pleasant are incongruent with Spanish authenticity. Marañón’s writing about Pradera, then, needs to construct a representation of Spain that is both authentic and modern.

Marañón himself has no love for the leyenda negra, its role in discouraging foreign visitors, nor its representation of a still backward Spain. In the prologue to Pradera’s cookbook, Marañón laments the fact that Spain’s sixteenth-century reputation persists into the twentieth century:

---

48 This state support for tourism first appears in Spain in 1905 in the form of the Comisión Nacional de Turismo.
En el caso de España la famosa leyenda negra, que pesó durante siglos sobre nosotros, como una nube sofocante, estaba en gran parte formada con la humareda densa del mal aceite frito; humareda, en parte, real; pero sobre esta realidad, amplificada y ensombrecida por la ligereza de unos, la mala voluntad de otros y la indiferencia de los más. (8)

His description of the “nube sofocante” from “mal aceite frito” to describe Spain’s leyenda negra alludes to nineteenth-century travel writing about Spain by Washington Irving (1832), Théophile Gautier (1843), Richard Ford (1846), Alexander Dumas (1851) and Hugh Rose (1875, 1877). Their Romantic interest in “wild and romantic scenery and exotic cultures” made Spain a favored destination in the nineteenth century for these writers, who were attracted by its remoteness, its mixture of Moorish and medieval heritage, and its popular culture (Barke and Towner 6). These same elements (casticismo, the “medieval revival,” for example) are those that comprised the components on which Spain’s national—castellanófilo, in Fox’s terms (12)—identity was constructed. So, nineteenth-century adventure tourists may have promoted this version of Spain abroad, but it was embraced as a presentation of Spanish identity in Spain as well.

Marañón identifies some of these writers directly in his “Breve ensayo,” where he attributes the persistence of the “leyenda negra de la cocina española” to travel writers’ and tourists’ scathing descriptions of the conditions in Spain, citing examples of writing about Spanish cuisine: “No hay un viajero inglés, francés o de otro país que, al referir en sus conversaciones o en el papel impreso sus impresiones personales, haya dejado de pintar con tintas sombrías la parvedad, la insipidez o el condimento agresivo de los manjares españoles” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 16). He blames Mme D’Aulnoy for writing about the “penalidades
gastronómicas” she suffered while traveling through Spain (16), and Ford’s representation in *Gatherings from Spain* (1846) merits his professional censure for its blindness to the importance of food to Spain: “El famoso Ford dedica uno de los capítulos [. . .] a los guisos y bebidas peninsulares, y es quizá el único tema en que flaquea, a veces, su penetrante visión de la psicología nacional” (16).

Marañón faults even “modern” writers, like Ali-Bab, for their misrepresentation of Spain’s cooking, which unfairly perpetuates Spain’s deficiencies as a destination on the tourist map, doing nothing to undo the *leyenda negra*. Marañón finds Ali-Bab’s 1928 assessment to be the most unjust of these outsiders’ views of Spanish cuisine; according to Ali-Bab, “España es un hermoso país; pero su cocina es bastante mediocre. [. . .] Realmente, en España sólo es bueno el cerdo” (Ali Bab qtd. in Marañón, “Breve Ensayo” 16-17). Ali-Bab’s mistake, Marañón insists, was to be guided by “malas compañías” who led him through Spain’s “fondas con pretensiones cosmopolitas, y casas con la cocina gobernada por jefes que hicieron su aprendizaje en los transatlánticos o en los trenes” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 17).

It appears, to Marañón, that Ali-Bab merely took advantage of the tourist infrastructure that existed for foreigners, which guided him to the “fondas con pretensiones”

---

49 Author of *Gastronomie Pratique* (1907) ‘Ali-Bab,’ or Henri, Babinski, was an engineer who spent much of his time outside of France. His cookbook was originally published in 1907, but it was edited and added to throughout the twentieth century. The original edition was subtitled “Études culinaires” and later editions carried different subtitles and additional new essays—for example, a nine-page “medical” article and a 41 page introductory essay about the history of eating (Hertzman web).
While Spain’s infrastructure remained unchanged through the nineteenth century, offering the same inhospitable accommodations and modes of transport offered to visitors in previous centuries, by 1928 more than twenty years of state-initiated tourism planning had succeeded in making the country more accessible. The 1905 creation of the Comisión Nacional de Turismo, led by the Conde de Romanones, identified tourism as a way for Spain to “overcome the stigmas of national difference and an alleged incapacity to adapt to modern ways,” according to Sasha Pack (“Tourism. . .” 658). Elites envisioned Spain’s integration into the European travel system as a way for Spain to modernize; tourism would be a “regenerative force for economically and socially stagnant regions” (657). Pack cites a Catalan diputado who described tourism as part of “the living interests of this country, those anxious for progress . . . must second this initiative . . . so that [Spain may] claim its rightful place among the CULTURED PEOPLES” (capitalization original to text qtd. in Pack 660).

Guided by this philosophy, the state developed tourism policies and began to plan a comprehensive infrastructure even before the arrival of any actual tourists. The 1905 Comisión Nacional focused on promoting “sunny Spain” and “awakening an interest in local cultural [sic] and heritage” (Pack “Tourism. . .” 660). In 1911, the Royal Tourism Commissariat, which had replaced the Comisión Nacional, passed laws requiring that municipalities provide services for tourists, and hotels were encouraged to modernize with

50 Foreign guidebooks of the early twentieth century encouraged visitors to avoid fondas run by natives due to their “abominable” sanitary arrangements (Barke and Towner 11). Tourists were directed instead to the ”good restaurants” in larger towns that served French cuisine (Barke and Towner 11).

51 Spain was never part of the grand tour itinerary of wealthy Europeans due to Protestants’ fears of the Inquisition and the “lack of inns, beds, and meals” (Barke and Towner 5). Furthermore, there was little contact between foreign elites and the Spanish elite; the Spanish court was considered boring (Barke and Towner 4-5).

52 Under the guidance of the Marqués de la Vega-Inclán, El Greco’s home in Toledo and other historic sites were restored and converted into museums or inns (Pack “Tourism. . .” 660).
an incentive system (660). During the years of Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship, improvements in the railroads and the creation of a highways network that linked towns were justified, in 1926, by tourism interests (Martin 275; Pack 660).53

In 1931, Second Republic politicians restructured the tourism board, creating the Dirección General de Turismo as part of the Interior Ministry (Pack, Tourism and Dictatorship 46-47). And, most importantly, Second Republic politicians sought and won a seat on the League of Nations Tourism Committee, a move Pack describes as an example of the Second Republic’s aggressive promotion of tourism and Republican politicians’ belief that tourism was an “extraordinary interest for Spain” with a “growing moral and spiritual importance” (Pack, Tourism and Dictatorship 46-47).

So, Spain’s tourist infrastructure should have made possible a more satisfying visit for Ali-Bab. However, a lack of information for travelers hindered that possibility: “Es cierto, sin embargo, que la visión extranjera, al llegar a nuestras tierras, frecuentemente se deforma por insuficiencia de información [. . .]” (“Breve ensayo” 18). And, as Marañón argues in his “Breve ensayo, although Spain’s modernization projects facilitated Ali-Bab’s visit, they also curtailed his experience of what Marañón calls authentic Spanish cuisine. It is difficult for visitors to gain access to an “authentic” experience of Spanish cuisine since “[l]a auténtica y maravillosa cocina española queda reducida a las casas particulares y a ciertos lugares semipúblicos, al margen de las guías oficiales [. . .]” (19). By disdainfully

53 With these new roads, the number of automobiles in Spain increased from 135,000 in 1927 to 250,000 in 1930 (Martin 275). Furthermore, Primo’s government made the state the investor in Spain’s major public works, from the highway system mentioned above to large-scale construction and the expansion of electricity and telephone use, and in underwriting Spain’s industry. However, the modernization sponsored by the state failed to motivate similar levels of investment by the private sector, which resulted in the suspension of these projects during the 1929 global depression (Martin 275).
characterizing the chefs whose restaurants Ali-Bab patronized as “jefes que hicieron su aprendizaje en los transatlánticos o en los trenes,” Marañón insinuates that the modernization that makes travel easier in Spain also threatens the authenticity of the experience of Spain on offer (17).54

**Casticista Spain or “hospitalario y cordial” Spain**

Marañón’s attempt to blame foreigners for perpetuating the leyenda negra in the late 1920s and 1930s is complicated by the fact that the domestic circumstances of the nation in this period made some parts of this representation true. The reality of Spain’s uneven development meant that there was still something to the notion of “black” Spain.

In the years following World War I, urban metropolises like Madrid, Barcelona, and Bilbao developed consumer cultures similar to cities in other parts of Europe, fueled by popular articles about decorating, fashion, hygiene, and cooking; these articles and photographs, however, depicted a lifestyle available only to a limited, urban-dwelling, affluent part of the populace.55 By contrast, according to Brigitte Mangien, rural Spain still maintained many of the characteristics typified in the leyenda negra (135-136). José Álvarez Junco describes how the “absence of any widespread modernization process in Spain left the rural world virtually untouched” and dissociated from “the new liberal-national identity, one

---

54 The tourism infrastructure that elites proposed and developed in the first thirty years of the twentieth century as a path to Spain’s modernization did succeed in bringing individuals to Spain. In the first years of the Republic, 200,000 foreigners visited Spain annually, attracted by the expanding resorts, amenities, and beach cultures. Most tourists came from Britain and France (Pack *Tourism and Dictatorship* 46-47).

55 The items these magazines promoted as part of a modern Spanish lifestyle were out of reach for much of the population. For example, Magnien mentions that the price of the “fonógrafo Quillet” (350 pesetas) equaled a schoolteachers’ salary for a month and a half: “Para mucho tiempo aún la vida moderna queda prohibida y, sobre todo, ignorada por la mayoría de los españoles” (136). Furthermore, even if magazines depicted women in short skirts smoking cigarettes, photographs of groups in cafés and other locales in Spain’s cities reflect a more modest dress code (136).
of ‘citizens’ and ‘Spaniards’” (83). Second Republic politicians and university students attempted to educate citizens in Spain’s rural towns out of the backwardness of underdevelopment via comprehensive education reform and programs like the Misiones Pedagógicas, which took “classic and modern culture” to towns and villages (Shubert 189). However, Shubert notes that “the extension of the democratic state deep into the countryside” created protests and violence as the “newly mobilized” working class attempted to end the control of caciques (190).

In further contrast to magazine images that presented a version of consumer modernity to which Spanish people could aspire, a group of authors and intellectuals fetishized “la España negra” out of “una fascinación motivada principalmente por preocupaciones filosóficas o políticas: pesimismo existencial, reacción nacionalista, frente a las influencias artísticas extranjeras, voluntad sincera y desesperada de ‘regenerar’ el país, o denuncia sarcástica de las lacras nacionales” (Mangien 136). Painters like Ignacio Zuloaga and Ramón and Valentín de Zubiaurre represented “España arcaica” in their work, while writers Darío de Regoyos, J. López Pinillos, Eugenio Noel, and Ramón del Valle-Inclán aestheticized the “decrepitud del país” (Mangien 137).

So, when Marañón, in his writing about cuisine, criticizes “muchos españoles” for directing the attention of foreigners—tourists, the engine of Spain’s modernization—to the elements in Spain that supported the continued relevance of the leyenda negra, he acknowledges the “authenticity” of that part of Spain:

Es cierto, sin embargo, que la visión extranjera, al llegar a nuestras tierras, frecuentemente se deforma por insuficiencia de información y por la necia manía de muchos españoles de excitar la atención de los extraños hacia el
elemento de casticismo agresivo e inhabitable de nuestra vida, y no hacia el otro: el hospitalario y cordial [. . .].” (“Breve ensayo” 18)

In this quotation Marañón suggests that the mythical image of casticista Spain associated with the apex of the Spanish empire is incompatible with Spain’s modernity. It is the “elemento de casticismo agresivo e inhabitable” that gives foreigners fuel for perpetuating the leyenda negra. In order to escape the reputation of the leyenda negra and present a representation of modern Spain to the world, Marañón suggests that Spain will need to shed the harsh identity that nation-builders used to build a Castile-centric Spanish national identity and embrace a version of Spanishness that represents a softer side, the “hospitalario y cordial” element (“Breve ensayo” 18). This is what Nicolasa Pradera represents for Marañón.

**Marañón’s shift—Pradera’s role**

By proposing Pradera as one of Spain’s “glorias nacionales,” as a representation of Spain’s progress, and as an embodiment of the “hospitalario y cordial” side of Spain that is attractive to tourists, Marañón attempts to redefine “Spanishness” as something that is no longer casticista. By describing Pradera as authentically Basque and defining her cuisine both as Basque and as an example of “la auténtica [. . .] cocina española” (Marañón, “Breve ensayo” 19), Marañón suggests a shift in the “components” that comprise Spain’s “ideal culture” (Bendix 4).56

56 According to anthropologist Regina Bendix in *In Search of Authenticity*, institutions like universities, or in Spain’s case, cultural institutions like the Institución Libre de Enseñanza and Centro de Estudios Históricos, research the “components of an ideal culture” and inculcate these ideas into the bourgeoisie, the axis of economic and political power (Bendix 4). Authenticity becomes a “core ingredient” in shaping the boundaries of the ideal culture; the authentic receives scholarly attention, while the inauthentic is maligned for spoiling or harming the components that structure the ideal culture (4). The canons of the cultural disciplines are constructed to understand, restore, and maintain the authentic (4).
Marañón proposes a cultural landscape in Spain in which the contours of Spain’s ideal culture would shift from idealizing and canonizing above all else the *casticismo* that he characterizes as “agresivo e inhabitable” (Marañón, “Breve ensayo” 18) or “más propicia para paladares rigurosos e indígenas que para ser gustada por las gentes extranjeras” (Marañón in Pradera 8) to a representation of Spanishness incarnated by Nicolasa Pradera and her cooking. Marañón proposes Pradera’s cuisine and the modernity she represents as a way to sidestep the incongruity that Torrecilla defines, in an argument summarized by Noël Valis: “To be modern seemed to mean not to be Spanish, that is, to be modern was to give up that which was traditional, in other words, what was seen simultaneously as both backward and authentic” (Valis 8). Marañón represents Pradera and her cuisine as a symbol of the way Spain can be modern and authentic by substituting the traditions at the center of constructions of Spanish nationhood (*casticismo*) for other, equally authentic traditions—like the “popular” cuisine that Pradera cooks.

Paradoxically, this new representation remains outside the immediate purview of visitors; Marañón locates the sites of “la auténtica y maravillosa cocina española” as “al margen de las guías oficiales, tan sólo conocidos del comedor experto” (Marañón, “Breve ensayo” 19). So, even if Marañón promotes this authentic, popular cooking to Europeans as a sign of Spain’s modernity and as a more welcoming representation of Spain, he also reveals an anxiety about its commodification: “Es la cocina más propensa a prostituirse por el industrialismo” (“Breve ensayo” 18).

Furthermore, Marañón’s redefinition of the ingredients that comprise authentic Spain underscores that the debate at hand is no longer focused on defining what is “national,” as it was during late-nineteenth century discussions about the need to produce a
national novel or the imperative for elites to eat Spanish cuisine (for example, Thebussem’s *La mesa moderna*). It is apparent in Marañón’s writing that he takes for granted the existence of a national cuisine. Spain’s cultural institutions have established the contours of a Spanish nation that have gained currency. Instead, the stakes of Marañón’s discussion are rooted in the “authored nature” of the national characteristics that Marañón wants to restructure (Köstlin qtd. in Bendix 7). That is, in his dissection of the *leyenda negra*, the experiences of tourists in Spain, and the practices of his peers in perpetuating the representation of dark Spain, Marañón makes explicit the act of authoring to which Bendix refers; he proposes that Spain reshape its authentic self, an imperative that underscores the instability of “authenticity.”

In this way, Nicolasa Pradera and her cuisine become a vehicle for Marañón’s repackaging of Spain and his representation of Spain’s modernity. The version of Spanishness Pradera represents stands up to the tests of both authenticity and modernity. For example, her work dismantles the *leyenda negra*: “Esta leyenda, digámoslo con júbilo, se ha desvanecido. Y ha contribuído a ellos, en primera línea, el auge de las cocinas regionales, que han dado gracia, modernidad y succulencia a la vieja y tradicional cocina castellana [. . .]” (Marañón in Pradera 8). Additionally, Marañón celebrates Nicolasa as one of “los artistas consumados del fogón que hoy poseemos” (“Breve ensayo” 18) and makes her an example of Spain’s ability to create something modern that incorporates foreign elements without crassly imitating them.57 Describing how her “descubrimientos culinarios” quickly become

---

57 Marañón’s description of Pradera’s ability to create something modern and original stands in contrast to Torrecilla’s description of Feijoo’s ridicule of the Spaniards who adopted foreign modes of dress, speech, and comportment as if all “buen gusto” resided on the other side of the Pyrenees (Torrecilla 16). Where Feijoo’s
“clásicos,” Marañón praises Pradera for her skill in incorporating elements “extraños” into her own dishes:

Y esta es la señal más expresiva de su mérito; que aquí, como siempre, la personalidad se mide, más que por ninguna otra cosa, por la capacidad de captación e incorporación de los valores extraños a la propia sustancia.

(Marañón in Pradera 12)

While Marañón never explicitly acknowledges the training Nicolasa most likely received in French culinary techniques, he refers to it indirectly when he characterizes her success as a consequence of her own merit and adaptability. In this way, he acknowledges France’s influence in the production of something in Spain that represents Spain’s modernity, but shows that the contact Pradera has had with France and French cooking does not dilute the originality and essential Spanishness of her work: “Es tan recia la fuerza del estilo y de la manera vasca, que aun esos elementos adevnicos o recientes se incorporan con rapidez [. . .].” (Marañón in Pradera 12).

Moreover, Marañón places Pradera’s cuisine in competition with French cuisine: “[. . .] como la famosa Nicolasa, que a su paso por la frontera francesa, en San Sebastián, desafía a los mejores maestros de allende del Pirineo [. . .]” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18). Even in San Sebastián, in a city at France’s border that attracts other Europeans who know French cuisine, Marañón asserts that Pradera’s skills are outstanding enough to compete for

ridicule came from native imitators’ unconditional, uncritical admiration of foreign practices without thought that their imitation might be embarrassing, Pradera’s culinary discoveries become classic recipes.
attention with the supposed *maestros* of French cuisine from across the border. Nicolasa and the other *sacerdotisas* of Spanish cuisine “han hecho, de un modo silencioso, más por el buen nombre de España que casi todos nuestros ministros de Estado” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18). Not only does Pradera contribute to the national reputation of Spain, but she is a culinary ambassador who can promote Spain’s interests abroad.

**Re-packaged authenticity at home**

Marañón’s suggestion that Spain shift the components of its ideal culture—its national identity—in order to create a tourist experience that is both authentic and coherent with modernity has domestic implications in addition to international ones. The circulation of a commodified representation of Spain was as important for some of Spain’s citizens—those individuals who would buy Pradera’s cookbook or eat at her restaurant—as it was for the tourists who visited. Its importance can be understood by examining three examples, which also illustrate the stakes of Marañón’s re-packaging of Nicolasa Pradera.

First, domestic tourists had been a market for this type of representation since the railroads first arrived to San Sebastián in 1864, soon followed by Isabel II and her coterie of courtiers. Since 1870, media in Madrid acknowledged the importance of attracting foreign tourists; there were economic benefits to “keeping wealthy Spaniards ‘at home’ rather than taking their *reales* to Biarritz or Deauville” (Walton 118). Wealthy Spaniards created a domestic tourism industry focused around seaside resorts and spas like those in San Sebastián, the location of Pradera’s restaurant. San Sebastián attracted increasing numbers of

---

58 Marañón mentions “la Señora Modesta” in Toledo who “ante las murallas de Toledo conserva, como un rito sagrado, la excelsitud de la cocina castellana” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18).
foreign tourists in addition to the domestic visitors, which made the city a “vector for the transmission of fashion cycles and cultures of emulation [. . .],” catalyzing what Walton also describes as “a kind of globalization of Spanish social practices and consumption patterns” (Walton 118).

Secondly, this version of Spanish progress and authenticity played a role in masking domestic unrest. For example, according to Walton, the “countervailing celebration of local and regional identities and customs” generated “in an attempt to use regional cultural distinctiveness and colorful local festivals to attract and entertain the tourists” not only presented a repackaging and promotion of the popular to present a version of Spanishness that was palatable to foreigners, it also served to erase contradiction, strife, or unrest within Spain (119). Pack relates that tourism “developers and government planners sought most of all [. . .] to present foreign tourists with a Cosmopolitan and in some ways dissociated leisure experience—and to present the same to Spaniards” (italics mine 658). And writing about San Sebastián, Castells describes how city officials deliberately cultivated an image of a

59 In “Breve ensayo,” Marañón cites Francisco Javier Sánchez Cantón’s tourist guide, Spain, published in 1930 by the Patronato Nacional del Turismo. Published in English, the book describes Spain’s art, architecture, and history and reassures readers that the image of Spain created by nineteenth-century travel writers is no longer accurate. Instead, visitors are invited to become tourists of a modernized, industrialized Spain that can cater to their comforts. Sánchez Cantón promises that “the business man and the student of affairs will also find here outlets for his enterprise and subjects for his study” (119); he describes admiringly the “metallurgical industries [which] are worked in accordance with the most efficient technical methods [. . .]” (120); and he notes the progress made in agriculture: “Agriculture has made tremendous strides, both by the use [of] modern machinery and by the introduction of new crops, such as sugar-beet” (20). By acknowledging Spain’s negative international reputation directly, the “undeniable backwardness of the country in the 19th century,” Sánchez Cantón uses the guidebook to promote a modern Spain in which “the trains stand comparison with the best in Europe, and if the railway system is not as extensive as it might be, recent years habe [sic] seen a great development in motor services encouraged by the extraordinary and rapid improvement in the roads, which [. . .] are now models” (120-121).
community without conflicts or tensions, in contrast to the class tensions rocking the rest of Spain during the period of San Sebastián’s growth as a tourist destination (Castells 351-352).

Contemporaneous with the development of a tourism industry that crafted an easily consumable experience of Spain, were the International Exhibitions staged in 1929 and 1930. Like Marañón’s re-packaging of the modernity of Pradera’s cuisine, these international exhibitions depended on reshaping the Spanish nation into a version of Spain that could be easily consumed by tourists. Robert Davidson describes world fairs like the exhibitions that took place in Barcelona and Sevilla as important events in which commerce and nationhood come into contact, and in which participant spectators compare the constructed images of nations to one another (229). Visitors see representations of progress, or technological advances, and they participate in an experience designed by elites that reaffirms collective national identity as Spaniards (Roche 45-46). In his 2001 essay “Modern Spaces” Brad Epps writes about how the Poble español of Barcelona’s 1929 Exhibition offered “el elevadísimo grado de civilización a que ha llegado la floreciente, sana, laboriosa, honrada y siempre hidalga nación española,” where individuals from throughout Spain could arrive and simultaneously see their “home” reflected while experiencing the illusion of a united nation (Epps 172). Epps describes it as a “carefully bounded’ place where the insecurity of (inter)national breakdown might be kept at bay” (172).

In 1933, Marañón’s re-packaging of Nicolasa Pradera as a Basque figure of tradition who incarnates Spain’s progress functions as a representation of Spain meant to distract its readers from the specter of national breakdown. Marañón may configure Pradera as a representation of Spain’s modernity, but his presentation of her as representative of Spain’s progress, like a world’s fair exhibition, applies a veneer of stability and civility over the unrest
incited by the processes of Spain’s modernization. Intellectuals like Marañón were preoccupied with the reputation of Spain abroad and the persistence of the “black” legend that highlighted what Marañón wants to cast as the violence and backwardness of Spain’s past rather than its modern condition. However, the arrival of democracy in the form of the Second Republic was not a magical solution to Spain’s backwardness and underdevelopment.

Instead, in his three years as a diputado to the Cortes Constituyentes Marañón witnessed and renounced the violence of the Círculo Monárquico church burnings in May 1931, events Republican lawmakers were unable to control. He had distanced himself from the 1932 decision of Republican politicians to repress the Jesuit order in Spain and appropriate their assets, citing the fact that the religious orders carried out necessary public services that the state in its present form could not provide (Gómez Santos 358). Marañón was also troubled by attempts to prosecute individuals for “colaboracionismo con la Dictadura,” namely the Duque de Alba (363); in a letter to Ramón Menéndez Pidal, dated November 11, 1932, he expressed his concerns about the prosecution of intellectuals like himself only to appease the masses clamoring for the spectacle of a jailed powerful aristocrat (Gómez Santos 364). In 1932 Marañón and the other members decided to dissolve the Agrupación al servicio de la República. Though the members stated publicly that the group’s mandate had been fulfilled with the establishment of the Second Republic, its dissolution presaged what Carr describes as the Summer 1933 exodus of intellectuals from direct involvement with Republican politics due to its upheavals (126-127). Gómez Santos describes Marañón as being “[u]n tanto desengaño de la política, quizás por las cosas que han ocurrido en España durante los últimos meses” (369). Among other events, Gómez
Santos refers to episodes of rural violence that culminated in the massacre of Casas Viejas (Carr 127). In November of 1933 Marañón resigned from politics.

So, in the figure of Nicolasa Pradera Marañón creates a representation of Spanish modernity that does not preclude its authenticity. However, if modernity is defined as the representation of the processes of modernization (Labanyi 385), Marañón’s creation of Pradera functions to conceal the deep conflicts that accompanied the modernization of Spain during the Second Republic.

**Conclusion**

In order to turn away from the upheavals of modernization that come with Spain’s Second Republic, Marañón distills an image of Spain’s modernity that elides those upheavals by reinscribing a very modern woman, Nicolasa Pradera, into traditional gender and class models. While this representation invokes his nostalgia for the sensual links between the foods he consumed as a child and the mother-servant figure who prepared them for him, it obscures the changes that Second Republic politicians institutionalized for women, their rights as citizens in Spain’s public sphere. It also allows Marañón to obscure the unrest and threat of breakdown that overshadowed Spain’s Republican democracy in 1933. Using his status as a scientist and statesman, Marañón urges his readers to agree with him that Pradera and her cooking represent not only the best of the *cocina española*, but she and her art represent the best of Spain’s progress to the international marketplace.

By crafting an experience of Spain that shifts attention from the elements associated with Spain’s violence and underdevelopment, its *casticismo*, to an experience of Spain characterized by the “hospitalario” Nicolasa Pradera (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18), and by
converting Pradera into a culinary ambassador for Spain, Marañón promotes a version of Spain not encumbered by the legacy of a casticista identity. He re-packages Spain’s “authenticity” so that it can be compatible with modernity. And in doing so he willfully obscures the processes of its modernization. He promotes instead a version of what Spain’s modernity could look like if only the processes of modernization could be safely represented in the figure of a “feliz cocinera” who prepares delicious food in a region properly subordinate to the Castilian center of the Spanish nation.
Conclusion: Spanish National Cuisine and Postnational Cuisine in Spain

In this dissertation I have shown that Emilia Pardo Bazán, Carmen de Burgos, and Gregorio Marañón, three of the most well-known figures of Spain’s early twentieth-century intelligentsia, wrote cookbooks, or parts of them, for diverse and often contradictory reasons—reasons born of the anxieties generated by the process of Spain’s modernization. All of these authors had access to the intellectual forums of their day; they could and did consider the changes wrought by modernization in articles published in magazines, journals, and newspapers. Yet, they chose the genre of the cookbook to disseminate these discussions, and they addressed middle-class women as their imagined reading public.

These writers circulated their ideas to women readers via cookbook prologues because middle-class women were central to the anxieties with which these authors struggled as a consequence of Spain’s modernization. These anxieties were generated by the shifting social structures in Spain as women gained access to education and to paid public employment. The weakening of traditional models of femininity, the emergence of a new model in the *nueva mujer moderna*, and the right to vote and to divorce granted by the constitution of the Second Republic also signaled the possibility that women could have a greater role in public life in Spain. At the same time, even as social roles were shifting for women, they also shifted for a newly mobilizing working class, which threatened the social order in Spain through political and labor organization, but also with violence and unrest.

So, what does it mean to talk about Spanish cuisine? In these cookbooks from the first three decades of the twentieth century we have seen how three Spanish intellectuals use
Spanish cuisine to promote a vision of Spain’s modernization that corrects for the instabilities generated by those same modernization processes. They use Spanish cuisine to attempt to inculcate a specific set of bourgeois values into women as a way to garner their collaboration in the effort to contain the working class. At the same time, these authors criticize the obstacles patriarchal ideology still placed in women’s way, and they weave in nostalgia for a way of life for women—that of the home—that had not yet even begun to pass into the past. Their writing in cookbooks is a way to make their readers participants in these goals.

Cookbooks are examples of a discursive space for women; it is the activity of women in their homes that these cookbooks were imagined to direct. So, the prologues of these cookbooks can be understood as the framing that ascribes meaning to the actions of the women who might have read the prologues and recipes, or who might have cooked from these books. Inherently, the cookbooks and their prologues represent strategies on the part of three writers and intellectuals who seek to direct the activity of their readers and make the things they do in their home kitchens meaningful for the nation.

Emilia Pardo Bazán’s *La cocina española antigua* (1913) places the feminine practices of home cooking in parallel to the dominant, masculine nation-building discourses of the early twentieth century. As a catalogue of the culinary practices that define the Spanish nation, the cookbook contains recipes from the *pueblos* whose *vejezuelas* grudgingly share their recipes, as well as from middle-class women living in Latin America whose cooking Pardo Bazán conceives of as resolutely Spanish. Her catalogue of Spain’s national cuisine serves her goal in making cooking a nation-building discourse while it also creates a role for herself as a nation-builder. Yet, Pardo Bazán shows in *La cocina española moderna* (1914) that converting
the feminine practices of cooking into a nation-building discourse is insufficient. And so, in
spite of the evident contradiction with her feminist ideals that advocated new roles for
women, she uses this second cookbook, in which she distinguishes which culinary practices
are barbaric and which are civilized, to shore up middle-class women’s domestic role as a
bulwark against the working class, whose protests and instabilities threaten the aristocracy to
which Pardo Bazán belongs.

Carmen de Burgos also addresses women’s roles in Spanish society and the meaning
of their activity in the kitchen. By illustrating that cuisine is a social practice that shapes
politics in countries outside of Spain, Burgos undermines the domestic ideology that would
dictate that cooking has little relevance to the public sphere. In so doing, in a popular genre
that had the potential to reach a wide feminine readership, Burgos engages in a practice of
“double writing” that masks underneath the conventionally feminine topic of her writing a
feminist defense of her role as a writer and as an intellectual whose ideas contribute to
Spain’s modernization (Zubiaurre 1).

If Carmen de Burgos uses her writing in cookbook prologues to show her women
readers how their activity can be meaningful outside the home, Gregorio Marañón, by
contrast, attempts to reinscribe women into traditional domestic and social roles in reaction
to the upheavals wrought by the Second Republic. His invention of Nicolasa Pradera in his
prologue to her cookbook *La cocina de Nicolasa* (1933) nostalgically frames traditional gender
and class models as the version of Spain’s modernity that will most appeal to outsiders. He
creates a representation of Spain that obscures the processes of its modernization.

The “Spanish” cuisine in these texts is mobilized to perform a variety of functions.
Cuisine as it is constructed in these texts creates a role for women in the construction of the
modern Spanish nation at the same time that it circumscribes them into traditional roles. Furthermore, as an invented tradition of the Spanish nation, Spanish cuisine also, as Gregorio Marañón’s writing suggests, communicates information about Spain to outsiders. In this context, cuisine played a central role in Spain’s self-presentation as a modern nation, even if cuisine did not ultimately acquire the status of an institutionalized national discourse, as was the case with literature.

One issue I did not explore in this version of the project is how cooking might function as a practice of resistance to the nation. What would a cooking of resistance look like and how would it be traceable in cookbooks or other culinary writing? In Carmen de Burgos’s 1925 prologue to *Nueva cocina práctica*, I found an interesting intertext that demonstrates one way in which food or cooking discourses might be used in an effort to resist the nation. Burgos incorporates into her introductory essay a lengthy text by Ramón Gómez de la Serna, along with his illustration, a “Mapa Gastronómico-Humorístico” that maps Spain’s alimentary wealth and diversity.¹

In his essay, Gómez de la Serna lampoons the state’s interest in deliberately constructing a national cuisine and the myths that it invents to support nation-building discourses. He describes the “cartógrafo gastronómico” who, as an employee of the Spanish state, takes a census of all of the dishes, regional specialties, and culinary secrets throughout the Peninsula. The *cartógrafo* grows fat as he travels throughout Spain by train, horse, and

---

¹ A modernist writer, Gómez de la Serna was Burgos’s domestic partner for a number of years. Burgos tells her readers little about his text and map. She alludes to the map on page forty-two of the prologue, following a comment about how the Arcipreste de Hita cites the regions that produce the best fish. She introduces Gómez de la Serna’s vignette after listing the “platos españoles” that “en todas partes [. . .] se presentan [que] se reciban con aplauso” (66).
cart, eating with the individuals he encounters, who all feel obliged to prepare him special meals. And yet, he concludes his trip with his clothing in tatters, since he cannot afford to replace them, and requests that the Government award him “un crucecita con distintivo azul o verde, que eso lo mismo me da, y a ser posible de oro y, desde luego, libre de gastos, y no sólo regalada, sino ya empeñada por lo más que den, pudiendo ser muy original la solemne entrega de la papeleta de empeño de la cruz recién concedida.” (69). Goméz de la Serna’s vignette shows the processes by which a national cuisine might be constructed. The state employee travels through the Spanish countryside—travel made accessible by trains, horses, and carts. He exploits the labor of the people he encounters by eating their food to document a national patrimony, and he wishes to be rewarded with what Hobsbawm calls a “ritual occasion” (11)—the awarding of a medal and a ceremony—at the conclusion of his trip. By describing a process by which the cooking of individuals across the Peninsula may be mapped, Gómez de la Serna charts one possible way of institutionalizing that knowledge for national purposes (Hobsbawm 6). At the same time, by making the cartógrafo an absurd figure, Gómez de la Serna paints the construction of a national cuisine as an absurd practice.

The nation is a way to imagine a community, according to Benedict Anderson. It functions as an epistemological ideological frame that, as Ernest Gellner writes in Nations and Nationalism (1983), is contingent and not a “universal necessity” (6). According to Gellner, “two individuals are of the same nation if and only if they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation” (7). The cookbooks and prologues analyzed in this dissertation are discourses that ultimately work to strengthen the nation, to map avenues to participation in its construction, to show how women are participants in a national project, and to make it
possible for readers of these texts to recognize one another as Spanish via cooking and eating practices.

**Postnational Spanish cuisine**

Asking what it means to write about Spanish cuisine in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has allowed me to do two things: first, to historicize the notion of a “Spanish national cuisine” as something that Emilia Pardo Bazán participated in inventing; and second, to consider cuisine as a category of knowledge that first became relevant to people’s lives in Spain in the late nineteenth century. Cuisine, as Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson defines it in *Accounting for Taste* (2006), “cannot exist without food; nor can it survive without words” (19). And yet, “culinary preparations become cuisine when, and only when, the preparations are articulated and formalized, and enter the public domain” (19). So, even though the cookbook genre had existed for hundreds of years previous to the period of my study, as a category of knowledge it only became relevant to people’s lives when they were able to read and when writing about food began to be published in widely circulating popular media—cookbooks and magazines.

The historicization of these two categories was necessary in order for me to tackle the project that first caught my attention: the work of twenty-first century haute cuisine chefs in Spain, among them Ferran Adrià, Juan Mari Arzak, and Santi Santamaría. My research into food, cuisine, and gastronomy in Spain began in 2003 with a series of questions about the nation in Spain and the work of these chefs, whose restaurants and ideas about food inspired *New York Times Magazine* contributor Arthur Lubow to gush, in his 2003 article “A Laboratory of Taste,” “After a trip to Spain this summer, I’m convinced: the
effervescence that buoyed French nouvelle cuisine in the 1970’s has somehow been piped across the Pyrenees” (1). Lubow was part of the global media attention that has focused on these chefs and their Michelin-starred restaurants over the last decade, identifying in Spanish haute cuisine “the new source of Europe’s most exciting wine and food” (1).

What caught my attention in Lubow’s article, and in subsequent media descriptions of the work of this group of chefs, were the descriptions of them as Spanish and Basque and Catalan.2 Lubow notes, for example, that “the most creative cooks in Europe were no longer French; they were Spanish” (1). And yet, he locates the “epicenters of the Spanish [culinary] groundswell in the northern part of the country—Catalonia, of which Barcelona is the capital, and the Basque country around San Sebastián” (1). Lubow’s location of Spain’s new haute cuisine in the autonomous regions of Catalonia and the Basque Country, regions with a history of competition with the Spanish state for national recognition, and his identification of the movement as “Spanish” illustrates his participation in creating a twenty-first century version of Manuel Vázquez Montalbán’s “instamatic portrait” of Spanish cuisine. In Contra los gourmets (2001), Vázquez Montalbán writes:

El balance es sabroso, pero tristísimo: la tortilla de patatas, la paella, el chorizo y el jamón de pata negra. Únase a estos platos, a manera de bebistrajo, la sangría y un nebuloso concepto de vino de Jerez, y obtendremos el retrato instamatic que la sabiduría convencional internacional se ha formado de nuestra cocina. (103)

2 The New Yorker also profiled Ferran Adrià in their May 12, 2003 issue.
Vázquez Montalbán names the *tortilla de patatas*, *chorizo*, and *paella* as the most well-known dishes that pass for “característicos de un talante culinario nacional,” which emerge as a consequence of attempts to “sublimate” Spain’s multiple regional cuisines into a Spanish national cuisine (103). Lubow makes the work of haute cuisine chefs like Ferran Adrià, Juan Mari Arzak, and Santi Santamaría into figures of the Spanish “talante culinario nacional” (103). And in doing so, he shifts the definition of “Spanish” cuisine to include the set of quotidian dishes Vázquez Montalbán names in addition to the internationally known figures of Spanish haute cuisine and their dishes and techniques.

Lubow’s article also led me to consider the international trend of focusing cuisine on local food and local practices. By focusing on the local, chefs and consumers can supposedly combat the global models of fast-food and mass-food production. Yet, some haute cuisine chefs in Spain seem to conflate local products with national identities by linking menu items to symbols of Basqueness, Catalanness or Spanishness. For example, Santi Santamaria’s Summer 2004 “menú de degustació” at his Sant Celoni restaurant, Racó de Can Fabes, featured mushrooms gathered from the nearby Montseny mountains, which have mythic resonances in Catalan literary and nationalist discourse. His translation of the Catalan “mar i muntanya” into “cansalada amb caviar” reworks local geographic referents—the *mar* and *muntanya*—into a dish with an ingredient universally associated with haute cuisine—caviar. This example demonstrates Kenneth Frampton’s idea of critical regionalism in that the “impact of universal civilization” in the form of caviar is mediated with “elements derived indirectly from peculiarities of a particular space”—the *cansalada* associated with the Catalan *muntanya* (Frampton 21). Robert Davidson has begun to study this focus on the local and the
Catalan nationalist focus on geography as he outlines in his article “Terroir and Catalonia” (2007).

But what do these symbols of Spanishness, Catalanness, and Basqueness mean to these chefs’ projects, especially if the market for them, and Lubow’s imagined readers, are a group of internationally mobile yuppies? The examples of Santi Santamaría’s and Juan Mari Arzak’s projects demonstrate how the cuisine produced by these two chefs makes their cuisines’ Catalanness or Basqueness subject to the same fragmentation that a commodity undergoes in its movement along globalized “object paths” (Baudrillard 34). Are these chefs practicing a cuisine that is somehow uniquely Basque or Catalan as a result of the local-ness of the ingredients and preparations? Or, do their projects participate in selling the difference of Basqueness and Catalanness to the individuals who read international press articles about the chefs and then travel to Spain to eat at their restaurants?

While my interviews with Ferran Adrià, Juan Mari Arzak, and Santi Santamaría in July and August 2004 gave me greater insight into how they envision their work, their cagey answers to my questions about how their projects participated in Spanish, Basque, or Catalan culinary traditions indicated that the roots of this project had to be in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the issue of the nation and the diversity of nations in Spain became pressing.

And so, my questions about avant-garde cuisine in Spain and the projects of this group of chefs have shifted. I would also like to consider how state and autonomous communities in Spain have collaborated to convert cuisine and gastronomy into a discourse with a reach far beyond the restaurants of its practitioners. For example, in 2004 the Generalitat de Catalunya, the Caixa de Manresa, and Ferran Adrià founded the Fundación
Alimentación y Ciencia (ALICIA), a non-profit organization dedicated to investigating nutrition (“Adrìà responde . . .”) and Mediterranean culinary patrimony, among other topics.\(^3\) According to its website, the foundation also exists to attract tourists: “un punt d’atracció cultural i turística per visitar Món Sant Benet i la Catalunya central” (“Fundació . . .”).

However, the Fundación has also served as a platform for Adrià’s defense of his cuisine in response to criticism from fellow haute cuisine chef Santamaría. In an interview with La Vanguardia reporter Xavier Mas de Xaxàs, Santamaría declared his “divorcio conceptual y ético” from Adrià and other practitioners of “alta cocina de vanguardia,” questioning these chefs’ reliance on “gelificantes y emulsionantes de laboratorio,” which Santamaría describes as being “perjudicial para la salud” (Santamaría qtd. in Mas de Xaxàs web).\(^4\) Santamaría’s criticisms of “el uso de sustancias químicas en la ‘Alta Cocina’ y la proliferación de la ‘cocina-espectáculo’” instigated Adrià’s response that he would publish a full response to the criticism through the Fundación Alicia (Govan web). The newspaper La Vanguardia then reported that Santamaría’s restaurant was boycotted as a consequence of his criticisms of Adrià, while the president of the multinational hospitality group (Relais & Chateaux) that represents Santamaría and Arzak, among others, attempted to contain in Spain the disagreement between the two so that it would not find its way to media in England and France: “esta ‘historia lamentable’ es una ‘guerra mediática’ que no debe tener

---

3 About the Mediterranean cultural patrimony, see Sabores del Mediterráneo: Aportaciones para promover un patrimonio alimentario común (2005), directed by Jesús Contreras, Antoni Riera, Xavier Media, and with a prologue by Ferran Adrià. Barcelona.

4 The ingredient Santamaría takes issue with is methylcellulose.
amplificación en medios ingleses o franceses.” (“Santamaría . . .”). As this example makes clear, the intertwining of Spanish haute cuisine with government initiatives and multinational marketing adds a new dimension to Gregorio Marañón’s preoccupation with arguing for the representation of Spain abroad by emphasizing the “hospitalario” elements of Pradera’s cuisine rather than Castile’s aggressive casticismo (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18).

Gregorio Marañón praised figures like Pradera, who as culinary ambassadors “han hecho [. . .] más por el buen nombre de España que casi todos nuestros ministros de Estado” (Marañón “Breve ensayo” 18). A final consideration regarding twenty-first century Spain is the role that Spain’s contemporary haute cuisine ambassadors, and the industries that have grown to support them, have played in converting Spain into a model destination for culinary tourism. Gwendolyn Blue and her colleagues, Dawn Johnston and Lisa Stowe, in the Faculty of Communication and Culture at the University of Calgary, traveled with a group of food studies students to Spain in the summer of 2007. Their purpose, according to the course website, was to explore a number of sites in the country as a way to examine theories of “food culture” (Blue web). They presented the course with its Spanish case study at the 2008 meeting of the Association for the Study of Food and Society. My question to this group at the conclusion of their presentation was about the information students were given about the history and politics of the places they visited and the restaurants where they dined. Blue and her colleagues responded that this type of history had not been the focus of their study trip.5 If students visited Nicolasa Pradera’s Casa Nicolasa restaurant in San

---

5 This was their response to my question during the question and answer session of the panel. An examination of the course website shows that F. Xavier Medina’s Food Culture in Spain (2005), a volume belonging to the Food Culture Around the World series, was part of their syllabus.
Sebastián (which they did as I discovered in a conversation with Blue) and also became acquainted with the “gastronomic clubs” (or *sociedades gastronómicas*) of the Basque Country (Johnston 2), how could the sociopolitical context that gave rise to both of those eating institutions not be part of their study?  

Blue and her colleagues responded that they did not delve deeply into the history or politics of the food culture sites they visited, not because they were not important, but because they are tangential to their study of food culture. Their purpose was to assess Spain as a site where certain twenty-first-century food culture phenomena could be observed.  

Spain was one of any number of places to do this work, and Spain, by offering “the highest number of Michelin stars per capita in Europe,” had become “one of the hottest foodie destinations in the world” (Johnston 1).  

In my interview with Ferran Adrià, one of the figures responsible for making Spain a “foodie destination,” I asked about the possibility of creating a cuisine like his in a location other than the secluded beach outside of Roses, a beach town 165 kilometers from Barcelona, where his restaurant el Bulli is located. Though I did not realize it at the time, I

---

6 Pradera’s restaurant was frequented by San Sebastián’s powerful elite, whose numbers had expanded as the city became a domestic tourist destination starting in the 1870s. By contrast, the *sociedades gastronómicas* developed in San Sebastián’s taverns and basements as social spaces for members of the working class as the expansion of the elite tourist industry and the renovation of the city center threatened to marginalize them (“Historia . . .”).

7 The food studies phenomena they sought to study include “regionalism, nostalgia, restaurant culture, the politics of food, taboos and rituals, and food and social identity” (Blue web). Johnston, Stowe, and Blue outline the itinerary for the trip: “The itinerary for the upcoming trip includes a detailed study of the Basque regional food experience, including tapas bars and gastronomic clubs. Students will also tour a cheese making facility, an artisan olive oil press and the medieval enclaves of Toledo and Cordoba to see, first-hand, the Moorish influence in Spanish cuisine. Because Spain has the highest number of Michelin stars per capita in Europe, we’ll also be exploring the culture of haute cuisine in Spain, to try and understand what makes the Spanish restaurant scene the darling of the Michelin Group” (Johnston 2).
was asking Adrià to confirm whether or not the “local” represented in the ingredients he chose for his dishes was rooted not just in the geography of the restaurant’s space, but in the history and social context of that space, and in the Catalan nationalist ties to the land. In answer, Adrià remarked that his cuisine, or any contemporary avant-garde cuisine, depends on a series of prerequisites: a particular climate, high-quality products, a good socioeconomic situation, and a historic gastronomy (Adrià interview). The nation, and the struggles that marked attempts to define the Spanish, Catalan, or Basque nations throughout the twentieth century, would seem to have little relevance to Adrià’s list. And it certainly indicates that the “local” is as contingent as the places where one of these projects might come into being. So, what does it mean to talk about the nation and (haute) cuisine in Spain? As this second project moves forward I plan to unravel the complicity of the Spanish state with global capital in creating the “instamatic portrait” of Spain’s postnational haute cuisine, which groups like Blue’s travel to Spain to consume (Vázquez Montalbán 103).
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