COOKING UP MODERNITY: CULINARY REFORMERS AND THE MAKING OF CONSUMER CULTURE, 1876-1916

by

KIYOSHI SHINTANI

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of History
And the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December 2008

University of Oregon Graduate School

Confirmation of Approval and Acceptance of Dissertation prepared by:

Kiyoshi Shintani

Title:

"Cooking Up Modernity: Culinary Reformers and the Making of Consumer Culture, 1876-1916"

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of History by:

Daniel Pope, Chairperson, History
Ellen Herman, Member, History
James Mohr, Member, History
Geraldine Moreno, Outside Member, Anthropology

and Richard Linton, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School for the University of Oregon.

December 13, 2008

Original approval signatures are on file with the Graduate School and the University of Oregon Libraries.

An Abstract of the Dissertation of

Kiyoshi Shintani for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department of History to be taken December 2008

Title: COOKING UP MODERNITY: CULINARY REFORMERS AND THE MAKING OF CONSUMER CULTURE, 1876-1916

Approved: _____
Dr. Daniel Pope

Fannie Farmer of the Boston Cooking School may be the only culinary expert from the Progressive Era who remains a household name today, but many other women took part in efforts to reform American foodways as well. Employing "scientific cookery," cooking based on the sciences of nutrition and physiology, these women paradoxically formed their careers within a prescribed culture of women's domesticity. At a time when the food industry was rapidly growing, culinary authorities engaged in commercial enterprise as intermediaries between producers and consumers by endorsing products, editing magazines and advertising recipe booklets, and giving cooking demonstrations at food expositions.

This study examines the role of cooking experts in shaping the culture of consumption during the forty years beginning in 1876, when the first American cooking school based on scientific principles was founded in New York. Consumer culture here

refers not only to advertising and a set of beliefs and customs regarding shopping at retail stores. Expanding the definition of consumption to include cooking (producing meals entails consuming foods) and eating, this dissertation also explores how cooking experts helped turn middle-class women into consumers of food. Drawing on cooking authorities' prescriptive literature, such as cookbooks, magazine and newspaper articles, and advertising cookbooks, this study takes a bifocal approach, illuminating the dynamic interplay between rising consumerism and foodways.

Culinary experts not only helped develop the mass marketing and consumption of food. They also shaped a consumerist worldview, which exalted mental and physical exuberance, laying the groundwork for consumer culture, especially advertising, to grow. They adopted commercial aesthetics into their recipes and meal arrangements and, claiming that the appearance of foods corresponded to their wholesomeness, culinary authorities suggested eye-appealing dishes for middle-class women to make and consume. The entwinement of culinary and consumer cultures involved cooking teachers' insistence on the domesticity of women, especially their role of providing family meals. This gender expectation, along with consumer culture, characterized twentieth-century America. Culinary reformers helped modernize American society at large at the turn of the twentieth century.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kiyoshi Shintani

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan
University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, History, 2008, University of Oregon
Master of Arts, 2001, Doshisha University
Bachelor of Arts, 1995, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Consumer Culture
Food Studies

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of History, University of Oregon, September 2001 – June 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Fannie Farmer may be the only culinary expert from the Progressive Era who remains a household name today, but many other women took part in efforts to improve American cooking and eating habits as well. Employing "scientific cookery," the newly developing sciences of nutrition and physiology, these women used cooking and diet as a tool to reform American society. In parallel with an emerging mass-marketing economy, cooking experts not only constituted a corporate marketing team to promote food products but also developed a consumerist outlook and adopted many elements of consumer culture into their recipes. This entwinement of culinary culture and consumer capitalism involved cooking teachers' insistence on women's roles as "consumers," that is, purchasers of household goods and as providers of family meals, even if they were wealthy enough to hire servants. These gender role expectations solidified in twentieth-century America. No matter how influential cooking teachers were in disseminating their ideas, culinary reformers helped modernize not only American cooking and eating habits but also American society at large.

In the United States, a major transition regarding cooking and eating occurred at the turn of the twentieth century. Before the 1880s, many Americans assumed that quantity, rather than quality, of food mattered. Respectable, well-off Americans despised food-related tasks and were not entirely comfortable about the animalistic act of eating. Many had not used processed foods nor seen bananas, among other "exotic" foods.

Twenty years later, however, many Americans became familiar with eating according to nutritional criteria, whether they practiced that diet or not; many women assumed kitchen work, partly because servants had become hard to come by and kitchen and utensil innovations made the task easier; Americans were leaving the genteel culture behind and displaying their appetites in public places without much hesitation; processed foods like gelatin had permeated into the lower-middle class, who could now enjoy making and eating decorative desserts, which had once belonged only to the higher classes; and bananas could be found everywhere by the early twentieth century. Thus American cooking and eating habits had become more commercialized, diversified, democratized, and casual—that is more modernized—by the early decades of the twentieth century.

This study examines the role of cooking experts in shaping the culture of consumption for forty years, beginning in 1876 when the first American cooking school based on scientific principles was founded in New York.[1] Consumer culture here refers not only to advertising and a set of beliefs and customs regarding shopping at retail stores. Expanding the definition of consumption into cooking (as producing meals entails consuming foods) and eating, this dissertation also examines how cooking experts helped turn women, especially middle-class women, into consumers of food. Thus, this study rests on the intersection between food studies and consumer culture.

---

[1] The first cooking school of any kind in the United States is believed to be Mrs. Elizabeth Goodfellow's Cooking School in Philadelphia, where the pastry cook and confectioner taught upper-class girls from around 1805 to the 1840. Goodfellow, who never published a cookbook, mentored Eliza Leslie (1787-1858), who popularized many of Goodfellow's recipes in her cookbooks. See Mary Anna Dusablon, *America's Collectible Cookbooks: The History, the Politics, the Recipes* (Athen: Ohio University Press, 1994), 69; William Woys Weaver, *A Quaker Woman's Cookbook: The Domestic Cookery of Elizabeth Ellicott Lea* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), xxxi.

The protagonists of this dissertation are domestic scientists, who were associated with major cooking schools in the Northeast and engaged in commercial enterprises, such as editing magazines and advertising cookbooks and conducting public demonstrations at food expositions. These domestic scientists include Juliet Corson, who founded the New York Cooking School; Maria Parloa, who was one of the first teachers at the Boston Cooking School and contributed to the *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Good Housekeeping*, among others; Mary J. Lincoln, who, after taking lessons from Parloa, became the first principal of the Boston Cooking School and later edited the *New England Kitchen Magazine*;[2] Fannie Farmer, the fourth principal of the Boston Cooking School who wrote for the *Woman's Home Companion* for ten years; Anna Barrows, who attended the Boston Cooking School and later edited the *New England Kitchen Magazine* with Mary J. Lincoln; and Janet McKenzie Hill, a graduate of the Boston Cooking School who edited the *Boston Cooking School Magazine*; and Sarah Tyson Rorer, who founded the Philadelphia Cooking School and edited two culinary magazines, *Table Talk* and *Household News*. Like Parloa, Rorer also contributed to the *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Good Housekeeping*.

In addition to these cooking experts, who were associated with major Northeastern cooking schools, this dissertation also deals with other advocates of scientific cooking. They included Emma P. Ewing, dean of the New York Chautauqua School of Cookery; Ella Eaton Kellogg, wife of Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, who managed

---

[2] The *New England Kitchen Magazine*, which inaugurated in April 1894, changed its name to the *American Kitchen Magazine* in September 1895, to *Home Science Magazine* in April 1903, to *Modern Housekeeping* in August 1905, and to *Everyday Housekeeping* in February 1906. See Blanche M. Stover, *The History of Home Economics*, ed. Hazel T. Craig (New York: Practical Home Economics, 1945), 10.

the domestic science department of the Battle Creek Sanitarium after studying at cooking schools in the Northeast; Marion Harland, a successful writer-turned-household expert, who was heavily enlisted by the food-processing industry for product endorsement; Mary Hinman Abel, a home economist who focused on the economic aspect of cookery; and Ellen Richards, who became the first woman who taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the first president of the American Home Economics Association. Arguably one of the leading home economists, Richards actively addressed food and cooking issues and published works on food and cooking, such as *The Chemistry of Cooking and Cleaning* (1882) and *The Chemistry of Food* (1899). Although Richards and some of the women might not have identified themselves as culinary experts and others might have rarely been involved in commercial activities, they still identified problems with American eating and cooking habits and acted on behalf of the cause of scientific cookery.

Focusing on cooking experts from the Northeast, many of whom became involved in commercial enterprises, this study excludes teachers of domestic science at newly established Midwestern colleges. Land-grant colleges, such as Kansas State Agricultural College (founded in1863), Illinois State College (1867), and Iowa State College (1869), all began offering housekeeping courses in laundry, sewing, and cooking during the 1870s.[3] The women who taught at these Midwestern schools educated women students in domestic science, including cooking and shopping, thus contributing to the development

[3] Stover, 5-6. For the development of domestic science in the Midwest, especially in Illinois, see Nina Collins, "Domestic Sciences at Bradley Polytechnic Institute and the University of Chicago," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (Autumn 2002), http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3945/is_200210/ai_n9117213.

of home economics, while their Northeastern colleagues were more heavily involved with the commercial enterprises of advertising cookbooks and food expositions.

Dealing with a dozen cooking experts, this research inevitably faces problems of generalizing about them. In fact, these cooking teachers turned out to be a diverse group of women in terms of personalities, food and life philosophies, and areas of activities. Some focused on nutrition and economy, while others emphasized taste and appearance of dishes as much as health; some attempted to incorporate tradition into science, yet others did not hesitate to discard old customs if they did not comply with science; some limited their use of media to books and periodical articles, while others employed a variety of commercial media; some focused their work on the poor, but others on the middle class.

So diverse a group notwithstanding, cooking experts shared three critical traits. First, domestic scientists assumed that women were responsible for managing the whole process of preparing family meals. Second, departing from the Calvinist idea of God's preordination, cooking experts joined other American healthcare experts in secularizing the notion of health by directly associating food intake to health. Third, and related to the second, domestic scientists were united under the banner of scientific cookery. Cooking teachers at the turn of the century were not the first to employ this term in the United States. The term had appeared at least by 1851, when "A Housekeeper" published a cookbook entitled *The American Matron: Or Practical and Scientific Cookery*.[4] Yet, the term was not popularized until the later decades of the nineteenth century, when a cohort

[4] A Housekeeper, *The American Matron: Or Practical and Scientific Cookery* (Boston and Cambridge, Mass.: James Munroe and Company, 1851).

of domestic scientists disseminated this term in their schools, cookbooks, magazine articles, and public demonstrations.

Scientific cookery encompassed the whole process of meal preparations and eating practices. In a narrow sense, scientific cookery referred to applying an objective body of knowledge derived from the newly developing sciences of physiology and nutrition into cooking. In the mid-nineteenth century, German scientists separated foods into protein, carbohydrates, fat, minerals, and water and concluded that each nutrient performed specific physiological functions, ideas that Harvey Levenstein calls the "New Nutrition."[5] Unlike food or nutrition reformers, most notably John Harvey Kellogg, cooking experts' expertise and pride lay in incorporating this New Nutrition into the practice of cooking. In a broader sense, scientific cooking encompassed the whole process of preparing meals, ranging from menu planning, choosing foodstuffs at local markets and grocery stores, kitchen design so that people could execute the job efficiently, and accurate methods of measuring ingredients. Cooking teachers also addressed how to use leftovers and how to can foods for future use. Thus the scientific method of cooking covered all areas of culinary and dietary practices.

Scientific cookery fell within the larger domestic science movement, which culminated in the first Lake Placid Conference of 1899, where a dozen domestic scientists, including Anna Barrows, Maria Parloa, and Ellen Richards, decided to employ the term *home economics*. This dissertation uses several different appellations

---

[5] Harvey Levenstein, *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 46.

interchangeably, such as domestic scientists, culinary authorities, experts, and teachers, advocates of scientific cookery, and culinary reformers.

This study sees cooking experts as reformers for two reasons. First, they identified problems with American cooking and eating habits and claimed to know how to fix them. As Burton Bledstein notes in his historical study of American professionalism, this lofty spirit of public good raised an issue of the sincerity of cooking reformers' idealism; it often became confused with an excitement of cultivating their own intellectual capacities and private profits derived from works purportedly for the common good.[6] Even if cooking teachers claimed that they taught, gave lectures, and wrote on the subject of scientific cookery for the benefit of the public, those women were well aware that such works provided them with an outlet for their own intellectual and creative endeavors and brought them financial rewards. Cooking reforms—just as other reform programs for that matter—provided win-win activities that blurred the line between public good and private advantage.

Second, I see advocates of scientific cookery as reformers because, unlike radicals, they aimed to improve American cooking and eating habits without changing political and economic systems. Those women believed that a better society—whatever "better" meant—depended on improving individual behaviors. Just as the Graham diet of antebellum America "instilled discipline and a willingness to forgo gratification in its followers, virtues that led to survival, even success, in industrial and commercial

---

[6] Bledstein, 69.

societies,"[7] cooking experts endorsed and reinforced the status quo. For instance, Emma P. Ewing stressed the importance of diet in her Chautauqua lecture by asserting, "Food is necessary to enable men and women to do the work of the world. And the quality of the work they do depends greatly upon the character of the food they eat."[8] In the same vein, Sarah Tyson Rorer wrote in 1902 that domestic science "has founded a permanent place in the curriculum of our public schools, where it has been most valuable as a means of mental and moral training as well as useful for the individual in home keeping or obtaining a livelihood, all of which tend to and aid in the development of industries. To fit students for living should be the main object of public education."[9] In other words, the goal of domestic science reinforced managerial values of personal efficiency for the sake of corporate success.[10]

Primarily focusing on middle-class women, cooking teachers emphasized the power of the masses in enacting and enforcing legislation for food products. Probably referring to the movement to regulate food that was occurring in such Northeastern states as Massachusetts and New York, Maria Parloa asserted in her 1880 cookbook, "Many people do not realize their responsibilities in regard to pure food laws. In food, as in everything else, the demand controls the supply. If the consumer demands pure food and

---

[7] Walters, 152.

[8] Emma P, Ewing, "Cooking and Culture," *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, July 20, 1898, 2.

[9] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book: A Manual of Housekeeping* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1902), 4-5.

[10] This view confirms Jackson Lears' observation that personal efficiency crisscrossed a private world of personal wellbeing and a public domain of corporate society. See T. J. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: The Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 138.

will not accept any other there will be no market for an adulterated or debased food, and so it will not be supplied. Lack of knowledge of the subject is largely the reason why so many housekeepers are not more actively interested in pure food laws and their enforcement."[11] In the same fashion, a chairperson of the Committee on the Food Supply of the National Household Economic Association proclaimed, "The adulteration of . . . food products can be controlled only by state intervention, together with the hearty co-operation of the consumer. But we must remember that the state will do nothing till there is a demand for pure food; it must be sustained by public opinion."[12] Domestic scientists thus emphasized the support of individual consumers for legislation to eliminate adulterated food.

Culinary reformers bolstered consumer capitalism by reinforcing women's role as consumers and their influence on production. In their studies of the *Ladies' Home Journal* in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, Helen Damon-Moore and Jennifer Scanlon both argue that the magazine assigned women the role to sustain capitalism by shopping.[13] I would argue, in this dissertation, that cooking reformers played the same role as women's magazines, along with advertising agencies, in shaping the perception of women as consumers, which persisted in the twentieth century. Seeing

---

[11] Maria Parloa, *Miss Parloa's New Cook Book and Marketing Guide* (Boston: Dana Estes And Company, 1880), x-xi.

[12] Kate H. Watson, "Report of Committee on Food," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (January 1895): 186.

[13] Helen Damon-Moore, *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the* Ladies' Home Journal *and the* Saturday Evening Post, *1880-1910* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 29; Jennifer Scanlon, *Inarticulate Longings: The* Ladies' Home Journal, *Gender, and the Promises of Consumer Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 230.

the purchase of food as part of cooking, culinary authorities gave advice for buying food, both produce at local markets and packaged mass-produced foods at grocery stores, and for cooking and eating nutritiously and economically to urban, middle-class women.

This research examines culinary reformers' efforts to shape cooking and eating habits of native-born, Anglo-Saxon, middle-class Americans similar in background to themselves. The cooking school movement began with the intention of assisting the poor and training working-class women and girls to become domestic servants, yet, the resistance of the poor to any change in their eating habits and the financial difficulties of cooking schools, among other reasons, prompted the schools to turn to middle-class women as major targets. Eventually, many of the cookbooks and women's magazines (both general and culinary) that the cooking experts edited and the food expositions in which they participated as company attendants and demonstration lecturers all targeted middle-class women. Hence, this research does not examine culinary reformers' interactions with the poor, immigrants, and racial minorities, another topic remaining to be explored.

I define the middle class in economic terms entangled with strong cultural implications.[14] The economic view of the middle class pointed to occupations and concomitant financial wealth. Living in urban areas, most middle classes were wealthy enough to conform to the stereotypical gender roles of "male producers and women consumers;" men engaged mostly in white-collar jobs and earned income large enough to

[14] I rely on John Henry Hepp, IV's definition of middle class in his work on Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth Century. See his *The Middle Class City: Transforming Space and Time in Philadelphia, 1876-1926* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 14-17.

keep their wives out of the job market. The middle class was also wealthy enough to hire up to a few domestic servants, hence reinforcing the perception of domestic labor as a lower-class pursuit.

As this economic view of the middle class suggested, food choice and what Sherrie A. Inness calls "kitchen culture"[15] marked the mixture of economic and cultural definitions of the class. As chapter VIII indicates, by employing occupation as one of the most important variables, cooking reformers reinforced the economic implications of the middle class by prescribing relatively expensive and light foods of vegetables and fruits to mental workers. However, the advocates of scientific cooking also employed gender as a criterion of food choice, assuming that salad and fruits were women's foods. In addition, the middle class could readily turn to decorative and aesthetic dishes as a medium to display their class status, if they were not wealthy enough to show off the possessions of the upper class, such as majestic mansions. Related to food choice, the middle class also referred to those who paid attention to physical health[16] and relied on science as a guide to manage their bodies. This respect for science made the middle class susceptible to expert advice, a phenomenon which created a profitable market for cookbooks.

---

[15] "Kitchen culture" refers to various discourses about cooking and gender roles generated by kitchen work. See Sherrie A. Inness, ed., *Kitchen Culture in America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 3.

[16] Bledstein, 155.

Among various elements of eating and cookery among the middle class, such as cooking equipment, kitchen planning, table manners, and the "servant problem,"[17] this research focuses on nutrition and recipes. Culinary reformers placed paramount importance on health, both physical and mental. Inheriting both the religious and scientific meaning of health from the previous generation of health reformers, cooking experts absorbed the knowledge of physiology and nutrition science which had developed throughout the nineteenth century. With their religious conviction to maintain healthy bodies, coupled with the newly developing knowledge of nutrition, culinary reformers set out to restore and maintain the health of the nation. In this research I mostly focus on nutrition for adults. Topics of nutrition for infants and children are fascinating, but they are beyond the scope of this research.[18] Nor do I examine kitchen and cooking tools designed to lighten kitchen work, one sign of modernity. This research does not explore the relationship between food and body either, although the body became a new object of the American consciousness, as the notion of fashion became popular at the turn of the twentieth century.

Examining how cooking experts attempted to shape middle-class cooking and eating habits in the context of an emergent consumer culture, this study recognizes the

---

[17] The servant problem referred to the shortage of servants of Northern European immigrants in the middle-class home in the later nineteenth century. Native-born white Americans were not enthusiastic about working as servants, while many immigrant women found jobs in factories. See Levenstein, Chapter 5.

[18] For the discussion of infant food and feeding practices in the United States, See Amy Bentley, "Inventing Baby Food: Gerber and the Discourse of Infancy in the United States," in Warren Belasco and Phillip Scranton, eds., *Food Nations: Selling Tastes in Consumer Societies* (New York: Routledge, 2002), Chapter 6. Another version of that essay appears in "Feeding Baby, Teaching Mother: Gerber and the Evolution of Infant Food and Feeding Practices in the United States," in Arlene Voski Avakian and Barbara Haber, eds., *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), 62-88.

inherent qualities unique to food, which set it apart from other commodities. In discussing the development of consumer society, historians tend to lump all consumer goods together, ranging from expensive durable products like automobiles and refrigerators to the everyday necessities of food and clothes. Yet food raised a concern different in nature than other consumer goods. Consumers could have indulged themselves in what Thorstein Veblen called "conspicuous consumption" to display their wealth in the form of clothes, jewelry, automobiles, and houses. Unlike these consumer goods, which raised moral concerns among leaders of American opinion, educated Americans had understood by the early twentieth century that diet would make a direct impact on health, regardless of socioeconomic standing. In her 1910 article on food, Anna Barrows summarized this new challenge: "The cook of the past had to make the best possible use of the meager nutrients at hand. The cook of the present and future has the harvests of the whole world within reach all the year around. How shall such abundant material be combined to satisfy the palate without overloading the digestive organs?"[19] This question summed up what Barrows and her colleagues tackled at the turn of the twentieth century, when the food manufacturing industry was becoming the biggest business in the United States. As Jackson Lears argues, since the emergence of consumerism, American society has been characterized by the tension between

[19] Anna Barrows, *Principles of Cookery*, vol. 5, *The Library of Home Economics: A Complete Home-Study Course on the New Profession of Home-Making and Art of Right Living: The Practical Application of the Most Recent Advances in the Arts and Sciences to Home and Health* (Chicago: American School of Home Economics, 1911), 39.

abundance and self-control.[20] This strain was particularly acute in the realm of food consumption.

In exploring cooking authorities' work in the culture of abundance, this research draws on the literature of those cooking experts, such as cookbooks, magazine and newspaper articles, and advertising cookbooks. In cookbooks, the preface and introductory sections, which often reveal authors' views on nutrition and even life philosophies, draw special attention. As Sarah Rorer wrote in the preface to *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book* (1902), "Please read carefully each chapter of instructions preceding the recipes, for herein lies the great value of the work."[21] Culinary magazines, such as *Table Talk*, *Household News*, the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, and the *Boston Cooking School Magazine*, are also important sources, edited by cooking experts and featuring many of their articles. These magazines also carried articles from outside sources and contributors who were not necessarily cooking experts, yet they were still noteworthy given that, after a selection process, the editors had decided to include them in their magazines. Culinary experts' articles in major women's magazines, such as the *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Good Housekeeping*, and the *Woman's Home Companion*, also provide a wealth of primary sources to this dissertation. In addition to periodicals, this dissertation utilizes advertising recipe booklets compiled by cooking experts. These brochures not only demonstrated commercial collaborations between the cooking experts and food manufacturers and importers, they also promoted materials (foods) and ideologies

---

[20] Lears, 33.

[21] Rorer, 3.

together, particularly women's responsibility to feed their families. This research uses these primary sources, prescriptive in nature, as cultural artifacts to understand what was on the minds of those who spearheaded scientific cookery. This research, therefore, does not explore the interplay between what culinary reformers taught and how much, if any, the public actually followed their advice.[22]

In addition to culinary reformers' written works published and unpublished, this research draws on sources regarding food expositions, such as pamphlets and newspaper accounts. As the term *food exposition* suggested, these promotional literatures reflected the hybrid nature of the event in two major points: the entwinement of food and commercial cultures on one hand, and the mixture of education and entertainment on the other. By using these fair brochures and newspaper articles, I illuminate culinary reformers' views of the food expositions in the context of the social and cultural dynamics of turn-of-the-century America.

By examining the role of culinary experts in shaping the cultures of cookery and consumer capitalism, this research contributes to three major fields of historical scholarship: home economics, food studies, especially feminist food studies, and consumer culture that focuses on how the professional-managerial class helped American society usher in the age of consumer capitalism. Historians of home economics have looked at the collaboration between home economists and business primarily in the 1920s or later; feminist food studies has focused on gender formation and has not examined

---

[22] In her history of the school lunch program, Susan Levine notes, "Most people regularly eschewed expert advice." Susan Levine, *School Lunch Politics: The Surprising History of America's Favorite Welfare Program* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2008), 22.

cooking experts' roles in shaping consumer culture; and the field of consumer culture has mostly examined advertisers, magazine editors, and merchants as agents of consumer capitalism without considering cooking experts.

To begin with, biographies of the turn-of-the-century cooking teachers are few and far between and are descriptive, rather than analytical. Among cooking authorities, Sarah Rorer has drawn the attention of historians and amateurs. Emma Seifrit Weigley's *Sarah Tyson Rorer* (1977) is a biography, while Pamela Vaccaro's *Beyond the Ice Cream Cone* (2004) reconstructs Rorer's cooking demonstrations at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904.[23] Weigley and Vaccaro both use plenty of primary sources to reconstruct the life of the famed Philadelphia cooking teacher, but they do not analyze Rorer's activities in a historical context.

Two biographies that examine the life of home economists—Kathryn Kish Sklar's *Catharine Beecher* (1973) and Janice Rutherford's *Selling Mrs. Consumer* (2003)—help this research lay out a historical framework in the development of home economics; cooking experts, who were born in the mid-nineteenth century, fell right between Catharine Beecher (1800-1878) and Christine Frederick (1883-1970). Sklar shows how Beecher emphasized the importance of the home precisely because she claimed that each home comprised a microcosm of the nation. Put differently, Beecher connected the private sphere of home with the public sphere of society and nation and argued that the

---

[23] Emma Seifrit Weigley, *Sarah Tyson Rorer: The Nation's Instructress in Dietetics and Cookery* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1977); Pamela Vaccaro, *Beyond the Ice Cream Cone: The Whole Scoop on Food at the 1904 World's Fair* (St. Louis: Enid Press, 2004).

health of the nation depended on that of the home.[24] Cooking teachers at the turn of the century inherited Beecher's view. In *Selling Mrs. Consumer*, Janice Rutherford examines the career of Christine Frederick, illuminating the issues that the home economist confronted, such as the conflict between old and new gender roles.[25] These themes that Rutherford and Sklar put forth apply to cooking experts, who filled the generation between Beecher and Frederick. Although my approach is not biographical, this research aims to bridge a historical gap between these two biographical works.

Historians have explored the relationship between home economists and business, but their periodization is often problematic; much literature explores this relationship in or after the 1920s, when many home economists joined private corporations. Kathleen Ann Smallzeried's *The Everlasting Pleasure* (1957), which explores American cookery from the colonial period to the 1950s, entitles one section covering the 1920s through the 1950s "Cook Meets Business." This timeline suggests that home economists did not get involved in business until the 1920s. In a similar fashion, Sarah Stage and Virginia B. Vincenti's anthology, *Rethinking Home Economics* (1997), includes several articles in the section of home economics and business, all of which address the relationship between the two in the period of the 1920s or later.[26] These articles collectively imply that home economists involvement in business did not begin until the 1920s.

---

[24] Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973), xii, 156-63.

[25] Janice Rutherford, *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick & the Rise of Household Efficiency* (Athens.: University of Georgia Press, 2003), Introduction.

[26] Sarah Stage and Virginia B. Vincenti, ed., *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997), Section V.

Hence this study questions prior research's periodization regarding the emergence of commercial mediators, who acted as go-betweens for consumers and producers. Steven Lubar suggests that this new role emerged in the early twentieth century,[27] perhaps with the rise of the home economics movement, but mediators emerged earlier, at least by the last decades of the nineteenth century, when culinary experts began working for literary journals, advertising cookbooks, and food expositions. In the same fashion, Carol Fisher's *The American Cookbook* (2006), which devotes one chapter to the discussion of advertising cookbooks, notes that the battle among the baking powder companies in advertising recipe booklets was set off in the early twentieth century;[28] but, as this research shows, this battle had already broken out by the 1870s in quick response to the food adulteration scare. In addition, food expositions, which provided space for commercial cooperation between food processors and cooking experts, took place mostly around the 1890s, primarily to address the outcry over food adulteration. The commercial association between business and women cooking experts thus began in the last decades of the nineteenth century, not in the early twentieth century.

Locating the origin of home economists' commercial ventures as late as the 1920s is problematic because this periodization attests to historians' presentations of home economists only as beneficiaries of consumer capitalism, which expanded their business opportunities. However, my research demonstrates that cooking authorities played an

---

[27] Steven Lubar, "Men/Women/Production/Consumption," in *His and Hers: Gender, Consumption, and Technology*, ed. Roger Horowitz and Arwen Mohun (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 28.

[28] Carol Fisher, *The American Cookbook: A History* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2006), 130-32.

active role in developing a culture of consumer capitalism through advancing the cause of scientific cookery.

In the scholarship of American food history, three historians stand out in paving the way for the development of the field since the 1980s. Susan Williams, a historian of the nineteenth century, traces changing trends in food consumption, first, during the latter half of the century in *Savory Suppers and Fashionable Feasts* (1985), and, later, from the 1820s to 1890 in *Food in the United States, 1820s-1890* (2006). Together, Williams's works provide this dissertation with a historical background of the middle-class dining experience. In both books she emphasizes that old customs survived a range of new foods and eating habits throughout the nineteenth century, an observation echoed in this dissertation.

Starting off where Susan Williams leaves off, Harvey Levenstein surveys American foodways from 1880 to the 1980s; he explores the evolution of American food consumption from 1880 to 1930 in *Revolution at the Table* (1988) and from 1930 to the early 1990s in *Paradox of Plenty* (1992). In these works of social history, Levenstein illuminates how various players—governmental officials, food processors, nutrition reformers, among others—struggled to shape American eating habits. In evaluating domestic scientists in *Revolution at the Table*, the author takes what Kristin Hoganson calls "the Americanization of the world" approach, focusing on the forces assimilating immigrants into American society.[29] Levenstein spends one whole chapter discussing the

[29] Kristin L. Hoganson, *Consumers' Imperium: The Global Production of American Domesticity, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 2-5.

New England Kitchen and criticizes its managers, including Mary Hinman Abel and Ellen Richards, for betraying ethnocentrism and blaming workers' plights on their immorality, rather than on their difficult economic circumstances.[30] This point is well taken, but my study emphasizes that many advocates of scientific cookery also embraced food cosmopolitanism, actively incorporating foreign foodstuffs into their recipes.

Unlike Levenstein and Williams, who trace changing (and unchanging) foodways within a certain period of time, Warren Belasco focuses on specific topics. In *Appetite for Change* (1989), the historian delves into power relations between the mainstream food industry and the natural food movement and how the former co-opted the latter in the 1970s and 1980s. Belasco then published *Meals to Come* in 2006, a synthesis of food and future studies, which traces the discourse regarding the prediction of food production and consumption for the last two centuries. By examining the intersection between culinary and consumer cultures, my study builds on Belasco's bifocal approach involving the history of food.

Led by these three historians of food, food scholars have expanded the scope of scrutiny to the intersection between food and race, class, identities, and nation building since the 1990s. In contrast to Levenstein, Donna Gabaccia employs the domestication of foreign foods framework in *We Are What We Eat* (1998). Exploring the relationship between ethnic foods and American identity, Gabaccia shows American willingness to integrate once "exotic" foods into an everyday American diet.[31] The year 2002 bore

---

[30] Levenstein, 102-3.

[31] Donna R. Gabbacia, *We Are What We Eat: Ethnic Foods and the Making of Americans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

witness to the publication of two anthologies, which both demonstrate how diversified food studies has become in term of scope and depth. One was *Food in the USA*, compiled by Carole M. Counihan, and the other was *Food Nations*, edited by Warren Belasco and Philip Scranton. Although they deal with different time spans (colonial to present for the former; the late 19th century to the present for the latter) and different geographical locations (the former, the United States; the latter, the American continent and Europe), they both explore the issues of state, identity, race, ethnicity, gender, class, and globalization regarding food.[32]

Perhaps more than any other field, the scholarship that focuses on the relationship between food and women has contributed to a recent surge in food studies. According to *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies* (2005), Laura Shapiro's *Perfection Salad* (1986) pioneers the culinary history of women.[33] Examining the career of cooking experts of the turn of the twentieth century, the protagonists of this dissertation, Shapiro depicts, among others, the inclination of Fannie Farmer toward culinary aesthetics as her personal idiosyncrasy.[34] Yet, evaluating her works in the context of consumer culture, this dissertation would argue that the famous cookbook author reflected and embraced a new culture of consumption probably more than any of her colleagues. This dissertation benefits greatly from Shapiro's work in the context of women's history, but also

---

[32] Warren Belasco and Philip Scranton, ed., *Food Nations: Selling Taste in Consumer Societies* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Carole M. Counihan, ed., *Food in the USA: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2002);

[33] Arlene Voski Avakian and Barbara Haber, ed., *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), 6.

[34] Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1986), Chapter 5.

demonstrates that exploring the same topic in a different social and cultural background generates a new interpretation.

Following in the footsteps of Shapiro, several scholars have explored the history of food and cooking by using gender as an analytical tool. In *Eating for Victory* (1998), Amy Bentley examines the relationship between food and women's roles in the domestic war-time effort of World War II.[35] Mary Drake McFeely examines women's responsibilities to cook for their families in twentieth-century America in *Can She Bake a Cherry Pie?* (2001). Also focusing on American society in the twentieth century, Jessamyn Neuhaus's *Manly Meals and Mom's Home Cooking* (2003) explores how cookbooks projected gendered images. These studies collectively reveal how food and cooking have shaped gender roles and expectations in American society in the twentieth century, expectations to which cooking authorities greatly contributed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Historians, including Neuhaus, have seen cookbooks not merely as lists of recipes but as windows to examine American society and culture. Mary Anna Dusaboln's *America's Collectible Cookbooks* (1994) traces the history of American cookbooks from the late eighteenth century to the 1980s and examines notable authors and their cookbooks in a historical context. *Recipes for Reading* (1997), an anthology compiled by Anne L. Bower, focuses on community and charitable cookbooks and shows how these

---

[35] Amy Bentley, *Eating for Victory: Food Rationing and the Politics of Domesticity* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998).

books tell stories, whether they are personal or historical.[36] In *Eat My Words* (2002), Janet Theophano illuminates how women used cookbooks to express their political and social concerns, such as women's rights and anti slavery.[37] Carol Fisher also explores the history of American cookbooks, illuminating how the works were entangled with social and political events of the time in *The American Cookbook* (2006). In line with Sklar's description of Catharine Beecher, who linked private and public spheres, historians have demonstrated that women have used cookbooks as a tool to connect with a wider society.

Probably the most prolific scholar in the field of recent feminist food studies is Sherrie Inness. In her three works published in 2001, she focuses on how food and cooking shaped gender roles in twentieth-century America. Her *Dinner Roles* explores how the popular media, such as cookbooks, women's magazines, and advertising, reinforced the cultural expectations of women, including the view of cooking as a woman's job, during the first half of the twentieth century.[38] Inness also has edited two anthologies, *Cooking Lessons*[39] and *Kitchen Culture in America*, with the former focusing on individual foodstuffs, such as bananas and Jell-O, and the latter exploring "kitchen culture." Inness's works, together with other works in feminist food studies, give this research much insight into the relationship between cooking and femininity.

---

[36] Anne L. Bower, ed., *Recipes for Reading: Community Cookbooks, Stories, Histories* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1997).

[37] Janet Theophano, Eat *My Words: Reading Women's Lives through the Cookbooks They Wrote* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 10.

[38] Sherrie A. Inness, *Dinner Roles: American Women and Culinary Culture* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001), 4.

[39] Sherrie A. Inness, ed., *Cooking Lessons: The Politics of Gender and Food* (Lanham, Md: Rowman & Little Publishers, 2001).

In discussing the formation of foodways, feminist food scholars often imply a gender dichotomy, setting male corporate capitalism against women consumers. In *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies* (2005), essays in the "The Marketplace" section collectively argue, "In the late nineteenth- and twentieth-century United States what came to be accepted as proper meals, even what mothers fed their babies, was constructed by large corporations."[40] Partly because she does not pay much attention to home economics, Katherine J. Parkin's *Food is Love* (2006), which shows how food advertising consistently targeted women throughout the twentieth century, shapes her discussion around the dichotomized framework of male-dominated advertising and women consumers. This framework suggests the control by male institutions over women consumers, which might be true to some extent. Yet, rather than pitting male institutions against women, my dissertation emphasizes that, often in cooperation with male-dominated food manufacturers, importers, and advertisers, women domestic scientists attempted to shape American cooking and eating habits through preaching promoting women's domesticity.

Since culinary reformers were native-born, white, Protestant middle-class women, I draw on the scholarship that examines the role of the professional-managerial class in shaping consumer culture at the turn of the twentieth century. Jackson Lears's concept of a "therapeutic ethos," which he formulates in *The Culture of Consumption* (1983), provides me with a useful theoretical framework to explore the role of cooking experts in navigating American society toward consumer orientation. This study explores the

[40] Avakian and Haber, 27.

careers of the advocates of scientific cookery in their role in creating consumer culture, a topic that historians have not examined.

In addition to consumer culture, that is, outlook and beliefs surrounding consumption, historians have shed light on the mediators who contributed to creating a culture of consumption. In *Land of Desire* (1993), which examines how the culture of consumer capitalism rose at the turn of the twentieth century, William Leach conceptualizes mediators as "brokers,"[41] while Steven Lubar called those who worked between production and consumption, such as advertising agents, product designers and home economists, mediators.[42] Lubar suggests that work remains to be done that examines the gray zone where men's and women's spheres intersected, and one way to explore this mixed zone is to study the mediators between production and consumption.[43] To put Lubar's suggestion into practice, this research will examine the culinary authorities who worked in the borderlands of these separate spheres. As the editors of *His and Hers* (1998) writes, "These 'translators' were individuals or institutions who facilitated communication between consumers and producers. . . . Without these translators firms could not and did not make products that consumers would not buy."[44] Cooking reformers represented these translators or "brokers," in Leach's words.

---

[41] William Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 10-11.

[42] Lubar, 29.

[43] Ibid., 20, 28-31.

[44] Horowitz and Mohun, 3.

In addition to "brokers," Leach's discussion of commercial contrivances, such as light and color, which were designed to rouse desire, helps me identify similar developments between culinary and consumer cultures; a rising interest in commercial aesthetics paralleled the rising popularity of culinary aesthetics symbolized by decorative foods and themed meals. Hence, increasing employment of color in advertisements in the 1890s coincided with the growing popularity of the color-themed dinner at the cooking schools. The employment of aesthetic devices was not a monopoly of the commercial enterprises of advertising and department stores.

On the topic of aesthetics, I draw on Richard Bushman's *The Refinement of America* (1992)[45] to understand the cultural climate of the nineteenth century. Tracing the development of the polite culture up to the mid-nineteenth century, Bushman shows how the Protestant ethic of work and thrift conflicted with the genteel culture of consumption, leisure, and art. This tension directly affected middle-class women's views of food and kitchen cultures, which culinary reformers tackled. This dissertation also confirms Bushman's emphasis on the simultaneous development of genteel culture and capitalism, the former generating demand and the latter providing supply.

In discussing how culinary reformers helped promote food imports, I draw on Robert Rydell's *All the World's a Fair* (1984) and Kristin Hoganson's *Consumers' Imperium* (2007). Rydell's argument that the world's fairs at the turn of the century

[45] Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993).

showcased the twin development of American abundance and imperialism[46] prompts me to view culinary reformers in this light, given that food fairs were miniature versions of world's expositions. The time frame of this dissertation, from 1876 to 1916, exactly corresponds with *All the World's a Fair*, beginning with the Centennial Exposition of 1876 and ending with the Panama-California Exposition of 1916, which is not a mere coincidence; this match reveals how American imperialism and consumer capitalism, both of which world's expositions promoted, and scientific cookery developed in tandem during these forty years. After all, among the many material benefits of American imperialism were tropical produce, such as bananas and sugar, and culinary experts were among those intermingling mass consumption of these goods with imperialism. On the other hand, Hoganson discusses the globalization of American domesticity at the turn of the twentieth century in *Consumers' Imperium*. The author suggests that, by devising recipes of foreign dishes and writing magazine articles on exotic foodstuffs, cooking experts greatly helped shape what Hoganson calls the "consumers' imperium," the role of imports in shaping American domesticity and consumerist outlooks that emphasized pleasure and novelty.[47] Works of Hoganson and Rydell both help me evaluate how culinary reformers contributed to developing consumer culture in the context of American imperialism at the turn of the twentieth century.

Encompassing several meanings of consumer culture, this research organizes chapters in thematic order. Chapters II and III serve as an introduction to the later parts of

---

[46] Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 35-6.

[47] Hoganson, 11-12.

the dissertation, placing key figures and terms—culinary reformers and scientific cookery—in a larger social and cultural context. Chapter II provides a brief biographical sketch of cooking reformers and traces how the ideal of women's domesticity ironically led to the professionalization of home management. The chapter illuminates how this professionalization inevitably created a contradiction between the ideal of women's domesticity and the professional careers with their pecuniary benefits of the cooking teachers.

The third chapter discusses how cooking experts participated in the public discourse of progress in order to underscore the importance of their work. Intertwining religious and secular causes—or, pursuing religious causes in secular terms, to be more precise—cooking reformers, like other Americans of the professional-managerial class, legitimized their work by employing the discourse of progress. If science provided cooking experts with an intellectual tool to underscore cooking and eating, these women used the narratives of progress as a medium to apply their work to a larger cultural purpose. However, as progress meant different things to different people, what the American public considered as progress posed a problem to culinary reformers. In the realm of food, cooking experts insisted that eating according to the laws of nature, which science illuminated, would lead Americans along the path to progress, while progress usually meant plenty of food, particularly meat, to the general American public. Whatever progress meant, in the late nineteenth century, the modern rhetoric of progress reinforced the secularization of American society to the point where Americans became predisposed to embrace a consumerist outlook.

With these discussions of key figures and terms, chapters IV, V, and VI examine how cooking experts contributed to shaping a culture of consumer capitalism. Chapter IV explores the mental outlook of the consumer culture. The increasing importance placed upon physical health advanced a therapeutic ideal, the quest for a secularized notion of health. This pursuit of mental and physical health laid the mental groundwork from which the modern consumer culture developed. Hence, this chapter focuses on Fannie Farmer, who displayed a consumer mindset—with the emphasis on the joy of cooking and eating, as opposed to nutrition and health—most explicitly among culinary reformers. Farmer is remembered for her exact measuring method and concise writing style, but her affinity with modernity was hardly limited to technical aspects; she also led American society in modernizing American attitudes toward food and eating, which increasingly emphasized appearance and taste.

Chapter V shows how commercial and culinary aesthetics, which broke with the Puritan tradition and marked the advent of consumer culture, developed simultaneously at the turn of the century, especially during the 1890s. Some culinary reformers' consumerist worldview was reflected in their emphasis on the aesthetic values in cooking and diet, in line with the commercial enterprises of advertising and department stores, which employed the aesthetic devices of color and photography. Cooking reformers quickly adopted these eye-pleasing devices into their dishes. The parallel between culinary and commercial aesthetics was reflected not only in advertising cookbooks but in food expositions as well. At the fairs, food processing companies used color and light to decorate their booths and domestic scientists held theme meals, most of which were

designed to appeal aesthetically to the audience. However, by the mid 1890s, this emphasis on the visual sense had spawned tensions between high genteel culture and the low culture of mass amusement. Notwithstanding the cooking experts' emphasis on the educational and aesthetic influences of the food expositions on the audience, news reporters increasingly depicted the fairs as entertaining rather than edifying.

Chapter VI traces the role of culinary reformers as intermediaries between food production and consumption. Originally enlisted by business in the wake of the pure food movement, cooking reformers soon joined forces with food manufacturers and importers to develop marketing campaigns. This growth of food marketing resulted from economic and political developments of the time, particularly the growth of industrialization, the improvement in transportation technology, and the expansion of American imperialism, all of which combined to bring food abundance to American society. By participating in these economic and political joint ventures, cooking reformers helped modernize, that is, commercialize, diversify and democratize, the American table.

The seventh and eighth chapters expand the concept of consumer culture into the realms of cooking and eating. Defining consuming as purchasing foods and using them in cooking, chapter VII explores why and how cooking reformers insisted that women manage the whole process of preparing meals, from purchasing foods to using leftovers. To achieve this goal, cooking reformers had to address the tensions between two cultural streams of the nineteenth century: the Protestant ethic of work and thrift, and the genteel culture of leisure, art, and consumption. Perhaps more than promoting cooking as a scientific and intellectual endeavor, cooking reformers probably knew that eye-appealing

dainty dishes would appeal to the middle-class consciousness. Creating aesthetic foods, the epitome of "conspicuous consumption," nicely blended the two opposing cultures and encouraged many women to go into the kitchen and grapple with decorating dishes.

Chapter VIII addresses middle-class women's appetite by defining consumption as eating foods. Although genteel Americans had considered eating as vulgar and animalistic, cooking reformers called for them to accept appetite as a natural physiological mechanism and to develop healthy eating habits. Here, contrary to the image of scientific cookery with its emphasis on system, management, and control, cooking reformers used what they claimed as science to liberate appetite from the culture of gentility, which viewed hunger for food in a negative light. In addition, eye-appealing dainty dishes, which were designed for genteel women to eat as well as to make, served as the intersection between scientific cookery, consumer culture, and women's appetite. This chapter shows how culinary reformers contributed to developing one element of modernity: women displaying appetite in public without scruples.

Summing up these seven chapters, I argue that cooking experts played a great role in modernizing American society at the turn of the twentieth century. Historians have given due credit to culinary reformers for modernizing cooking and eating habits,[48] but these cooking authorities contributed to shaping a consumer orientation of American society as well in four primary ways. First, by collaborating with businesses, cooking experts helped develop mass marketing and consumption. Second, culinary teachers, especially Fannie Farmer, actively incorporated art into cooking and appreciated the

[48] See Harvey Levenstein, "The New England Kitchen and the Origins of Modern American Eating Habits," *American Quarterly* 32 (Autumn 1980); Levine, 10-11, 22.

appearance, flavor, and taste of dishes, as opposed to nutritive values. Third, and related to the second, culinary reformers helped liberate women's appetite from the constraints of the genteel culture. Fourth and finally, domestic scientists promoted women's responsibility to shop for and feed their families, an ideology that persisted throughout the twentieth century. In short, advocates of scientific cookery affected large dimensions of consumer culture. A legacy of cooking experts' efforts to modernize American cooking and eating habits by preaching the gospel of nutrition went far beyond the realm of cooking and diet.

Thus the title of this dissertation, "Cooking Up Modernity," suggests a parallel between cookery and the larger society. Just as many recipes demand that cooks orchestrate a variety of ingredients of foodstuffs and seasonings, all of which chemically interact with each other by boiling, baking, or roasting, into one harmonious artifact called a dish, cooking experts had to juggle a welter of cultural and social forces in middle-class America in order to promote scientific cookery and women's role of managing family meals. In parallel with many dishes that were the products of complex chemical reactions and skillful arts, transforming society from one based primarily on the Protestant culture to one of modernity resulted from intricate social and cultural interactions, even if culinary reformers did not intend to modernize American society.

Examining the career of cooking reformers provides a window into the social and cultural landscapes of Progressive America. To trace the history of culinary experts in modernizing American society begins with the middle decades of the nineteenth century when they were born and some careers began to be professionalized.

CHAPTER II

CULINARY REFORMERS IN THE FEMININE CULTURE OF PROFESSIONALISM

In a memorial to his wife, Ella Eaton, who died in 1920, John Harvey Kellogg wrote that her university degree and her teaching and writing skills had proved to be a great help in his endeavors in health reform. At the Battle Creek Sanitarium, Ella managed the sanitarium's magazine, *Good Health*, as well as assisted the course instruction in the "School of Hygiene,"[1] where her teaching experience after college surely helped. Ella possessed the basic academic skills to understand scientific knowledge, the writing skills to spread that knowledge through mass-circulating literature, and the teaching experience to conduct classes. Many of Ella Eaton Kellogg's colleagues in scientific cookery shared these backgrounds, and they collectively accelerated the professionalization of the field in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

This chapter briefly provides a biographical sketch of cooking reformers and lays out the social and cultural contexts from which advocates of scientific cookery emerged. Why did some women take up cooking as their careers? What resources did they use to forward their reform agendas? How did they deal with the cultural conflict between their public work and the feminine ideal of domesticity? Exploring these questions will shed light on how some middle-class women utilized the resources available to them within

[1] John Harvey Kellogg, *In Memoriam, Ella Eaton Kellogg* (Battle Creek, Mich., 1920).

the developing culture of professionalism. If the professional-managerial classes of the Gilded and Progressive ages were engaged in "the search for order"[2]—to borrow the phrase of historian Robert Wiebe—amid massive social and cultural changes, scientific cookery became the social tool to bring about that order for some women.

Many advocates of scientific cookery were born into the old stock Protestant bourgeoisie, to prominent families in the Northeast. Marion Harland's father was a prosperous businessman in Virginia. Mary Hinman Abel's father was a physician and she attended college, a rare achievement for women during the nineteenth century. Janet McKenzie Hill was a direct descendant of the Harrison family, who produced the ninth and twenty-third presidents of the United States. Anna Barrow was of Revolutionary War lineage and belonged to the Daughters of the American Revolution. Juliet Corson's father was a produce wholesaler; Mary J. Lincoln's father was a pastor; Sarah Tyson Rorer's father, a pharmacist, and Fannie Farmer's, a printer. Many culinary reformers were, regardless of financial standing, of respectable, native-born background, part of the dominant bourgeoisie.[3]

---

[2] Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967).

[3] For biographical information on Anna Barrows, see Myra Belle Horne Lord, *History of the New England Woman's Press Association, 1885-1931* (Newton, Mass.: Graphic Press, 1932), 213-14; Maine Women Writers Collection, "Anna Barrows Collection, 1861-1948," Maine Women Writers Collection, http://www.une.edu/mwwc/research/barrowsa.asp. For Juliet Corson, see Hannah Hawthorne, "Juliet Corson," *Table Talk* 2 (March 1887): 81-83; The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Corson, Juliet," The Historical American Cookbook Project, http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_corson.html; J. E. White, *The "Home Queen" Cook Book* (Chicago: M. A. Donohue & Company, 1901), iii-vi; Edward T. James, ed., *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), 387-88. For Fannie Farmer, see The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Farmer, Fannie Merritt," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_farmer.html; Alan Davidson, *The Oxford Companion to Food* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 289; James, 597-98. For Marion Harland, see The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Marion Harland (pen name), Mary Virginia Terhune,"

These personal backgrounds were historically significant because these women grew up in the middle of what historian Burton Bledstein calls "the culture of professionalism."[4] This culture referred to the social arrangement and outlook that characterized the expanding American middle class. Professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, gained personal profits and prestige through their work of maintaining or restoring the welfare of the community. This new middle class claimed that they learned and acquired science, the purportedly objective body of knowledge that illuminated the natural order of the universe. They derived their sense of authority from science, which was ideally available to anybody who was willing to strive for it. American society had witnessed the expansion of this middle-class professionalism since the mid-nineteenth century.

The professionalization of American society affected women as well as men. Paradoxically and ironically, the doctrine of what historians call the "cult of true

---

http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_harland.html; Sarah Knowles Bolton, *Successful Women . . .* (Boston: D. Lothrop Co., 1888), microfiche, 90-109; James, vol. 3, 439-41; Julian Shallcross, "Marion Harland," *Table Talk* 2 (February 1887): 19-20. For Janet McKenzie Hill, The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Hill, Janet McKenzie," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_hill.html; Lord, 214-15. For Mary J. Lincoln, see Davidson, 446; The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Lincoln, Mary Johnson Bailey," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_lincoln.html; James, vol. 2, 406-7; Mary J. Lincoln, "How I Was Led to Teach Cookery," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (May 1894), 67-69; Lord, 212-13. For Sarah Tyson Rorer, see Gertrude Bosler Biddle and Sarah Dickinson Lowrie, ed., *Notable Women of Pennsylvania* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942), 242-43; Davidson, 671; Mary Wager-Fisher, "Mrs. Sarah Tyson Rorer," *Table Talk* 2 (February 1887): 50-52; The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Rorer, Sarah Tyson," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_rorer.html; James, vol. 3, 193-95; *Book News: A Monthly Survey of General Literature* 12, 279-80; "Who's Who in Home Economics, Sarah Tyson Rorer," *Practical Home Economics* 7 (January 1934): 13; Emma Seifrit Weigley, *Sarah Tyson Rorer: The Nation's Instructress in Dietetics and Cookery* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1977).

[4] Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: N.W. Norton, 1976).

womanhood"—a cultural outlook that celebrated women's domestic roles—paved the way for women's professionalism in the field of domestic science, which blossomed in the later decades of the nineteenth century. As Bledstein points out, women themselves reinforced their responsibility for the home precisely because they recognized that domestic ideology set limits on their sphere of activity. Because women recognized their spatial restraint, they expanded their potential for professional fulfillment within that space.[5] To be professional meant—and still means—one must circumscribe one's specialty. Some middle-class women took up traditionally middle-class female occupations, such as teaching, writing for magazines, and home management, including cookery. By the time some women had become involved in scientific cookery in the late nineteenth century, American society had laid out a fertile cultural ground where women were able to promote cookery as a profession.

As part of the larger domestic science movement, scientific cookery provided women with a means to claim their space in the culture of professionalism. Cooking reformers represented the blend of moral authority to address the welfare of the society and science to achieve the goal. Their claim that unscientific cooking and eating would lead to sickness (if not death) might have drawn fear from "amateurs." As Bledstein points out, the authority of "professionals" was premised on the existence of "amateurs," from whom professionals commanded respect and awe.[6] Cooking teachers' dismissal of

---

[5]Ibid., 54-55.

[6] Ibid., 90.

many women as "ignorant" revealed their arrogance derived from their sense of superiority over "amateurs."

Reflecting this development of professionalism, many culinary reformers received a high level of education, which provided the academic foundation that enabled them to study scientific cookery in the future. Some culinary reformers grew up in families that emphasized education for women as well as for men. Perhaps the value of women's education derived from women's roles as educators of their children at home. Some cooking experts received education that prepared them for college, even if they did not eventually attend college. The father of Marion Harland instructed a tutor to educate his daughters "as if they were boys preparing for college."[7] Juliet Corson moved from Massachusetts to New York City in her teens and for the next fifteen years, under the guidance of her mother, aunts, and uncle, studied Latin and Greek history and classical poetry.[8] Sarah Tyson Rorer attended the all-girls East Aurora Academy near Buffalo, New York, and studied, among other subjects, English, science, and the classics.[9] Having a pharmacist father, however, led her to entertain an ambition to follow in her father's footsteps, which later lured her to the Woman's Medical College in Philadelphia. Born to a mother who had taught English for several years at a women's seminary in New Jersey before her marriage, Anna Barrows attended a local academy in Maine before going to the Boston Cooking School. These educational backgrounds established the basic

---

[7] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Marion Harland (pen name), Mary Virginia Terhune."

[8] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Corson, Juliet."; White, iii.

[9] Letter from Amy A. Forden, Aurora (NY) Historical Society to Emma Seifrit Weigley, October 22, 1965; quoted in Weigley, 13.

academic foundations that helped these women tackle scientific cookery in their later years.

Some reformers received a college education, a privilege in the late nineteenth century. Mary J. Lincoln graduated from the Wheaton Seminary (Wheaton College today) in Norton, Massachusetts. Mary Hinman Abel (Elmira College in New York) and Ella Eaton Kellogg (Alfred University, New York) obtained college degrees. After graduating from Vassar College, Ellen Richards became the first woman to attend and graduate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as well as the first to teach there. Receiving a higher education was a rare achievement for women in the latter half of the nineteenth century, when only 1.9 percent of women between the ages of 18 and 21 went to college.[10] Culinary reformers as a group boasted of a much higher percentage of college graduates.

Many future cooking teachers attended normal schools, which trained students to become teachers, and gained teaching experience. Maria Parloa attended a Maine normal school and later taught several winters in Florida.[11] After finishing normal school, Janet McKenzie Hill became an assistant teacher at a Massachusetts school.[12] Mary J. Lincoln graduated from Wheaton Female Seminary in 1864 and taught school for one term in

---

[10] Damon-Moore, Helen, *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the* Ladies' Home Journal *and the* Saturday Evening Post, *1880-1910* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 41.

[11] For biographical information on Maria Parloa, see The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Miss Parloa," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_parloa.html; James, vol. 3, 16-18; "Miss Maria Parloa." *Journal of Home Economics* 1 (October 1909): 378-85.

[12] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Hill, Janet McKenzie."

Vermont.[13] And, after finishing college, Mary Himan Abel and Ella Eaton Kellogg went into teaching.[14] Their teaching experiences served the women well when they turned to the teaching of cookery.

In addition to teaching, some women "discovered" the importance of cooking during their stint as writers, considered as an appropriate occupation for women. The expansion of the middle class throughout the nineteenth century increased the number of women who read, which in turn accelerated the gender separation of reading materials. Reflecting the expanding market of literature for women, some women embarked on the writing career. Marion Harland began writing fiction at the age of sixteen and published her first novel in the 1850s, which launched her successful career as a writer.[15] Helped by her educational background in classics, Juliet Corson worked in journalism, writing for the *New York Leader*, the *Sunday Times*, the *Saturday Courtier*, and the *National Quarterly Review* before launching a cooking school in 1876.[16] Possessing excellent writing skills, Ella Eaton Kellogg was invited by her future husband, John, to assist him with his magazine, the *Health Reformer*, which changed its title to *Good Health* in 1879.[17] After attending private school, Anna Barrows became a writer and wrote a section entitled "The Home Makers' Column" in a weekly county paper in Maine. These

---

[13] The Historical American Cookbook Project, f"Lincoln, Mary Johnson Bailey."

[14] Ibid.

[15] Damon-Moore, 23.

[16] "Death of Juliet Corson," *New York Times*, June 20, 1897, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9F0DE7D81230E333A25753C2A9609C94669ED7CF.

[17] Elizabeth Neumeyer, *"Mother" Ella Eaton Kellogg* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Heritage Battle Creek, 2001), 8.

women honed their writing skills through their journalism professions, which surely helped them write cookbooks and magazine articles later in their careers in cookery.

These writing skills, combined with their educational backgrounds, cookery-related knowledge and skills, and gender propriety, enabled three women to launch a monthly culinary periodical, the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, in 1894, "the first professional magazine in home economics."[18] The magazine marked the joint venture of Anna Barrows, Mary J. Lincoln, and Estelle M. H. Merrill, a philanthropist and journalist, who wrote for the *Boston Globe*. Barrows came to know Lincoln when the former wrote a review for the latter's *Boston Cooking Book* (1884). This acquaintance probably led Barrows to attend the Boston Cooking School, from which she graduated two years later. In the meantime, Lincoln and Merrill had both graduated from Wheaton Seminary—Lincoln in 1864, and Merrill during the 1870s—and belonged to the Wheaton Seminary Club, the school's alumnae club, where they probably met.[19] The *New England Kitchen Magazine* was the product of these three women, who combined their culinary knowledge with their editorial skills.[20]

With their writing skills, high levels of education, and teaching experience, some women purportedly used cookery as a vehicle to do public good. Volunteering as secretary to the Woman's Educational and Industrial Society of New York, Juliet Corson

---

[18] Blanche M. Stover, *The History of Home Economics*, ed. Hazel T. Craig (New York: Practical Home Economics, 1945), 4.

[19] For biographical information on Estelle M. H. Merrill, see Julia Ward Howe, Mary Elvira Elliott, Mary Hannah Graves, Mary A. Stimpson, Martha Seavey Hoyt, comps., *Representative Women of New England* (Boston: New England Histological Publishing Company, 1904), 375-76.

[20] Myra Belle Horne Lord, *History of the New England Woman's Press Association, 1885-1931* (Newton, Mass.: Graphic Press, 1932), 214.

took up cooking to help poor women who were hit by the economic downturn of 1873.[21] Hence, Corson taught "the little children from the mission schools and charitable institutions"[22] and Native-American girls at the government Training School for Indian Youth in Pennsylvania in December 1881.[23] Corson also gave free lessons to poor, working women at the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York in 1883.[24] Unlike Corson, who had no high culinary skills when she launched her volunteer works, Maria Parloa capitalized on her experience as a pastry cook in New Hampshire. She gave a lecture on cookery first at a local church in Florida, where she had a teaching position, and then in New London, Connecticut, in 1876 to raise money to donate an organ to the church. These experiences with a charity led her to open her own school in Boston in 1877, travel to Europe to learn cooking in England and France the next year, and then teach at the newly opened Boston Cooking School in 1879.[25] After opening her own cooking school in New York City in 1883, Parloa taught immigrant girls for free in the evenings.[26] The pioneers in scientific cookery, like Parloa and Corson, thus initially used cooking to help the poor and for charitable causes.

---

[21] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Corson, Juliet."

[22] "The New York Cooking School," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 60 (December 1879): 27.

[23] Ibid., 290.

[24] The U. S. Bureau of Education, *Industrial Education in the United States: A Special Report* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883), 288.

[25] Stover, 6; The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Miss Parloa."

[26] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Miss Parloa."

Even if women's sense of moral duty motivated them to work for a social cause, many women claimed that they took up cookery as a career only after unfortunate personal circumstances had forced them to find a venue for earning an income for themselves, contrary to gender propriety. As Emma P. Ewing noted, "It was unwomanly for a woman to be self-supporting and independent."[27] If this view dominated American society in the nineteenth century, those women who chose cooking as their career must have been well aware of their violation of gender expectations. Fannie Farmer, plagued with paralysis in her teens, became a domestic servant in the home of a family friend during the 1880s, when her father encountered difficulty in supporting his family.[28] At the encouragement of the family friend, Farmer attended the Boston Cooking School at the age of 30 to train as a cooking teacher,[29] perhaps knowing that her disabled body made her prospects of marriage slim. (She remained single for her entire life.) According to Mary J. Lincoln, Emma P. Ewing went into the profession only after "Business losses and the failing health of her husband led her to take up writing and lecturing on cookery as a profession."[30] Following the same steps as Ewing, Lincoln worked as a domestic servant after the health of her clerk husband failed in the late 1870s, an experience that eventually led her to the newly established Boston Cooking School.[31] Intentionally or not, women could reassure society of their adherence to femininity by claiming that they took

[27] Emma P. Ewing, "Home-Making," Date unknown (1888 or after), Emma P. Ewing Collection, Iowa State University.

[28] James, vol. 1. 597.

[29] Davidson, 289; The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Farmer, Fannie Merritt."

[30] Mary J. Lincoln, "The Pioneers of Scientific Cookery," *Good Housekeeping* 51 (October 1910): 471.

[31] Lincoln, "How I was Led to Teach Cookery," 69.

up cooking as a career only through personal misfortunes or when their husbands had ceased their roles as breadwinners.

No matter how women came into the professional world of scientific cooking, as Harvey Levenstein and Laura Shapiro note, cooking provided women with the opportunity to expand their field of activities within the prescribed women's sphere.[32] In other words, the gendered structure of occupations—or the culture of professionalism—encouraged women who aspired to study science to turn to the subjects of food, diet, and cooking. Reflecting on her attempt to study pharmacy at a men's college, Sarah Tyson Rorer confessed, "I hadn't any idea how difficult it would be. . . . Women who did things that other women didn't do were ridiculed, and not much respected. I was very sensitive to this attitude, and soon gave up trying to be the first woman pharmacist."[33] Rorer frankly admitted that she was not comfortable breaking gender norms and implied that cooking and food provided her with a "reasonable" career option. Food and other fields related to the home opened science-related career fields to women. Future home economists, including Ellen Richards, found domestic science was the only field open or

---

[32] Harvey Levenstein, *Revolution at the Table* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 75; Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1986), 47.

[33] Dr. Mary Green, the first woman member of the American Medical Association, faced difficulties in a medical school. "In the face of opposition, persecution, and ridicule in the early sixties she (Dr. Mary Green) won her victory in 1868 by graduation with distinction from the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia." See "Another Woman Pioneer," *New York Times*, December, 15, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9801E0DC1E3DE433A25756C1A9649D94649ED7CF; Elise Biesel, "The First Cook in the Land," *Good Housekeeping* 58 (March, 1914), 420-21. When Rorer remarked, "Women are welcomed in professions where they were hooted down when I was a girl" at the Women's World's Fair in 1925, she might well have referred to her broken dream of becoming a pharmacist. See "Cooking 'Pioneer' Lauds Modern Man," *New York Times*, April 22, 1925, http://select.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=F00F15F6385B12738DDDAB0A94DC405B858EF1D3.

considered appropriate to women. A career in cookery and food helped ease any awkwardness women felt about breaking the norms for respectable women. In sum, some women skillfully combined the "cult of true womanhood" with science to claim their space in the culture of professionalism.

The professionalization of scientific cookery culminated in the formation of several professional organizations in the mid 1890s. Cooking instructors formed the New York Association of Teachers of Cookery in February 1894 (which according to the *New England Kitchen Magazine* was comprised of about forty members in the area of New York City)[34] and the Cooking Teachers' League founded in Chautauqua, New York, the following year.[35] These efforts to organize teachers of cooking in the mid 1890s embodied the professionalization of domestic science.

The professionalization of domestic science inevitably contributed to the elitist nature of knowledge. As sociologist Paul Starr explains in the history of American medicine, "The Jacksonians saw science as knowledge that could be widely and easily diffused, while the Progressives were reconciled to its complexity and inaccessibility."[36] Some culinary reformers seemed to be aware of the complexity of scientific cookery, as Emma P. Ewing wrote in 1894, "The food question which so greatly perplexes us to-day did not distract the equanimity of our ancestors a hundred years ago. Having

---

[34] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (January 1895): 201.

[35] The *American Kitchen Magazine* reported on "the conference on domestic economy" held during the summer of 1896 by the Cooking Teachers' League with Emma P. Ewing serving as a chairperson. See "A Week at Chautauqua," *American Kitchen Magazine* 5 (September 1896): 249-57.

[36] Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine: The Rise of a Sovereign Profession and the Making of a Vast Industry* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 140.

comparatively little acquaintance with either science or cookery, they thankfully ate what they could get, and went through life unconscious of the fact that the health and happiness of the average citizen depends largely upon the character of his victuals."[37] Ewing captured the ironic consequence that science brought to people of her age in the question of food: perplexity. Ewing did not suggest what she meant by "the food question," but, given that she implied that the issue derived from modern science and cooking, she might have referred to discrepancies among culinary experts over food values, as reflected in the debate over the desirability of pie (See chapter III). The complexity of science also manifested itself in Farmers' Bulletins, published by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), several editions of which cooking experts compiled. In her study of the reports, Nancy Duran observes, "The early bulletins often explain complex new knowledge in nutrition, clearly expecting housewives to be interested in and to understand this new and complex subject. Considering the low education level of many farmers and farmwives, it is surprising how sophisticated the material often is in the early bulletins."[38] "The culture of professionalism required amateurs to "trust" in the integrity of trained persons, to respect the moral authority of those whose claim to power lay in the sphere of the sacred and the charismatic. Professionals controlled the magic circle of scientific knowledge which only the few, specialized by training and indoctrination, were privileged to enter, but which all in the

---

[37] Emma P. Ewing, "The Missing Link in the Food Question," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (August 1894): 216.

[38] Nancy Duran, "Farmers' Bulletins Advice to Women on Diet, Food, and Cooking," *Journal of Agriculture & Food Information* 6 (2005): 51.

name of nature's universality were obliged to appreciate."[39] Perhaps the USDA simply aimed to exert the air of scientific authority over rural women, well aware that they would have difficulty following the material if ever they tried.

The coexistence of science as the new religion with the old Protestant ethic enabled household scientists to intertwine their secular interest in food with the moral imperatives of self-restraint. After all, eating was an individual function; for many middle-class Americans at the time, what one would eat or not was basically an individual choice. Hence one major objective of scientific cookery was to teach each American (and immigrant) what to eat. As Jackson Lears writes, the core of nineteenth-century morality was "the autonomous individual, whose only moral master was himself."[40] In a society free from external moral authorities, such as a king, lord, or master, self-control became an important tool to preserve the public order. This ascent of self-control as a moral value began with Protestant ministers and was soon joined by the secular professions of physicians and social reformers,[41] which included advocates of scientific cookery.

The promotion of self-restraint buttressed by science was exemplified by scientific cookery. At the time when technological, transportation, and industrial developments increased the production and import of food, a call for the wise selection of foods inevitably involved the tension between taste and pleasure on the one hand, and

---

[39] Bledstein, 90.

[40] T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 12.

[41] Ibid., 12-13.

nutrition and health on the other. Not surprisingly, many cooking reformers called for Americans to choose nutrition and health when faced with a choice. Culinary authorities must have been proud of Talcott Williams, who was then writing for the *Philadelphia Press*, a daily newspaper, and later became the first director of the School of Journalism at Columbia University in 1912. During his commencement speech to the Philadelphia Cooking School in 1896, Williams, who claimed to have visited Sarah Tyson Rorer's house multiple times, asserted, "I can say from long experience at her house that I have never had a piece of pie served. While I look upon pie with an envious eye, I think it best that I should not eat it."[42] To cooking reformers Williams' self-control was exemplary; he admitted his craving for pie but refused to eat by controlling his appetite.

In a similar fashion, cooking demonstrations, which inevitably produced finished dishes, became a site of the tension between abundance and self-control. A Philadelphia newspaper sarcastically captured these competing interests in Sarah Tyson Rorer's cooking demonstrations held during the local food exposition in 1900:

> All those who are interested in moral reform should certainly recommend Mrs. Rorer's lectures, if for no other reason than that it teachers a tremendous lesson in self-restraint. . . . By the time the lecture is over and the results of Mrs. Rorer's handiwork are arranged temptingly on a nearby table appetites are keen and remarks such as "My, don't that look good," "I wish she'd let us taste it," are heard on every side. The first day in fact the temptation proved too strong and the appetizing viands were carried off piecemeal. Next day Mrs. Rorer announced that "The Ladies," the emphasis was strong, "would please not eat the dishes which are for inspection only." So now a colored man keeps silent guard, and hungry humanity may regale only their eyes and nostrils, and pass slowly by on the other side.[43]

---

[42] "Philadelphia Cooking School Commencement Day," *Household News* 4 (June 1896): 248.

[43] "Keep a House a Year and Be Miserable," *Philadelphia Press*, November. 17, 1900, 6.

Apart from the fact that the newspaper took the audience's glaring appetite for granted, which went against the ideal of gentility (See chapter VIII), the article mocked the value of self-control and sarcastically depicted how Rorer and her dishes tantalized the audience. Rorer, on her part, may well have enjoyed imposing self-restraint on her audience before the nose of savory dishes.

Preaching the importance of food, culinary reformers often linked their work to the temperance cause. After all, alcohol was still a substance humans ingested and excessive drinking might well have done harm to a human body. Culinary experts associated intemperance to unhealthy eating habits, as Sarah Tyson Rorer claimed in her 1886 cookbook, "Two-thirds of all the intemperance in the land is due to ill and unscientific feeding,"[44] without indicating the source of her statistics. Given that the largest temperance group was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), cooking reformers may have recognized a bright potential to draw temperance women into the cause of scientific cooking.

More than the WCTU, many culinary reformers joined Chautauqua, an adult education movement started in western New York State initially to educate Sunday-school teachers. Chautauqua and the WCTU were both founded in 1874 and, according to Andrew Rieser, "continued to enjoy close relations for the next four decades."[45] The *New England Kitchen Magazine* reported in the summer of 1894 that the WCTU was to hold

---

[44] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's Philadelphia Cook Book: A Manual of Home Economics.* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1886), 561.

[45] Andrew C. Rieser, *The Chautauqua Moment: Protestants, Progressives, and the Culture of Modern Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 180-81.

its meeting at a Chautauqua assembly in Bay View, Michigan, whose topics included "How Shall We Educate Our Daughters?" and "Home Education."[46] The WCTU and Chautauqua had shared interests, including domestic education, which surely attracted the attention of the cooking experts.

Combining religious piety and educational zeal, both of which traditionally belonged to the women's sphere, Chautauqua attracted a large number of women and advocated values suitable to women cooking teachers. Maria Parloa paved the way for the presence of cooking teachers in Chautauqua in the summer of 1879, followed by Emma P. Ewing, who was invited there in 1882 to establish a summer cooking school. Ewing's connection with Chautauqua continued until 1902, succeeded by other women, including Anna Barrows. In Pennsylvania, Sarah Tyson Rorer gave her cooking lessons at the farmers' annual encampment in Mt. Gretna for the first time in 1889, which developed into the Pennsylvania Chautauqua three years later. Rorer seemed to be one of the prominent figures there and boasted of having one building named "Sarah Tyson Rorer Hall," completed in 1897.[47] In addition, the *New England Kitchen Magazine* reported in the summer of 1894 that Mary J. Lincoln was scheduled to teach at the Long Island Chautauqua Assembly Association, and Cornelia C. Bedford, superintendent of the New York Cooking School, at the Chautauqua Assembly at Bay View, Michigan., while Anna Barrows taught many seasons at the Maine Chautauqua Union as the director of the

[46] "From Bay View, Michigan," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (August 1894): 246.

[47] "Pleasant Days at Chautauqua," *Philadelphia Press*, July 11, 1897, 5.

cooking department.[48] The ambience that welcomed cooking lectures eventually led to the formation of the Cooking Teachers' League in 1895 at Chautauqua, which also hosted the tenth annual Lake Placid Conference on home economics in 1908. Chautauqua thus provided an environment favorable to cooking teachers, who disseminated their messages to mostly middle-class women.

Many cooking instructors participated in Chautauqua and the WCTU, yet paradoxically, at least some of them criticized women's participation in social activities for causing neglect of their domestic duties. Women's clubs mushroomed in post Civil-War America in response to the great social changes of the time, marked by an increase of immigrants and the formation of urban slums. Women's clubs, such as the Woman's Educational and Industrial Society of New York, which led to the founding of the New York Cooking School in 1876, and the Woman's Education Association of Boston, which, following the example of New York, established the Boston Cooking School three years later, shared a belief in the moral superiority of women and therefore justified the expansion of their activities into the realm of social reform. This spirit of social activism invited criticism from some cooking teachers, such as Emma P. Ewing, who, during her speech in Kansas City in 1890, criticized such club women: "When pious women come and tell me they are so actively engaged in benevolent work that they have no time to attend to culinary matters, or look after the food that goes upon their own tables, I say to them as I say to you, that no church work, no temperance work, no good work of any

[48] "The Summer Schools," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July, 1894): 182.

kind, can be done effectively without the aid of good food. . . ."[49] This castigation of women's clubs was echoed by Sarah Tyson Rorer. She once derided women's clubs, averring that women should spend more time in the kitchen, which, as Weigley points out, seemed ironic, given that Rorer's career took off after she took cooking classes sponsored by a Philadelphia women's club.[50] This conflict—women domestic scientists who expanded their activities outside the home telling other women to stay home—marked the most glaring paradox revealed in the feminine culture of professionalism.

Emphasizing women's domesticity, many culinary reformers sarcastically equated the term "new woman" with home managers, thus objecting to the common definition of women who aspired to their liberation from domesticity. Sarah Tyson Rorer scoffed at women who longed for expanding their feminine sphere into public arenas. "I am going to use an expression I dislike . . . 'the new woman,'" so began Rorer during the 1895 food exposition held at the Madison Square Garden. She then asserted, "There is no new woman. Women are always the same, but the women of to-day are going to change places with the men. They are going to do the business, and the men will do the cooking.'"[51] Exaggerating a gender reversal, Rorer ridiculed women who aspired to break with the nineteenth-century ideal of femininity. She would have agreed with Ellen Richards, who concisely articulated her definition of the new woman: "The true new

---

[49] Emma P. Ewing, "Cookery and Christianity," *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, August 8, 1890, 6.

[50] Weigley, 182-83.

[51] "There Is No New Woman," *New York Times*, October 19, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9D01EED8113DE433A2575AC1A9669D94649ED7CF.

woman—the woman *who is mistress of her own household*"[52] (emphasis in original). Attempting to incorporate a systematic approach to home management into with women's domesticity, domestic scientists asserted that, whatever the new woman meant, women should devote their energy to managing home.

In contrast to Richards and Rorer, who insisted that women stay home, Anna Barrows called for women to experience business outside the home, learn the scientific approach to business, and apply that knowledge and skills to housekeeping. The *American Kitchen Magazine*, which Barrows co-edited and managed, editorialized in 1897: "The college women and business women who undertake to conduct a home are not satisfied with methods adapted to the conditions of past generations or with the subterfuges so often adopted by those who are unwilling to admit that housekeeping is a business."[53] Barrows thus suggested that women should receive a higher education and engage in business, which would expose them to the scientific world that they would never encounter if confined to the home. She repeated this sentiment at the National American Woman's Suffrage Association (NAWSA) in 1900. Speaking on "New Professions for Women Centering in the Home," Barrows asserted:

> The main objection made by conservative people to definite occupations or professions for women has been that such callings would inevitably tend to destroy the home. . . . The fear is sometimes expressed that the club movement is drawing women away from home interests; but the general attention now given to household economics by all the women's clubs proves that women are realizing

---

[52] Ellen H. Richards, "The Place of Science in Woman's Education," *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (September 1897): 227.

[53] "Trade Journals," *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (October 1897): 36.

> that knowledge of history, art and science is needed to give the broad culture necessary for the proper conduct of the home life.[54]

Arguing that housekeeping, like business, depended upon systematic methods, Barrows exhorted women to experience the business world so that they could adopt that systematic approach to housekeeping. Barrows also linked business experience to shopping, saying, "The business woman understands human nature, and therefore can deal successfully with the butcher, the baker and other tradespeople."[55] Although she still considered home the center of women's activities, Barrows's open encouragement to women to work for income at a suffrage convention sharply departed from the nineteenth-century definition of femininity.

When household scientists discussed suffrage, they emphasized the priority of domestic work, although they did not flatly object to the right to vote. Anna Barrows might have been the exception, given that her attendance at the NAWSA, coupled with the following observation she made in 1895, indicated her support of suffrage: "Vegetarianism has undoubtedly grown stronger within a generation, and, like total abstinence and woman suffrage, has passed through the stages of contempt and toleration and now commands a certain degree of respect even from its opponents."[56] Barrows at least saw suffrage in the same favorable light as temperance and a plant-based diet. Other

---

[54] Anna Barrows, "New Professions for Women Centering in the Home," NAWSA Convention, Washington, D.C., February 8-14, 1900 in *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper*, ed. Mari Jo and Paul Buhle (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 369.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Anna Barrows, "Fashion in Foods—Vegetarianism," *Congregationalist*, August 22, 1895, 271.

advocates of scientific cookery, if ever they expressed their views of suffrage, put a priority on domestic work. A contributor to the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, which Barrows edited, proclaimed:

> If asked why I do not advocate woman's suffrage, I could paraphrase a fine historical narrative with the answer, "Domestic service, Madam." Until women are ready to face honestly the questions of their daily life, accept the principles on which they must build their reform, and *act* on some of their convictions, they are certainly unequal to governing a nation. When they show ability for organization in their homemaking, as well as their acknowledged qualities of unselfishness, self-sacrifice and tenderness, it will be time enough for them to attempt to legislate for a country[57] (emphasis in original).

The writer suggested that becoming efficient homemakers was a prerequisite to women expanding their interest to politics. In the same fashion, Emma P. Ewing asserted to her Chautauqua audience, "The ballot in the hands of woman would undoubtedly right many wrongs. But would it put better food upon our tables? In my judgment, good bread in every home is as desirable as a ballot in the hands of every woman."[58] Other domestic scientists may well have agreed with this view.

Cherishing women's domesticity over their political rights, many culinary reformers called for women to become "homemakers" who created household environments conducive to transmitting moral values to their family members,[59] as opposed to "housekeepers" who performed domestic duties only on a material and physical basis. A *New England Kitchen Magazine* contributor asserted that a home must

---

[57] Ethel Davis, "Dishonesty and Caste: In Domestic Service," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 113-14.

[58] Emma P. Ewing, "Culinary Rubbish," *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, August 8, 1897, 5.

[59] Susan Williams, *Food in the United States, 1820-1890* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006), 155-56.

be "a haven for . . . men who come back to it from a rasping world. . . ."[60] and defined homemakers as follows:

> The woman who says, "I can't bother about my kitchen; I leave that to my servants," and who spends her time in working for the poor, cultivating her mind, assisting in public work of any kind, or in "society duties" is still less of a home-maker than the housekeeper. . . . To be a home-maker . . . certainly requires her presence in her home and close application to all housekeeping duties, but it means also that all her work must be considered from the point of view of what it will do for the character of her family, not for what it will do for the character of her furniture.[61]

Emphasizing women's physical presence at home and her mortality, the writer evoked, the concluded the article by proclaiming, "The making of a home is just the filling of a house with love."[62] Homemakers embodied the cult of true womanhood.

Many cooking reformers so cherished the private home that many of them opposed a cooperative kitchen, where a community or a group of families would hire agencies to provide meals to them, thus eliminating kitchen work from private homes. First portraying cooperative housekeeping in his utopian novel *Looking Backward* (1888), Edward Bellamy elaborated on the notion in *Good Housekeeping* the next year, which generated a tremendous interest in middle-class America as a prospective solution to the shortage of servants.[63] Domestic scientists were not comfortable with cooperative housekeeping because the idea challenged the premise of scientific cookery that women

---

[60] Ibid., 171.

[61] Ethel Davis, "Dishonesty and Caste: In Housekeeping and Home-Making," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (January 1895): 173.

[62] Ibid., 174.

[63] Levenstein, 65.

were primarily responsible for providing meals for their families. Emma P. Ewing scoffed at the idea:

> Cooperative housekeeping, in my judgment, furnishes no adequate remedy for the evils that overshadow the household. . . . In its most perfect form it is but a miserable make-shift for necessary family isolation; and, when divested of its tinsel drapery, means a terrible dilution of our already intensely attenuated home life. For most women a thorough knowledge of housekeeping is a much more desirable boon than an entire exemption therefrom. A home should be a sacred spot where center all the social and domestic virtues. . . .[64]

The sentimental view of home in discussing cooperative housekeeping was shared by Sarah Tyson Rorer. She questioned the legitimacy of cooperative housekeeping, writing in a 1914 issue of *Good Housekeeping*:

> It is quite evident that we are drifting toward cooperative living. . . . Housekeeping will be a wholesale business for a few, not retail for the many as it used to be. Will that be a better arrangement than the present one? From an economic standpoint, I should say yes, most emphatically. . . . But sentimentally, esthetically—there I have doubts. Whether the atmosphere of the house will go with its industry—that I cannot say. But if it does, then I believe, confidently, that something else will take its place. . . ."[65]

Although Rorer did not use the terms like home and family, she was obviously uncomfortable with the prospect of the cooperative kitchen eroding home life. In the article, Rorer emphasized how cooking was simple, contrary to many women's assumptions, suggesting that women remain as homemakers, not succumb to the lure of cooperative living. Many culinary experts maintained the importance of private family

---

[64] Emma P. Ewing, "Home-Making," Date unknown (1888 or after), 8, Emma P. Ewing Collection, Iowa State University.

[65] Elise Biesel, "The First Cook in the Land," *Good Housekeeping* 58 (March 1914): 421.

life even if keeping such a family commanded more time and money than cooperative housekeeping. This emphasis on private family life also fostered consumer capitalism. If, as Helen Damon-Moore argues, "Designating consuming as women's work and urging women to do it more often actually shored up capitalism and aided in the further development of national markets,"[66] agents of consumer capitalism—manufactures, merchants, and advertising—surely supported private home life, where they could promote labor-saving devises and foods.

Emphasizing women's domesticity, culinary reformers made efforts to play down their commercial ties and the pecuniary benefits of their works. As their fame as cooking experts rose, they expanded their sphere of activities into business by contributing to magazines, providing their original recipes to advertising cookbooks, lending their names to food and kitchen products, becoming omnipresent at food fairs, and authoring their own cookbooks. These commercial ventures made the cooking experts prominent public figures and brought them a fortune, but they quickly denied their pecuniary motivation and underplayed their status as public figures. For instance, in her testimonial to Cottolene, a vegetable oil manufactured by the N. K. Fairbank, Juliet Corson wrote, "When I was requested to give publicity to some of the recipes for the making of dishes in which Cottolene is used, it seemed only just and gracious to do so, though I thereby departed from my usual custom."[67] Corson implied that she did not usually lend her name to a commercial product and preferred to keep her distance from commercialism. Maria

---

[66] Damon-Moore, 49.

[67] Juliet Corson, *600 Selected Recipes* (Chicago: N. K. Fairbank & Co., 1893), 3.

Parloa took the same approach, but Laura Shapiro portrays Parloa as a hard-headed business woman, who, because of her high fee for her lessons, gave the Woman's Education Association of Boston a hard time managing the Boston Cooking School.[68] In response to her endorsements of food and food-related products, Maria Parloa denied "the solicitations, suggesting or knowledge of anybody likely to receive pecuniary benefit therefrom."[69] This view was confirmed by Edward W. Bok, the editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, of which Parloa was a part owner. In the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, Bok briefly discussed how Maria Parloa gained a fortune from her work in cookery and proclaimed, "Miss Parloa never bothers herself with the commercial end of a literary transaction."[70] Cooking experts like Parloa and Corson thus detached themselves from commercialism and played down the monetary benefits derived from their business activities.

Mary J. Lincoln also maintained a low profile in her commercial involvements. In her autobiographical article in the *New England Kitchen Magazine* entitled "How I Was Led to Teach Cookery," she proclaimed, "From the time when I resolved to share the burden of providing a home, I have never sought any work. Everything I have done, every lesson I have taught, every line I have written for publication, has been given me to do, has been almost forced upon me, with no seeking on my part."[71] Lincoln denied any personal ambitions to work in the public sphere. With regard to her involvement as the

---

[68] Shapiro, 58-59.

[69] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Miss Parloa."

[70] "A Domestic Woman Abroad," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 41.

[71] Lincoln, "How I was Led to Teach Cookery," 69.

secretary in Mrs. Lincoln's Baking Powder Company, founded around 1899, Lincoln wrote a long apologia in her *American Kitchen Magazine*. She insisted that she had neither financial benefit from her endorsement nor endorsed any products that she considered without merit, thus underscoring the absence of sheer commercialism in her new business venture. An old stock New Englander who extolled the dignity of labor, Lincoln claimed that she preferred a life of business to that of leisure and asserted, "I see no reason why a woman should not engage in the manufacture of a clean, pure baking powder, as well as in the making of that same powder into cakes or breads and offering them for sale."[72] Lincoln defended her commercial ventures by emphasizing the feminine aspect of her business. She presented herself as a moral guardian who was making "a clean, pure baking powder," which would be eventually brought into the home, a woman's domain. Perhaps in order to offset her work for pay outside home, Lincoln's department entitled, "From Day to Day," in the *American Kitchen Magazine*, announced in 1897, "This month our readers have an opportunity to see Mrs. Lincoln in her sanctum in the pleasant home. . . . Here she writes the answers to the questions from all over the country. . . ."[73] Lincoln probably desired to project her domesticated image in her own magazine.

Cooking experts exhorted women to become homemakers, yet some of them were far from the ideal homemakers that they presented as models. Some cooking teachers, such as Maria Parloa, Fannie Farmer, Anna Barrows, and Juliet Corson (whose only

---

[72] *American Kitchen Magazine* 11 (July 1899): 157-58; quoted in Shapiro, 195.

[73] *American Kitchen Magazine* 6 (April 1897): 41.

companion at her death in 1897 was "her colored maid"[74]) remained single for their entire lives, a common pattern among well-educated women at the time. In addition, Sarah Tyson Rorer had separated from her husband by the late 1890s. Although Emma P. Ewing authoritatively declared in 1890, "Happiness depends largely on health, and health on cookery; and when I consider the condition of our American kitchens, I no longer wonder that divorces are so common. . . ,"[75] creating a stable home seemed to take more than scientific cooking.

Although many of these pioneers were not ideal homemakers, the popular culture, and perhaps the cooking teachers themselves, exploited their images as preachers of happy homemakers. Rorer's case was especially ironic. In the advertisement of Mrs. Rorer's Coffee, her own brand presented the product as a medium to reinforce the tie of a married couple. The advertisement featured a man and a woman contentedly facing each other with their own cups of coffee in their hands and read, "Mrs. Rorer's coffee makes happy wives and contented husbands."[76] Perhaps this advertising copy reflected the general assumption by the public of cooking experts as skillful homemakers. In addition to this commercial venture, a Broadway musical, *Sitting Pretty*, which opened in 1924, featured a song entitled "Mr. and Mrs. Rorer" with the following passage:

> When Mister Rorer said that he was blue
> Kind Missis Rorer filled him up with stew

---

[74] "Death of Juliet Corson."

[75] "A Summer at Chautauqua," *Tribune Monthly* 2 (September 1890): 19-20.

[76] A. P. Johnson, *Library of Advertising* (Chicago: Cree Publishing Company, 1911), 185.

> And there'd be no divorce today If only wives would act the way
> That kind Missis Rorer used to do![77]

Although she failed to maintain an intact family, the identification of Sarah Tyson Rorer with the ideal homemaker seemed to persist in the mind of the public.

Perhaps this discrepancy between ideals and realities derived from a contradiction inherent in the professionalization of scientific cookery: cooking teachers expanded their sphere of domestic activities into the public sphere in order to preach to women the importance of domesticity, including cooking. Armed with a high educational level and skills in writing and teaching, both of which belonged to women's sphere, many women chose a career in cookery with the lofty intention of advancing the nation through self-improvement. This purpose matched with the notion of progress, which shaped the worldview of mainstream American society at the turn of the twentieth century. Cooking experts joined other members of an emerging professional-managerial class to address their work in the framework of progress, thus underscoring the importance of their work to American society.

---

[77] Weigley, 167.

CHAPTER III

CONTROLLING APPETITE AS A PATH TO PROGRESS

In *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book*, the author defined cookery as "the art of preparing food for the nourishment of the human body. When given its proper importance in the consideration of health and comfort, it must be based upon scientific principles of hygiene. . . ." Mary Lincoln viewed cooking as an art based on scientific laws and then employed a discourse of progress popular among Americans who belonged to the professional-managerial class: "All civilized nations cook their food, to improve its taste and digestibility. The degree of civilization is often measured by the cuisine."[1]

Just as Lincoln viewed cookery as a measure of civilization, narratives of progress proliferated among the writing and speeches of cooking and food experts at the turn of the twentieth century. Fannie Farmer dedicated her best-selling *Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* (1896) to the president of the Boston Cooking School writing, "In Appreciation of her helpful encouragement and uniting efforts in promoting the work of scientific cookery, which means the elevation of the human race. . . "[2] (capitals in original). Similarly she wrote, in her 1912 cookbook, "The art of cookery, when not allied with a degenerate taste or with gluttony, is one of the criteria of a people's

---

[1] Mary J. Lincoln, *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book: What To Do and What Not To Do in Cooking* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1916), 1.

[2] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *The Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1896), dedication page.

civilization."[3] Farmer's approach to cookery stood in sharp contrast to Lincoln's in many ways, yet they both agreed that cooking indicated and promoted the progress of American civilization. Put differently, they saw scientific cookery as a vehicle to lead Americans along the path to secular salvation.

This chapter explores how advocates of scientific cookery addressed the doctrine of progress at the turn of the twentieth century. The notion of progress provided a major frame of reference in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,[4] and cooking experts constituted active participants in this discourse of progress. They intended to achieve the same result as advertisers did, who presented themselves as agents of progress primarily to offset their associations with patent medicines' questionable advertising practices. Culinary reformers, who were vexed with the public image of cooking as dirty and with its link to the lower classes (See chapter VII), naturally jumped at the discourse of progress to claim their status as cultural authorities. Culinary teachers could have applied the statement proclaimed by J. Walter Thompson's newsletter in 1916—"One of the very definite phases of our work is to be educators"[5]—to their own career in cooking. Culinary authorities believed that they were guiding Americans along the path to progress by preaching the gospel of scientific cooking and eating. What brought cooking experts to the notion of progress in the first place? How did they use this discourse? What did progress mean to them? Did culinary experts encounter any conflicts

---

[3] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *A New Book of Cookery* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1912), v.

[4] Pamela Walker Laird, *Advertising Progress: American Business and the Rise of Consumer Marketing* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 3.

[5] J. Walter Thompson Newsletter, 27 June 1916, JWT Archives; quoted in T. J. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 206.

between traditions and religious values on one hand and the modern idea of science and progress on the other? If so, how did they solve these conflicts? Did progress mean the same thing to them as to other contemporary Americans? If not, did any conflict arise because of those differences?

By exploring these questions, this chapter will show how culinary authorities intertwined tradition and old cultural values with what they claimed as science to present themselves as agents of progress. They viewed progress in a different way from the leaders of American opinion, who identified food abundance, particularly the consumption of meat, as a mark of American abundance and progress. To culinary reformers, the wealth of food, especially meats, posed a problem to the nation, since they feared that food abundance would induce overeating. Hence, employing the dichotomized discourse of progress or degeneration to legitimate their apprehension, cooking teachers resorted to the Protestant ethic of self-control and the simple life to tame what they feared as American extravagance.

Scientific cookery inherited a trend already in place during the antebellum period: a belief in the power of food to affect human health. This new perception of the relation between food and health originated in the Second Great Awakening of the early nineteenth century, which generated an ideology of what historians call the "hygienic millennium" or "physical perfectionism."[6] The idea promoted the notion of the healthy

[6] "Hygienic millennium" is a term Harvey Green uses to describe "a truly Christian society, in which all citizens would have as perfect bodies as possible." Harvey Green, *Fit for America: Health, Fitness, Sport, and American Society* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986), 28; quoted in Kathryn Grover, ed., *Hard at Play: Leisure in America, 1840-1940* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press; Rochester, N.Y.: Strong Museum, 1992), 25. Ronald G. Walters uses "physical perfectionism" to describe the same

body as part of secularized salvation and encouraged contemporary Americans to include a healthy body as part of the definition of a great republic.[7] For instance, Sylvester Graham (1795-1851), the most famous antebellum health reformer, departed sharply from the Calvinist belief which dictated that God preordained human destiny, including health, and therefore whether one could maintain or improve health was irrelevant to one's intentions or efforts. Rather than the Bible, Graham relied on physiology and advocated abstemiousness in food and sex as a prerequisite to attain salvation. He recognized the effect of food intake on physical health, the view on which scientific cookery was founded.

Advocates of scientific cookery accelerated the secularization of health in the latter half of the nineteenth century, as Ellen Richards proclaimed, "I believe that man's efficiency in this world, if not his happiness in the next, is mainly due to the precautions he takes to use suitable food and to avoid dangerous combinations."[8] Emphasizing the quality of food one consumed, Richards suggested that the utilitarian needs of physical health were equivalent to happiness in the next world. Fannie Farmer exemplified this trend of secularism in her *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent* (1904) by listing the necessary conditions for health as follows:

---

phenomenon. Ronald G. Walters, *American Reformers, 1815-1860*, rev. ed (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997), 148.

[7] Joan Burbick, *Healing the Republic: The Language of Health and the Culture of Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Introduction.

[8] Ellen H. Richards, *The Cost of Food: A Study in Dietaries* (New York: Robert Brummond and Company, 1901), 104.

1. A correct supply of food.
2. The proper cooking of same.
3. Air and sunlight supply.
4. Good environment.
5. Exercise.
6. Rest.
7. Sleep.
8. Bathing.[9]

Apart from the fact that the use of itemization in her writing marked it as modern, devoid of any hint of religion and its moral teachings, Farmer understood health in a strongly secular and materialist sense.

The secularization of health accompanied a belief that physical well-being reflected the health of the mind. As Ronald G. Walters writes, Americans under the Calvinist influence had seen body and mind as discrete entities, yet antebellum health reformers connected the two.[10] Advocates of scientific cookery inherited this approach to body and mind; as Fannie Farmer wrote in her *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent* (1904), "Health may be defined as a sound mind in a sound body."[11] This link between body and mind was also reflected in the temperance cause as well as in the cooking experts' link between bad diet and crimes. In her article on bread, Sarah Tyson Rorer declared, "There is not in my mind the least doubt that poor bread is the cause of much crime. Such people are half starved, and their restless, uncomfortable bodies

---

[9] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1904), 18-19.

[10] Walters, 147-48.

[11] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, 18-19.

govern their unsound minds. A *sound* mind is found only in a sound body"[12] (emphasis in original). By emphasizing the effect of nutrition on the mind, cooking experts like Rorer not only legitimized their work but also pushed the idea that science could affect the mind just as much, if not more, than religion did.

The growing power of science over religion in shaping the notion of health manifested itself in the transformative nature of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, a Protestant denomination founded in 1863. Emphasizing diet's role in shaping health, Ellen White, the founder of the group, opened a health reform institute in Battle Creek, Michigan, in 1866 and promoted the Grahamite diet of vegetables, fruits, nuts, and non-refined wheat.[13] Although Seventh-Day Adventism was hostile to medical professionalism,[14] White soon recognized the importance of a doctor's certificate and sent John Harvey Kellogg, then a believer in the Church, to study medicine first at the University of Michigan and then at Bellevue College in New York City, where he earned a medical degree.[15] Armed with cutting-edge knowledge of medical science, Kellogg took over the health reform institute in 1876 and turned it into the Battle Creek Sanitarium. There the doctor, together with his wife, Ella Eaton, who managed the institution's domestic science department, experimented with various health treatments

---

[12] *Household News* 3 (July 1895): 283.
[13] Walters, 158.

[14] Joan Jacobs Brumberg, *Fasting Girls: The History of Anorexia Nervosa* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 76.

[15] The Historical Society of Battle Creek, "John Harvey Kellogg," The Historical Society of Battle Creek, http://www.geocities.com/Athens/oracle/9840/kellogg.html.

for the mostly wealthy guests. In short, a health institution established by a religious founder had turned into a secular health resort run by a doctor by the turn of the century.

In spite of the secularization of American society, religion and morality persisted, and many cooking reformers underscored their secular work with spiritual rhetoric. For instance, Sarah Tyson Rorer gushed to her audience at a food exposition, "To be a dyspeptic is to be a very wicked person, indeed! . . . . You never find dyspepsia and Christianity together. It is an utter impossibility."[16] Rorer believed that Christians had the moral obligation to maintain their health by observing the rational laws of nutrition. Ellen H. Richards summed up this modern version of salvation by proclaiming, "Applied science—knowledge of the laws of nature—chemical, physical, physiological, psychological, sociological—is to be our salvation."[17] The Protestant ethos of salvation remained throughout the nineteenth century, but science, not religion, would lead Americans into salvation.

The persistence of the old was also reflected in a celebration of the colonial revival, which swept the nation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Baffling historical events, such as the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the economic recessions of the last decades of the nineteenth century, prompted Americans to turn to the seemingly simple and secular past. This longing for the past bloomed in the wake of the centennial celebration of 1876, which together with paeans to modern industry and technology celebrated the national heritage. This social, political, and economic turmoil

---

[16] "A Cook in Silk Attire," *Philadelphia Times*, November 15, 1893, 2.

[17] *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (September 1897): 226.

encouraged Americans to draw on the past as a guiding resource in the face of the bewildering present and the unknown future.[18]

In addition to the role of the colonial revival as inspiration, materials from the colonial period served as a reference point by which Americans could trace their evolutionary progress. The Boston Food Fair of 1897 featured a colonial home, as the *American Kitchen Magazine* reported: "On one side of the hall was the facsimile of a colonial home, furnished with all that belonged to the typical house of two centuries ago. At the other entrance one corner of the hall was furnished in the most approved manner for modern dining-rooms."[19] By comparing these two homes, the audience could see how American homes had developed. The same issue of the periodical also reported "the revival of the real old-fashioned tea parties" held by "the various organizations which have aroused our interest in our ancestors." Consequently, according to the magazine, people held colonial tea parties during the second week of December "whether their great grandfathers participated in the famous Boston tea party or not."[20] Although the *American Kitchen Magazine* did not elaborate on "the real old-fashioned tea parties," the events must have provided participants with an opportunity to observe how the tea party had changed—or improved—from the colonial past.

The commercial world seemed to exploit the popularity of the colonial revival by associating commodities with colonial symbols, thus blending an old story into a new

---

[18] Alan Axelrod, ed., *The Colonial Revival in America* (New York: Norton & Company, 1985), 19.

[19] The Boston Food Fair," *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (December 1897): 116.

[20] "Concerning Teas," *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (December 1897): 114.

commercial economy. For example, Minute Tapioca Corporation of Central Massachusetts borrowed its name from the Minutemen. The company's advertising cookbook, *The Minute Man Cook Book* (1909), featured a story of their heroic activities, followed by recipes devised by, among others, Janet McKenzie Hill. No relation seemed to exist between the product and the Minutemen except for its revolutionary use of a food material, as the product claimed, "Minute Tapioca has revolutionized the use of Tapioca."[21] The blending of colonial heroes with pre-made gelatin confused patriotism with consumer loyalty, as the cookbook reiterated, "Look for the Minute Man on the Package"[22] at grocery stores. In other words, Minute Tapioca exhorted consumers to care for this product in the same way that they loved their country. Whatever the cultural implications of the Minutemen for a twentieth-century processed food, Minute Tapioca seemed to exploit the colonial revival.

This fusion of the old and the new also manifested itself in the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, which claimed that the periodical aimed to blend the past and the present. The November 1894 issue of the culinary magazine quoted a woman who had returned to her native town for the first time in many years, "When I am invited out to tea here, I am disappointed if I do not see the same raised biscuits, damson preserves, pound-cake, cup-custards and the like, that I remember as being so good when I was a child. I don't want croquettes and salad: one can get them at any good hotel." To this nostalgia, the periodical responded: "THE NEW ENGLAND KITCHEN MAGAZINE hopes to

---

[21] Ibid., 16.

[22] Wayne Whipple, *The Minute Man: A Brief Account of the Battles of Lexington and Concord* (Orange, Mass.: Minute Tapioca Co., 1909).

revive the best of the old time cookery and unite it with the results of modern science"[23] (capitals in original). Three years later in 1897, the periodical, whose title had changed to the *American Kitchen Magazine*, reiterated this stance: "The aim of the *American Kitchen Magazine* is to bring together and classify the best ideas of the past and present regarding home science. . . ."[24] The magazine confirmed its editorial stance that embracing the new did not necessarily mean discarding the old.

Mary J. Lincoln, one of the periodical's editors, probably reflected the *New England Kitchen Magazine*'s stance on tradition when she defended the consumption of pies, a traditional New England specialty. Although she wrote, "A simple course of fruit is all that is needed after a dinner, and is much more wholesome than pies,"[25] admitting that fruits were healthier than pies, she did not abandon the dessert. At a demonstration lecture entitled "Christmas Pies and Pastry" during the 1894 World's Food Fair in Boston, Lincoln, a native of the "Pie Belt," compromised on this issue of dessert. She rejected the extreme of "having pie for breakfast, pie for dinner, and pie for supper" and, perhaps referring to cooking teachers such as Juliet Corson and Sarah Tyson Rorer, "the extreme hygienists of the present day who denounce every thing of this kind as 'pig and pastry poison.'" Instead, Lincoln, offering "a middle ground," claimed that "if we are going to have pie at all it is better to have a good" and "it seems to me that we can

---

[23] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (November 1894): 99.

[24] "A Standing Offer," *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (October 1897): 37.

[25] Lincoln, 391.

indulge in a pie occasionally," especially during Thanksgiving and Christmas.[26] Lincoln told Americans that they did not have to abandon their cherished pies completely, even if their pies were nutritiously frivolous. The fact that Mary J. Lincoln sided with pies and cakes was remarkable, given that she cherished the New England cultural values of thrift and simplicity, and thus could have easily dismissed these desserts as frivolous.

Although cooking reformers blended old traditions into new scientific orders, they often viewed conventional practices, particularly those of cooking methods, as a block to progress. Hence, some cooking experts deplored the anachronisms—or ignorance, in their favorite term—regarding cookery prevalent among American women. The publishers of Ella Eaton Kellogg's *Science in the Kitchen* (1892) lamented, "The art of cookery is at least a century behind in the march of scientific progress. The mistress of the kitchen is still groping her way amid the uncertainties of mediæval methods. . . ."[27] Hence, the publisher presented the cookbook in order to accelerate the procession of progress in the realm of cookery. In the same vein, Marion Harland admonished her readers to learn scientific principles of cooking:

> "I account that day lost in which I have learned no new thing," said an aged sage. Our housewife may lay the saying to heart. If there be a better way than hers of doing anything—from making pickles to giving a wedding supper—she should be on the alert to possess herself of it. It is not true that it is easier for young people to keep themselves and their houses abreast of the times than it is for their elders. The first step that counts in the downward road is the tendency not to take any step at all. To stand still is to be left.[28]

---

[26] Mary J. Lincoln, "Christmas Pies and Pastry," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 131.

[27] Ella Eaton Kellogg, *Science in the Kitchen* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Modern Medicine Publishing Co., 1892), 3.

[28] Marion Harland, *Marion Harland's Complete Cook Book: A Practical and Exhaustive Manual of Cookery and Housekeeping* (St. Louis: The Marion Company, 1906) 184.

Harland thus called on her readers to be progressive by learning new things; if they stopped doing so, they were doomed to downfall.

As Harland illustrated, narratives of progress often took on the dichotomy of progress and downfall. If salvation required a healthy body, anything that went against achieving or maintaining health pointed to downfall. In other words, in the linear course of progress, Americans who stopped advancing or growing were inevitably doomed to degeneration. [29] Discussing the status of domestic service within the frame of evolution, a contributor to the *New England Kitchen Magazine* wrote in 1894, "Evolution must always be slow and gradual, and should women make a concerted movement to free domestic service from those conditions which now put a social stigma upon it, it would be some years before they could hope to place it on a basis that would induce women of reason and intelligence to enter it in large numbers. In the end the housekeeper's relief must come through such a change, and her only choice lies between hastening or retarding it."[30] Three years later, emphasizing the importance of science in women's education, Ellen H. Richards simply put, "It was fast coming to be choice between knowledge and extermination."[31] To Richards, who often employed the rhetoric of Social

---

[29] E. Melanie DuPuis, *Nature's Perfect Foods: How Milk Became America's Drink* (New York: New York University Press, 2002), 12-13.

[30] Ethel Davis, "Dishonesty and Caste: In Domestic Service," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December, 1894): 116.

[31] Ellen H. Richards, "The Place of Science in Woman's Education," *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (September 1897): 227.

Darwinism, if women learned scientific principles and applied them to housekeeping, women were in the march of progress, but if they did not, they were doomed.

The processed food industry employed this "progress or declension" dichotomy as a marketing ploy. N. K. Fairbank, producer of Cottolene, a newly invented shortening, entitled one section of its advertising booklet "Progress and Cookery: The World Moves" and wrote, "There is no better illustration of this old saying than the numerous schools now-a-days devoted to practical kitchen processes. These schools have been alert to find a reasonable substitute for lard, the use of which is so generally condemned. This want has been fully met by the new shortening."[32] N. K. Fairbank presented Cottolene as "progress" as opposed to lard, which marked degeneration. In the company's view, by presenting a new shortening, the manufacturer had eliminated a stumbling block—lard—in the path to progress. In this discourse of progress, women who took up Cottolene were leading the world toward progress, while those who were stuck with lard were taking the world to its downfall.

Among cooking experts, Sarah Tyson Rorer most often played on the fear of degeneration by relegating Americans to a rank lower than the so-called uncivilized. Drawing upon the Darwinian theory of evolution, Rorer played on narratives of progress to hit a nerve with white, middle-class, Protestant Americans, who comprised most of her audience. Perhaps as a strategy to prompt her audience to improve their living habits, including cooking, Rorer often challenged conventional wisdom and placed "uncivilized" at a higher rank than "civilized Americans." Following her appearance at the World's

---

[32] N. K. Fairbank Co., *Cottolene* (Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1893), 5.

Columbian Exposition of 1893, Sarah Tyson Rorer said to her audience at the Philadelphia Food Exposition, "The Turks, dirty as they are . . . clean with their food. Everything is spotlessly neat and, what is most commendable, there is no waste of coal. A Turkish family uses in one year an amount of fuel that would probably last the civilized American family one month."[33] Rorer extolled the economical practices of the Turks by comparing them with "civilized " and in her view, extravagant Americans; if the "uncivilized" Turks could use fuel economically, why could Americans not do so? A few days later, Rorer then picked on Boston, a city of reputed sophistication, comparing its people with the Sri Lankans:

> The ordinary Singhalese, or even the dirty Turk, knows more about what goes into his mouth than the highly-civilized American. One thing a Singhalese has learned is never to eat the skin of a bean. He knows the human stomach cannot digest hulls and the American doesn't. . . . We have one city which is eminently a bean-eating city and it is a very brainy city: yet, at the same time, it is a city of nervous prostration. I never call on a person in Boston when I don't find that he is off taking a rest.[34]

Although Rorer saw Americans, including Bostonians, as more civilized than Sri Lankans and the Turkish, she suggested that Americans learn from the "under-civilized." Rorer even implied that dogs were more intelligent than at least some humans. Noticing some parents who failed to teach their children the importance of masticating bread, Rorer said, "They (dogs) . . . chew and chew the bread. They are educated."'[35] Rorer implied that dogs were more civilized than humans in this dimension of behavior. At a

---

[33] "Cookery in a Turkish Tent," *Philadelphia Times*, November 17, 1893, 4.

[34] "[Unreadable] A Cingalese Cook," *Philadelphia Times*, November 19, 1893, 7.

[35] "That Christmas Dinner," *Philadelphia Press*, December 10, 1896, 10.

time when the officials of the world's fairs employed white supremacy as a cultural force to erase the class differences among whites,[36] Rorer implicitly stated that if Americans had a shared national purpose, it should be acquiring a scientific approach to food and improving their cooking and diet.

As Rorer reversed the conventional order of civilization, the notion of progress was subject to multiple interpretations. For instance, the American public predominantly welcomed technological development as a mark of progress, while culinary reformers viewed industrial growth as a double-edged sword. According to Jackson Lears, "The chief engine of progress was industrial technology" and "for many Americans the railroad was the first among many machines which embodied the new primacy of their country's industrial might."[37] Simon Patten, a noted economist, sang a paean to the railroad, writing, "Immobile masses of men used to die of famine while a few hundred miles away crops rotted on the ground for lack of transportation. Famine no longer threatens a country where railroads carry freight."[38] To Patten and many of his contemporary Americans, perhaps including the cooking experts, the railroad symbolized a mighty technological development, which was leading the nation to progress.

However, American technological prowess posed a problem to the cooking experts in two major ways. First, many culinary reformers blamed transportation

---

[36] Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 236.

[37] T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 8.

[38] Simon Patten, *The New Basis of Civilization* (New York: The MacMillion Company, 1907), 15.

development for the loss of the seasonality of food. As Maria Parloa observed, "The railroads and steamers connect the climes so closely that one hardly knows whether he is eating fruits and vegetables in or out of season."[39] This loss of seasonality invoked sentimentality among some cooking experts like Anna Barrows, who lamented, "When strawberries are in the market all the year they have less charm in the height of their season."[40] But Barrows and her colleagues also pointed out practical problems that derived from the loss of seasonality. In the section entitled "Proper Seasons for Different Foods," Sarah Tyson Rorer lamented in one of her cookbooks, "Our rapid transportation makes it almost impossible to give exact time when vegetables are in season. . . . It is well to remember that appetites are destroyed by too much sameness" and advised her readers "use vegetables in season in the locality in which you live."[41] To Rorer and other cooking experts, eating foods in season constituted adherence to the laws of nature. In the meantime, other advocates of scientific cookery pointed to the higher prices of out-of-season foods. Ellen H. Richards counted the "purchase out of season when the price is out of all proportion to its value"[42] as one of the wasteful practices regarding food.

Second, more than the seasonality of food, advocates of scientific cookery were alarmed by the food abundance that scientific, technological, and industrial development

---

[39] Maria Parloa, *Miss Parloa's New Cookbook: A Guide to Marketing and Cooking* (Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1880), 48.

[40] Anna Barrows, "Labor That Satisfieth Not," *Congregationalist and Christian World*, March 11, 1905, 327.

[41] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book: A Manual of Housekeeping* (Arnold And Company, Philadelphia, 1902), 31.

[42] Ellen Henrietta Richards, *The Cost of Living as Modified by Sanitary Science*, 3d ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1915), 70.

had produced. Again, ironically, this abundance of food could become a formidable force leading the nation toward degeneration, according to the advocates of scientific cookery. As Sarah Tyson Rorer admonished the readers of her cookbook in 1886, "We must keep steadily before us the principle that it is not the quantity of food received which nourishes the body, but the proportion that can be digested of such food, all else is worse than waste, whose presence clogs and throws out of order the delicate digestive organs."[43] Rorer and her colleagues feared that food abundance inevitably led to the temptation to overeat, which would cause digestive malfunction, a major catalyst of physical degeneration. Ellen H. Richards pushed the concern of Rorer further and warned against overeating, which in her view would lead to "race extinction." In *The Cost of Food* (1901), she castigated men's idea of the "good life" and wrote:

> It is . . . over-nutrition which threatens race extinction. To quote Prof. Patten: "Formerly the underfed failed to survive; now it is the overfed among whom the elimination is taking place. . . . Over-nutrition, as well as under-nutrition, weakens the body and subjects it to evils that make it incapable of survival. The plethora of food now enjoyed induces men to eat and drink more than their systems can stand. . . . Must we look among women for the best examples of over-feeding? . . . It is said that all female animals become barren when overfed. . . ."[44]

Drawing on Simon Patten, who expounded on Social Darwinism, Richards directly linked overeating to downfall. To her, degeneration meant not only physical debilitation on an individual basis but also the annihilation of the Anglo-Saxons, or what Americans called "race suicide" at the time.

---

[43] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's Philadelphia Cook Book: A Manual of Home Economics.* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1886), 561.

[44] Richards, *Cost of Food*, 4-5.

Domestic scientists' fear of food abundance and its implications in degeneration stood in sharp contrast to the leaders of American opinions, who extolled the wealth of food as a mark of progress. Food has served as a metaphor for abundance since ancient times, and as Jackson Lears writes, people have dreamed of the freedom from hunger throughout the world.[45] In a sense, the history of humankind has been the history of human endeavors to free itself from hunger, where both the quality and the quantity of food served as a measure of progress. Simon Patten began *The New Basis of Civilization* (1907) by writing, "The basis of a new civilization" pointed to "a rich and beautiful valley" with "the well-tended farms, the strong stone houses, the busy men and animals moving peacefully over roads and field."[46] To Patten, "this plentiful valley" was "evidence that economic forces can sweep away poverty, banish misery. . . ."[47] Patten exalted a fertile valley for its potential to produce an abundance of food, which then formed, in his words, "the basis of a new civilization."[48]

In this equation of food abundance with progress, American opinion leaders widely viewed the consumption of meat as a mark of progress, while, in contrast, plant foods represented degeneration. George Beard, a nineteenth-century neurologist, wrote, "In proportion as man grows sensitive through civilization or through disease, he should diminish the quantity of cereals and fruits, which are far below him on the scale of

---

[45] Lears, *Fables of Abundance*, 17.

[46] Patten, 3.

[47] Ibid., 3-4.

[48] Ibid., 4.

evolution, and increase the quantity of animal food, which is nearly related to him in the scale of evolution, and therefore more easily assimilated."[49] The doctor reasoned that the more humans progressed, the more easily they could consume animal protein than plant foods. Samuel Gompers would have agreed with Beard, given that the leader of the American Federation of Labor entitled his plea for the extension of the Chinese Exclusion Law as *Meat v. Rice*. In this 1902 pamphlet, Gompers did not discuss meat and rice per se. He employed these foodstuffs as metaphors for, as the subtitle read, "American Manhood" and "Chinese Coolieism," respectively. Considering that Gompers wrote the article to win the public over to his cause, he entitled the plea well. The labor leader probably knew that *Meat vs. Rice* was an emotive title, striking a chord with the masses in two related ways. First, the title was instantly recognizable to almost anybody who read English. Second, by polarizing meat and rice, Gompers located these two foods within the same framework as debates, sports, games, and "good and evil," prompting readers to take sides. Gompers must have known which side the public would choose. Hence, he approvingly quoted James G. Blaine, who proclaimed in 1879 at the United States Senate deliberation of the Chinese Exclusion Law: "You can not work a man who must have beef and bread, and would prefer beef, alongside of a man who can live on rice. In all such conflicts, and in all such struggles, the result is not to bring up the man who lives on rice to the beef-and-bread standard, but it is to bring down the beef-and-

---

[49] George M. Beard, M.D., *Sexual Neurasthenia [Nervous Exhaustion] Its Hygiene, Causes, Symptoms and Treatment with a Chapter on Diet for the Nervous* (New York: E.B. Treat & Co., 1898, New York: Arno Press, 1972), 272; quoted in Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (New York: Continuum, 1990), 30.

bread man to the rice standard."[50] In short, *Meat vs. Rice* resonated with the zeitgeist of American society at the time, where the dichotomized discourse of progress or degeneration dominated its worldview.

As the example of *Meat vs. Rice* indicated, Americans of the professional and managerial class often used food to divide society along the lines of class, race, and gender. In the discourse of civilization, meat symbolized progress, abundance, wealth, Anglo Saxons, and men, while, by contrast, plant foods, such as cereals, vegetables, and fruits, embodied degeneration, scarcity, poverty, "others," and women. For example, Simon Patten revealed the class implications of meat in *The New Basis of Civilization*. He noted the scarcity and high prices of meat and wrote, "Salaried people and the higher class of laborers felt the embargo more than the vast majority of immigrants who have not yet learned to measure their well-being by the pounds of flesh they consume."[51] Patten suggested that the higher the socioeconomic class, the more people consumed meat. On the other hand, when Gompers sneered, "the Chinese, living on the most meager food,"[52] he most probably referred to rice, the title of his plea. If meat symbolized American riches, grains and vegetables represented scarcity and poverty.

In addition to class, Americans attached racial implications to food in the context of progress. Again, Patten wrote, "The development of meat tastes . . . will depend upon

---

[50] Samuel Gompers, *Some Reasons for Chinese Exclusion. Meat vs. Rice. American Manhood against Asiatic Coolietism. Which Shall Survive?* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), 24.

[51] Patten, 21.

[52] Gompers, 27.

the ascendancy of Anglo-Saxon tradition. . . ,"[53] thus placing Anglo-Saxons at the top of the line of progress, which meant the acquisition of the taste for meat. By contrast, the economist wrote, "A vegetable diet is normal to the Italians and semi-tropical people. . . ,"[54] thus suggesting that non Anglo-Saxons were behind in the march of progress. In addition to the subtitle of his plea "American Manhood against Asiatic Coolieism," Gompers included the following quote from Blaine, who contended, "Either the Anglo-Saxon race will possess the Pacific slope or the Mongolians will possess it."[55] Within this dichotomy, if "the Mongolians" represented rice, "the Anglo-Saxon race" meant meat.

Of Jewish background, Gompers might have hesitated to equate Americans with Anglo-Saxons, but he was probably comfortable attaching gender implications to foods. By entitling his plea *Meat vs. Rice: American Manhood against Asiatic Coolieism*, Gompers indicated the dichotomy between the masculinity of meat and American (or Anglo-Saxon) laborers and the femininity of rice and Chinese laborers. Generally assigning meat to physical laborers or winter consumption, culinary authorities did not particularly attach masculinity to meat, but they did imply that rice was less masculine. Mary J. Lincoln wrote in her *Boston Cook Book*, "In China, India, and other extremely hot climates, rice is the universal food. Rice contains a very small amount of flesh-forming material . . . . The natives of rice-eating countries owe much of their lack of

---

[53] Patten, 22.

[54] Ibid., 21.

[55] Gompers, 24.

spirit and energy to this defective diet."[56] Lincoln suggested that "lack of spirit and energy" among rice-eating people like the Chinese derived from a lack of "flesh-forming material,"[57] which indicated meat and other animal protein. On the other hand, Sarah Tyson Rorer referred to the effect of rice on the physical status of Asians: "The absence of the cellulose has, no doubt, much to do with the easy digestion of the rice, and the lack of tissue-building food has its influence over the stature of the 'Japs' and Hindoos."[58] Cooking experts confirmed the lack of masculine traits of rice eaters that the labor leader had implied, although these women warned against the over-consumption of meat and might have refused to celebrate that foodstuff in the way Gompers, Patten, and Beard did.

In summary, culinary authorities believed that exercising self-control in the face of food abundance was the key to progress, while their contemporary Americans saw access to abundance, particularly meat, as a mark of high civilization, connoting Anglo-Saxon, wealth, and masculinity. Generally, cooking experts emphasized quality over quantity and called for a balanced diet, although what they considered as a proper diet varied from individual to individual, depending on climate, season, occupation, and age (See chapter VIII). In any event, cooking experts claimed the importance of scientific cookery, precisely because food abundance challenged the notion of self-control.

Partly as a response to the American craving for meat and penchant for overeating, cooking reformers called for simplicity not only in the diet but also in life in

---

[56] Lincoln, 468.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Domestic Economy for Farmers' Wives," *Household News* 4 (April 1896): 133.

general. As Jackson Lears sees "the simple life" as "an old-fashioned republican solution to the problem of overcivilization,"[59] advocates of simple living invoked old cultural values in the face of a modern problem. Many cooking experts espoused this tenet, and while each had her own idea of and approach to simplicity, Sarah Tyson Rorer and Janet McKenzie Hill made an interesting contrast. Rorer attempted to achieve simplicity within an urban setting, while Hill was heavily inclined to the country life.

Sarah Tyson Rorer exhorted many of her urban, middle-class audience to simplify their everyday life. To be sure, at a time when the country life movement captured the imagination of the urban middle-class, Rorer did extol outdoor life. She actively participated in the Pennsylvanian Chautauqua held in Mt. Gretna in the summer, partly because she enjoyed life in the mountains. However, Rorer seemed to believe that the simple life did not necessarily mean living in a rustic home in the country and called for simplifying everyday life—including cooking methods and diets—in an urban setting. A media report about her appearance at the 1897 food show indicated that Rorer became an ardent advocate of the simple life in the late 1890s, writing, "That simplicity of living has become a cult with Mrs. Rorer . . . one of its most popular exponents." During a lecture, she called for the audience to simplify their diet in terms of both food choice and amount.[60] In a section entitled "A Plea for the Little Dinner" in *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book* (1902), the author wrote, "Small, inexpensive dinners, well arranged, are much more enjoyable than one large conventional dinner served to sixty ill-selected persons. . .

---

[59] Lears, *No Place of Grace*, 74.

[60] "Mrs. Sarah T. Rorer and the New Cult," *Philadelphia Evening Bulleting,* November 9, 1897, 3.

. The art of dining is quite apart from dinner giving. The person who dines has studied the art of living, lives frugally and elegantly. A reform in dinner giving is, I am pleased to note, being instituted. Simple dinners are now 'the correct thing.'"[61] Rather than rejecting urban middle-class amenities, Rorer advocated "refined simplicity" to counteract excessive materialism. In other words, she employed the Protestant ethos of frugality and self-control to try to bring order to the homes of the urban middle class.

While Rorer advocated simplicity in an urban setting, Janet McKenzie Hill tended to equate the simple life with contact with nature. In a 1903 editorial entitled "Simplicity in Living" in the *Boston Cooking-School Magazine*, a writer (probably Janet McKenzie Hill, the editor of the magazine) wrote, "Does not simplicity in living consist mainly in wholesome food, a comfortable dwelling-place, and close contact with nature in abundant outdoor life?"[62] The writer counted living and activities in nature as one component of the simple life. Owning a summer home in South Chatham, New Hampshire, near the Maine border, Hill held cooking classes there starting in 1904. The advertisement proclaimed, "Summer Classes in Cookery and Vacation Outing Combined."[63] By combining study with leisure in a mountain setting, perhaps Hill attempted to tame the effects of over-civilization on her students as well as herself.

Thus, as cultural authorities, cooking experts actively employed the doctrine of progress and offered solutions to over-civilized Americans. To cooking reformers, progress paradoxically meant exercising the traditional Protestant ethos of self-control in

---

[61] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *New Cook Book*, 664.

[62] "Simplicity in Living," *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* 7 (January 1903): 304.

[63] *Boston Cooking School-Magazine* 13 (April 1909): xxx.

the face of the abundance of food which modern technology and industry had brought. True to the antebellum notions of a perfect body as a prerequisite to salvation, cooking experts reasoned that self-control was required to attain health, both physical and mental. This secularization of the notion of health, which cooking reformers reinforced, eventually laid a psychological foundation which engendered the modern consumer culture.

CHAPTER IV

EATING AS A THERAPEUTIC ACTIVITY

To cooking reformers, scientific cookery served as a medium to lead the nation to secular perfectionism. With health of paramount importance, some cooking experts focused on dietetics, diet for the sick, as therapeutics. In an article entitled "The Therapeutics of Diet," Carrie M. Dearborn, the third principal of the Boston Cooking School, asserted, "We must not think of therapeutics as relating to drugs only; it should be considered in a broader sense. There is a curative power in fresh air, sunshine, exercise, clothing and, most of all, in the food we eat."[1]

Dearborn's remark revealed four attributes of dietetics that characterized the late nineteenth century. First, Dearborn assumed that restoring health was a totally secular project, rather than moral or spiritual. Second, she suggested that curing the sick did not exclusively depend on drugs and the physicians who prescribed them. Third, she recognized the healing power of nature. And fourth, she reinforced the understanding that food would dictate health, a belief that originated with the antebellum health reformers. Subscribing to these four aspects of dietetics, cooking experts like Carrie M. Dearborn used cooking and diet as a tool of therapy, that is, for healing physical illness.

This chapter discusses how cooking experts approached the relationship between cooking and eating habits, and health. Considering health of paramount importance,

---

[1] Carrie M. Dearborn, "The Therapeutics of Diet," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July 1894): 153.

culinary reformers viewed the relationship between food and health in two primary ways: a defensive approach to restore and maintain health and abundance therapy which aimed to draw out emotional and physical exuberances. The boundary between the two was not always clearly demarcated, as Fannie Farmer approached dietetics, whose primary objective was to restore normal physical functions, by employing abundance therapy with the aim of stimulating the appetite of the sick. Farmer most explicitly revealed an emotional approach to foodways, yet many of her colleagues also promoted cooking and eating as sensual experiences at least to some extent. Whether taking a defensive or abundance approach, culinary authorities put an emphasis on physical and mental health, a prerequisite for pursuing self-fulfillment in this world.

Advocates of scientific cookery constituted the promoters of what Jackson Lears calls a therapeutic ethos, a quest for psychic and physical health. According to Lears, a therapeutic ethos arose in reaction to the widespread condition of nervous prostration, prevalent among middle-class America in the last decades of the nineteenth century.[2] Nervous breakdowns occurred primarily in response to the urbanization of society, which had detached Americans from agrarian toil on the land, and tothe rationalization of society.[3] This social change accompanied the professionalization of careers, increasingly fragmenting a once-organic whole into many specific areas of expertise and control in the

---

[2] T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture*, 1880-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981), 47-52; T. J. Jackson Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization: Advertising and the Therapeutic Roots of the Consumer Culture, 1880-1930," in *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880-1980*, Richard Wightman Fox and T. J. Jackson Lears, ed. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), 7.

[3] Lears, *No Place of Grace*, Chapter 1.

name of efficiency.[4] In this urbanized and fragmented society, many Americans of the professional-managerial class suffered nervous breakdowns and yearned for intense bodily and emotional experiences to restore their emotional and physical health. As Lears notes, the point of neurasthenia rested not in the number of its suffers but in the fact that observers saw nervous illness as a cultural problem prevalent among the middle class.[5]

Sarah Tyson Rorer represented one of many urban middle-class Americans who were on the verge of nervous breakdown. In her biography of Rorer, Emma Seifrit Weigley begins the story of the cooking teacher in the year 1879, right before she took cooking classes offered by a local women's club, by describing how miserable she felt with herself and her life. Twenty- nine years old, married with two small children living in a Philadelphia suburb, Rorer felt depressed and half ill. Her depression seemed to derive primarily from her family environment. Her husband, a clerk and bookish whose only pride lay in his handwriting, was indecisive and incompetent and commanded a salary that was barely adequate for their family. Rorer was not comfortable around her father-in-law, a go-getter who ran a prosperous family business in Philadelphia and refused to involve his incompetent son in the trade—although he was the only son. Rorer's first son was frail and feeble and her daughter had died before the age of two in an accident in 1875. Her father, a pharmacist who had served in the Civil War and returned in poor health, died the next year. Her mother followed him a few years later. Rorer was estranged from her only brother and rarely spoke to him. Being a housewife in

---

[4] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," 7-8.

[5] Lears, *No Place of Grace*, 51.

this disheartening family environment may have accounted for her depression, boredom, and frustration.[6] At a suggestion of an acquaintance, Rorer began to attend classes at the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia, an opportunity she enjoyed since she had once entertained the idea of becoming a pharmacist. She later took cooking lessons offered by a Philadelphia women's club.

In the context of her depressing everyday life, activities outside of the house took on two related meanings for Rorer: liberation from home, and therapy. Weigley begins her portrayal of the life of Rorer by quoting advice from a lecturer at the Woman's College: "So in conclusion, ladies, for the best of health, don't stay cooped up in your homes; get out in the fresh air."[7] Weigley uses this "get out in the fresh air" advice as a metaphor for women's liberation from a stifling home life; attending the Women's College and a cooking course gave Rorer a feeling of liberation from a suffocating home. As Weigley writes of Rorer, "Sallie had never been happier. She realized that at last she had found something that truly interested her."[8] Her experience in cooking classes marked a turning point in her life, liberating her from a stagnant home life and launching a remarkable career as a cooking authority.

In addition to liberation from home, to Rorer and other neurasthenic Americans, the command to "get out in the fresh air" also expressed a therapeutic ethos: a quest for a secularized meaning of health. Going outside, especially spending time in nature, seemed

---

[6] Emma Seifrit Weigley, *Sarah Tyson Rorer: The Nation's Instructress in Dietetics and Cookery* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1977), 11-13.

[7] Ibid., 9.

[8] Ibid., 15.

to help improve the health of Rorer and her feeble son. Weigley writes that Rorer "had to admit that the fresh air was invigorating."[9] As Lears points out, the longing behind a therapeutic ethos partly pointed to a yearning for nature and nostalgia for the supposedly vigorous health of those who lived in a primitive environment.[10] Ella Eaton Kellogg employed this longing for nature when she promoted the consumption of cereals:

> Those nations are the most hardy and enduring whose dietary is most simple. The Scotch peasantry live chiefly upon oatmeal, the Irish upon potatoes, milk, and oatmeal, the Italian upon peas, beans, macaroni, and chestnuts; yet all these are noted for remarkable health and endurance. The natives of the Canary Islands, an exceedingly well-developed and vigorous race, subsist almost chiefly upon a food which they call gofio, consisting of parched grain, coarsely ground in a mortar and mixed with water.[11]

Perhaps in order to challenge conventional wisdom that animal protein, especially red meat, represented energy food, Kellogg appealed to the American public's longing for the vigorous health allegedly enjoyed by those who lived and worked in nature, that is, those "less civilized" than themselves. This yearning not only infused an over-civilized sentiment into urban, middle-class America, but also provided cooking experts with an incentive to promote scientific cookery intertwined with health. As Lears writes, this therapeutic ethos consisted of two streams—an older ethos based on the scarcity of emotional and physical resources[12] and a newer ideal based on abundance.

---

[9] Ibid., 11.

[10] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," 11; Ann Vileisis, *Kitchen Literacy: How We Lost Knowledge of Where Food Comes From and Why We Need to Get It Back* (Washington: Island Press, 2008), 101.

[11] Ella Eaton Kellogg, *Science in the Kitchen* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Modern Medicine Publishing Co., 1892), 41-2.

[12] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," 11.

Born and raised in the mid to late nineteenth century, most cooking reformers grew up with the value system that rested upon the older form of therapeutic ethos, which, according to Lears, originated in the professionalization of medicine that began in the early nineteenth century and promoted a defensive and maintenance orientation toward mental and physical health.[13] This state of mind assumed physical and psychic scarcity, within which individuals maintained or restored health or strove to conserve their energies. Many cooking reformers adopted this value system in their approach to the issue of health. For instance, as Anna Barrows wrote for a Protestant newspaper in 1887:

> We must keep a reserve force of nerve power, our capital on which we draw in time of need. Our American people live too hard, and daily use all the strength they have; by and by, when a greater strain comes, there is no capital in reserve, and the whole person, body and mind, yields either by sudden death or nervous prostration. Hence, to be ready to endure the strain of active life, the wise young man and woman will guard their health, and lay up a stock for years to come. Better not stand at the head of your class if to do so requires you to go without plenty of sleep, good food eaten slowly, and sufficient exercise, for these three are the foundation [sic] of good health.[14]

Barrows made her argument by assuming that energy was limited and called for saving physical and nerve powers for future use. She also equated the conservation of these strengths with health. In the same fashion, in the January 1899 issue of the *American Kitchen Magazine*, an anonymous writer described the role of the cooking school as: "Give the girl a knowledge of scientific principles at the basis of domestic affairs, and she has power; give her practice in doing what she thinks, and she has power, —power to

---

[13] Ibid., 6-12.

[14] Anna Barrows, "Ready to Act," *Christian Union*, March 10, 1887, 15.

save income, health and life. . ."[15] (emphasis mine). Like Barrows, this writer displayed a prudential, maintenance-oriented approach to the role of cooking in women's lives.

The quest for self-realization and improvement by saving and managing resources laid the groundwork for the growth of experts who purported to help individuals achieve that goal. Teachers of scientific cookery represented such professions, focusing on the role of foods in preventing sickness and maintaining health through diet. This maintenance orientation of scientific cookery best reflected the "repair" metaphor employed by the cooking experts. For instance, in discussing the role of water in circulating blood, Juliet Corson said in 1879, "This fluid condition is necessary, both to the blood and to the secretion, in order to enable them to supply the body with new material, to repair its daily waste, and also to afford an avenue for the discharge of its worn-out particles."[16] Sarah Tyson Rorer employed this repair theory thirty-five years later when she wrote, "A person in perfect health must . . . repair the tissues of the body with proper foods, every twenty-four hours."[17] Culinary experts thus reasoned that tissues or other physical organs would wear out in everyday life and needed to be "repaired" by supplying proper nutrition to these "broken" tissues.

The culinary reformers' maintenance approach to cooking best manifested itself in dietetics. A specialty of cookery which aimed to use diet to restore health and treat

---

[15] *American Kitchen Magazine* 10 (January 1899): 130-31.

[16] Juliet Corson, *Cooking School Text Book* (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1878), 228.

[17] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's Diet for the Sick* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1914), 7.

disease, dietetics was also often called "therapeutic diet"[18] or "therapeutics of diet."[19] Dietetics embodied a belief in the role of food in restoring health, and, as did other aspects of society, compartmentalized and analyzed the disease and prescribed diets accordingly. Dietetics reasoned that different diseases would require different prescriptions of diet, rather than the "one size fits all" approach that physicians had taken.[20]

Among the many cookbook authors who worked in the field of dietetics, Juliet Corson, Sarah Tyson Rorer, Ella Eaton Kellogg, and Fannie Farmer in particular, contributed to developing this specific branch of scientific cookery. Originally launching her career as a cooking reformer primarily to address the plight of the poor in New York City, Corson soon took up dietetics and introduced a course of cooking for invalids at several schools and hospitals, including New York State Training School for Nurses, the Brooklyn City Hospital, and the New York State Charity Hospital Training Schools.[21] She also wrote articles on dietetics in the *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, a monthly journal for physicians, from 1882 to 1883 and published *Diet for Invalids and Children* in 1886. Originally entertaining an ambition to become a pharmacist, Rorer apparently had an interest in curing disease even before launching her cooking career. She founded the Philadelphia Cooking School in 1882, in response to encouragement by local physicians,

---

[18] Dearborn, 153.

[19] Weigley, 68.

[20] Ibid., 18.

[21] The Historic American Cookbook Project, "Corson, Juliet," The Historic American Cookbook Project, http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_corson.html.

who felt that lectures on nutrition, diet and cookery would enhance the public welfare.[22] Also at their request, Rorer set up a diet kitchen to prepare and deliver meals that had been prescribed to patients.[23] Rorer edited "Dietetics: Food for Invalids" in *Table Talk* and later the "Cookery for the Invalid" section of her monthly journal, *Household News*. She also published *Mrs. Rorer's Diet for the Sick* in 1914 to disseminate her knowledge of dietetics. Ella Eaton Kellogg, probably after visiting cooking schools in both Philadelphia and New York in 1883, taught dietetics to nurses at the Battle Creek Sanitarium School of Home Economics. She was also a charter member of the American Dietetic Association.[24] Fannie Farmer, having contracted polio in her youth, was especially convinced of the importance of diet for physical health. According to Laura Shapiro, after leaving the Boston Cooking School and opening Miss Farmer's School of Cookery in 1902, Farmer focused on dietetics[25] and two years later, published a comprehensive *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent*, which targeted nurses as well as mothers. Through these works, cooking experts like Corson, Rorer, Kellogg, and Farmer contributed to the development of dietetics, whose professionalization culminated with the foundation of the American Dietetic Association in 1917.

---

[22] Blanche M. Stover, *The History of Home Economics*, ed. Hazel T. Craig (New York: Practical Home Economics, 1945), 7.

[23] Wiegley, 33-4.

[24] The Historic American Cookbook Project, "Kellogg, Ella Eaton," The Historic American Cookbook Project, http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_kellogg.html.

[25] The Historic American Cookbook Project, "Farmer, Fannie Merritt," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_farmer.html.

Dietetics brought cooking experts into contact with male physicians, which helped reduce the inequality in power relations between those male physicians and women in the health professions. As Joan Burbick shows in her work on the narratives of health during the mid-nineteenth century, the role of ordinary women as caretakers of health declined as physicians, lay healers, and the teaching of physiology competed with each other for authority as guardians of the nation's health.[26] However, the growing recognition of the influence of food in maintaining health gave middle-class women—at least some—leverage with which to assert cultural authority as caretakers of health. Male physicians might have had knowledge and understanding of the theory of dietetics but, because of the gender role prescriptions of the times, they had no practical skills to translate that knowledge into an actual meal. The development of professionalization along gender lines limited women's advancement into science, but ironically, this limitation opened up the field of cooking, which put women in a position where male doctors solicited their advice on diets for the sick.

In this cultural milieu, some cooking experts commanded authority over male physicians, who epitomized Anglo-Saxon professionalism. For instance, Sarah Tyson Rorer held a class at home for three doctors from the Jefferson and the University of Pennsylvania hospitals and taught them her ideas about the relation of food and diet to diseases.[27] In addition, as suggested by Philadelphia's best doctors, Rorer set up a diet kitchen in her school to prepare meals for patients and acted as a diet advisor to those

---

[26] Joan Burbick, *Healing the Republic: The Language of Health and the Culture of Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 4.

[27] Weigley, 24-25.

sent by the city's doctors.[28] This strong tie with the medical world apparently led to the appearance of physicians at local food fairs. Annual Philadelphia Food Expositions often designated one day as "Doctors' Day," where Rorer lectured on "How to Feed Our Sick." According to local newspapers, this event drew scores of the city's hospital and private physicians and nurses, who listened to Rorer's talk on diets for, among others, diabetes and consumption.[29] Hence, some physicians expressed gratitude to the cooking experts. At the Philadelphia County Medical Society in 1883, Charles M. Seltzen, M.D., presented a paper entitled "Dietetics for the Sick," which the doctor stated that he had studied "under the instructions and guidance of Mrs. S. T. Rorer" and suggested other society members follow suit, asserting, "I can safely say that if every member of this Society were to do likewise, their . . . success, and self-satisfaction in the practice of medicine would be increased many fold."[30] The *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, a medical journal, expressed the same gratitude to Rorer's lecture, writing, "One lecture in the course for the special benefit of physicians, is given to the preparation of food for the sick, and the physician who is fortunate enough to hear the lecture will find he has gained more of practical benefit from this clinical demonstration than he could glean from physiologies and chemistries innumerable."[31] In the same vein, Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, then

---

[28] Ibid., 33-34.

[29] "At the Food Show," *Public Ledger*, November 22, 1892, 2; "Two Cooking Lessons," *Philadelphia Times*, November 23, 1893, 22; "Proper Diet for the Sick," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 15, 1894, 2; "Doctors' Day at the Food Show," *Philadelphia Record*, November 15, 1894, 5; "How to Feed Our Sick," *Public Ledger*, November 15, 1894, 10.

[30] *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, October. 13, 1883, 402.

[31] "The Food Exposition," *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, November, 25, 1893, 833.

pioneering in the study of diabetes, credited Fannie Farmer as "the stimulus which started me in writing about diabetes."[32] Cooking experts like Farmer and Rorer exerted their influence on male physicians, who then acknowledged these women's works in dietetics.

Thus dietetics augmented the authority of women cooking experts. Perhaps because they were well aware of the power that dietetics bestowed upon them, these women used their specialty as a publicity tool. In publicizing the school in 1901, the *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* highlighted the school's authority on dietetics, writing, "The SCHOOL is an authority on Invalid Cookery, having for years given instruction on that subject to the students of the Harvard Medical School, to the State and City Hospitals of Massachusetts and other States"[33] (capitals in original). Perhaps this sense of authority over highly regarded medical institutions reflected a sense of accomplishment of the cooking experts, especially those specializing in dietetics.

In addition to the defense approach represented by dietetics, many culinary authorities endorsed a newer, abundance therapy in cooking and eating. As Jackson Lears explains, both older and newer therapeutic ideals pointed to a secular project, but, in contrast to an older ideal, which was based on the scarcity of resources, a newer version aimed to tap abundant energy. A newer therapeutic ethos assumed abundant resources, from which to draw out emotional exuberance and bodily vigor.[34] In the realm of cooking and eating, the ideal of abundance focused on drawing the emotional exuberance of the

---

[32] Edward T. James, ed., *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Presds of Harvard University Press, 1971), 597.

[33] *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* 6 (October 1901): advertising page.

[34] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," 12-15.

cooking and eating experiences. Put differently, the newer therapeutic ideal primarily pointed to the sensuality of food: the flavor, appearance, and taste of dishes.

Cooking experts did care about the non-functional parts of eating, at least to some degree. Juliet Corson defined good cooking: "It gives that variety of flavor and diversity of form upon which the appetite so largely depends; in a word, it insures the fulfillment of the requirements of health, while it gratifies our gastronomic tastes."[35] Corson thus endorsed both the older and newer therapeutic ethos. In the same vein, Janet McKenzie Hill designed her 1902 cookbook to utilize "the most common and inexpensive food products"[36] and wrote, "That the careful use of this book may enable the thoughtful mistress or maid to . . . prepare them as to bring out and conserve their latent and nutritive qualities of juiciness and flavor, and at the same time render them pleasing to the eye and acceptable to the palate. . . ."[37] Hill stressed the importance of appearance and taste as well as nutrition. No matter how much they emphasized the wholesomeness of food, cooking reformers also endorsed gastronomic joy.

Among cooking experts at the turn of the twentieth century, Fannie Farmer stood out in her employment of abundance therapy in cooking and eating, especially for the sick. According to Shapiro, Farmer was more proud of *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent* (1904) than her other works, and "her sensitivity to the emotional state

---

[35] Juliet Corson, *Cooking School Text Book; and Housekeepers' Guide to Cookery and Kitchen Management* (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1879), 236.

[36] Janet McKenzie Hill, *Practical Cooking and Serving* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1902), x.

[37] Ibid.

of the patient was especially acute."[38] Farmer sympathized with the sick probably because she had experience. Farmer contracted polio during high school, which forced her to limp for the rest of her life. When the Boston Cooking School became part of Simmons College in 1902, Farmer opened Miss Farmer's School of Cookery, where she advertised a diet for the sick as the school's specialty.[39] In her approach to dietetics, Farmer employed abundance therapy; she underscored the power of emotion to stimulate the appetite of patients. This approach strongly attested to Farmer's affinity with mind cure.

Mind cure referred to a spiritual outlook that featured optimism and cheerfulness as avenues to a richer and fuller life. This positive thinking emanated from Protestantism and spawned new religious groups based on positive thinking, such as New Thought, Unity, and Christian Science in the late nineteenth century. Mind cure pointed to the extent of the secularization of American society, given that, regardless of religious affiliations, all mind curers believed in "salvation in this life."[40] Their emphasis on the secularized notion of health was best expressed by one sympathizer of New Thought, who asserted, "fear is the great disturber. It causes all physical ills" and "positive thinking

---

[38] Shapiro, 123.

[39] Ibid.

[40] J. H. Leuba, "Psychotherapic Cults: Christian Science; Mind Cure; New Thought, The Monist 22 (July 1912): 350-51; quoted in Willaim Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 228.

is essential for health and wisdom."[41] Assuming the connection between body and mind, mind curers prescribed that a healthy body depended on a healthy mind.

In tune with mind cure, Fannie Farmer underscored the emotional appeal of food, especially in dietetic cooking. According to her, "Important things to consider in feeding the sick" consisted of:

1. Appeal to the sense of sight.
2. Appeal to the sense of taste.
3. Consider temperature.
4. Digestibility.
5. Nutritive value.
6. Economy. [42]

By emphasizing the sight and taste of food, Farmer implied that sensual pleasure possessed power to draw the appetite of the sick. Hence, Farmer advised, for instance, that a loaf of bread be shaped into a heart and ice cream served in a "flower pot with a daisy stuck into it."[43] In the same fashion, in her advice on the sandwich in *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent*, Farmer directed, "The shape . . . often makes a difference. A heart-shaped sandwich often pleases an adult as well as a child."[44] Farmer seemed to reason that the pleasing sight of a meal would brighten a patient's mood, which would stimulate appetite and lead to curing the disease. Farmer was most likely to agree with one advocate of New Thought, who asserted, "There is a latent power . . . a

---

[41] Freeman Champney, *Art and Glory: The Story of Elbert and Hbbard* (New York, 1968); quoted in Leach, 230.

[42] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent*, 43; As Laura Shapiro notes, Farmer's colleagues in scientific cookery would have reversed this order. See Shapiro, 124.

[43] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, 37; quoted in Shapiro, 124.

[44] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, 178.

force of indestructible life, an immortal principle of health, in every individual, which if developed would heal all our wounds."[45] In accordance with this belief in the healing power of emotion, Farmer emphasized the eye-pleasing effect of food.

In addition to the shape of the food served, Farmer recommended an attractive place-setting for the sick. For instance, she directed, "Select the choicest china, silver, and glassware, making changes as often as possible. It often proves pleasing to carry out a color scheme. Nervous patients are apt to be depressed in the early morning, therefore for this reason make the breakfast tray as attractive as possible by using bright flowers."[46] Here again, aiming to enhance a patient's psychic mood, Farmer exalted the appearance of an entire meal. Even an advertising page of her *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent* contained a Boston cooking ware company that stressed the importance of eye appeal: "The serving of food in a dainty, appetizing way is very nearly as essential as to have it pure and properly cooked, to appeal to a sick person,"[47] with which Farmer surely agreed. Just as Farmer thought highly of the cheerfulness of a setting as a way to increase physical vigor, she extolled the pleasing appearance of a meal.

Thus Farmer suggested that emotion would play an important role in stimulating the appetite of the sick. In discussing the usefulness of chafing dish cookery (cooking in a pan on the table), Farmer wrote, "When the eye of the convalescent brightens and his appetite is stimulated by a choice tidbit prepared on the chafing dish, then its value is

---

[45] Orison Swett Marden, *Peace, Power, and Plenty* (New York, 1909), 12; quoted in Leach, 229.

[46] Ibid., 44.

[47] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, advertising page.

most appreciated, and it is considered among the indispensables. All in all, the chafing dish is most happily in evidence when congenial spirits meet to make glad after 'the lamps are lit' and 'small cheer and great welcome make a merry feast.'"[48] Farmer implied that not only the wholesomeness of chafing dish recipes themselves but also the emotion triggered by the chafing dish would help cure the sick. In the same vein, Farmer prescribed that "it is the duty of the cook to stimulate the appetite by appealing to the sense of hearing, smell, sight, and taste."[49] When most advocates of scientific cookery placed digestion as of paramount importance, Farmer underscored sensual feelings.

Fannie Farmer also exhorted doctors to cultivate pleasing personalities, probably because she believed that they would affect the mental state of the patient. In a lecture at a hospital that specialized in nervous disorders, Farmer advised doctors, "Please your patient whenever you can. No matter how scientific a doctor may be, if he is brusque he doesn't please, and a pleasing personality is a success no matter what the pursuit."[50] This emphasis on a pleasing personality marked the advent of a consumer culture. As Jackson Lears points out, a corporate society entailed increasing contact with people, as opposed to independent producers who primarily dealt with things. In a society of corporate capitalism, personality replaced character as a means to business success.[51] Perhaps Farmer was not aware that her habit of mind indicated a culture of consumption. She

---

[48] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *Chafing Dish Possibilities* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), 20.

[49] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, 15.

[50] Notebook, Lucy Allen papers; quoted in Shapiro, 123.

[51] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," 8; Warren I. Susman, *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), xx-xxii.

emphasized a doctor's pleasant personality because an affable doctor would help cheer the patient which would then affect his or her physical health.

Farmer's affinity with abundance therapy sharply contrasted with her colleagues in two major points: approach to kitchen drudgery and French cooking. In the approach to the issue of kitchen work as drudgery, if Fannie Farmer, the fourth principal of the Boston Cooking School (1891-1902), embodied a newer therapeutic ethos of abundance, by contrast, Mary J. Lincoln, the first principal (1879-1885), revealed an older therapy based on scarcity. Fond of ornamental dishes, Farmer seemed not to mind about spending long hours in the kitchen if cooking produced joy. Hence, her directions for "canary salad" read, "Moisten with Mayonnaise Dressing, replace cover, arrange on lettuce leaf, and garnish with a canary made by mashing Neufchâtel cheese, coloring yellow, and shaping, designating eyes with paprika and putting a few grains on body of bird. Also garnish with three eggs made from cheese colored green and speckled with paprika."[52] Farmer probably designed this "canary salad" and other elaborate dishes to evoke pleasure both in the cooks and the diners, in tune with an abundance therapy. By contrast, Mary J. Lincoln stated during her speech at the Woman's Congress at the Columbian Exposition of Chicago in 1893, "All labor in the preparation of food, which does not tend to make the food more digestible, or is done solely to give variety, or to cater to an unnatural appetite, is unprofitable. . . ." Lincoln insisted that the ultimate goal of cooking was to render foods digestible, which constituted the core of scientific cookery. She then went on to denounce elaborate dishes:

---

[52] Farmer, *Food and Cookery*, 254.

> Women would lessen the labor of cooking greatly if they would cease making mixtures of food materials which require much time and labor in their preparation, and also the expenditure of great digestive energy. Why should we take anything so simple and delicious as a properly roasted or boiled chicken, and expend time and labor in chopping it, mixing it with so many other things that we cannot detect its original flavor, then shaping, egging and crumbling it, and making it more indigestible by browning it in scorching fat?[53]

In contrast to Farmer, Lincoln evoked a scarcity therapy and emphasized preserving energy and time.

Whether cooking experts approached cooking and eating with scarcity or abundance therapy, they all assumed that maintaining or restoring physical health was the main goal of foodways. A therapeutic ethos then laid fertile ground for an embryonic consumer culture to grow, as Jackson Lears argues.[54] The affinity between a therapeutic ethos and a consumer culture was illustrated in a 1916 Quaker Oats advertisement, which read, "Mark the lovers of Quaker Oats. . . . They believed in keeping young. For oats create vitality. They feed the fires of youth. They are vim-producing, spirit-giving. . . . Lovers of life eat liberally. Lovers of languor don't."[55] This advertisement, taking the newer therapeutic approach, sang praises to high spirits that exalted invigorating youth and an exuberant life. Simply put, the message was: Eat Quaker Oats and your life will be richer and fuller. As this 1916 advertisement intertwined health, food, and a commercial message, the therapeutic ethos tied processed, packaged foods to consumer culture, both

---

[53] Mary J. Lincoln, "Extracts from Cookery, or Art and Science versus Drudgery and Luck," A Celebration of Women Writers, http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/eagle/congrees/lincon.html.

[54] Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization," xiii-xiv.

[55] *Good Housekeeping* 62 (June 1916), 109; quoted in T. J. Jakcosn Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 158.

of which developed at the turn of the twentieth century. Culinary reformers were part of this parallel development, not only by promoting food products but also by endorsing culinary and commercial aesthetics.

CHAPTER V

APPEALING TO THE EYE: CULINARY AND COMMERCIAL AESTHETICS

As discussed in the previous chapter, cooking reformers endorsed the sensual aspects of the eating experience as well as nutrition. Among the senses, culinary experts put a special emphasis on sight, as the *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* editorialized in 1913: "Cooking may also be a high art as well as a science, for it appeals to the three senses of sight, taste and smell. . . . Color and decoration enter very largely into the effect and value, as well as the appearance of what we eat, therefore these deserve to be carefully studied."[1] Many cooking experts agreed with this approach to cooking as art and incorporated the value of eye appeal into their recipes and meal arrangements.

This chapter traces how culinary reformers adopted aesthetics into their recipes and how they viewed eye-pleasing decorations displayed at food expositions during the 1890s. The invention of new visual devices, such as photography and color, prompted not only merchants but also cooking experts to pursue these eye-appealing techniques. As Wendy Woloson observes, in her study of confectionery, "Outside influences clearly affected how women behaved in their homes. Cooking classes, commercial expositions, window displays, and advertising informed them about the current fashions and which ones they should try implementing at home."[2] Cooking teachers joined other commercial ventures to promote the value of eye appeal among women.

---

[1] "Woman's Affairs," *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* 18 (November 1913): 287.

[2] Wendy A. Woloson, *Refined Tastes: Sugar, Confectionery, and Consumers in Nineteenth-Century America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 2002), 212.

Culinary reformers' espousal of commercial aesthetics proved their orientation toward a culture of consumption. By the first half of the nineteenth century, Americans had linked aesthetics to sensuality and European aristocracy and disapproved of any kind of aesthetic enterprise. By the second half of the century, however, the urban elite had embraced aestheticism, decorating their houses with European paintings and statuaries, for instance.[3] Cooking experts incorporated this trend, thus promoting one critical ethos of consumer culture. However, the purported "high culture" that culinary teachers endorsed was soon threatened by "low culture," that is, the culture of mass consumption and amusement.

To begin with, the development of culinary aesthetics represented the notion of novelty, which constituted an important aspect of consumer culture. As William Leach writes, fashion occupied the center of this idea and encouraged the production and consumption of model changes and new commodities. This quest for the new had been embedded in the tradition of the United States, which was often described as the "New World," "new heaven on earth," and "new nation." The Enlightenment, which pursued science and reason, had also accelerated this quest for the new.[4] Consequently, novelty had entered the American commercial lexicon by the late nineteenth century. Perhaps Fannie Farmer embraced novelty more than her colleagues. Her prose style featured

---

[3] T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture*, 1880-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981), 77.

[4] William Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 4-5.

directness, yet, in contrast, her recipes embodied imagination and sentiment,[5] as she invented many recipes, added novelties to many basic preparations, and applied French names. She strove for "new ways, new ingredients, and new combinations,"[6] in the words of Laura Shapiro. Farmer's popularity—her *Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* (1896) enjoyed better sales than any other contemporary cookbook—might have rested on her penchant for novelty, which matched the emerging consumer culture.

Arguably the advent of photography, a novel technology, prompted cooking reformers to value the appearance of dishes and meals. The halftone screen process had been developed by 1893, enabling magazines to utilize photography, a new technology which, by the beginning of the new century, had quickly come to constitute a major illustrative tool for commercial aesthetics.[7] As early as 1892, Ella Eaton Kellogg inserted several photos in her cookbook, showing the procedures for making soup and using zwieback for fruit toast as well as illustrating finished dishes, such as "nut pound cake, "bean croquettes" and "baked cabbage a la russe."[8] Kellogg made efforts to present her dishes aesthetically in photos by decorating these finished dishes with flowers.

Among the high-profile cooking authorities, Janet McKenzie Hill pioneered the use of photography in her recipes, thus stimulating the popularity of culinary aesthetics.

---

[5] Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1986), 121-23.
[6] Ibid., 123.

[7] Elspeth H. Brown, *The Corporate Eye: Photography and the Rationalization of American Commercial Culture, 1884-1929* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 162-63.

[8] Ella Eaton Kellogg, *Science in the Kitchen* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Modern Medicine Publishing Co., 1893), 275, 291, 390, 474.

In response to the publication of the Century Corporation's cookbook in 1895, which utilized photography, the board of managers of the Boston Cooking School invited Hill in early 1896 to propose a new culinary magazine. This meeting led to the inauguration of the *Boston Cooking School Magazine* in the summer, with Hill as editor. The photographs in the magazine drew the attention of a man who was assisting Edward Bok of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, who, by the end of the 1890s, invited Hill to join Maria Parloa and Sarah Tyson Rorer in managing the magazine's household department.[9] Supplying photos of finished dishes to the magazine, Hill actively used photography in her culinary presentations, which placed her "in the front rank of writers on such subjects."[10] Hill wrote in her 1902 cookbook, "As the main idea in *The Journal* was pictorial rather than literacy, the details of combination (in recipes) were not dwelt upon in that publication; these are here . . . now made complete."[11] Not content with simply appealing to the eye, Hill nevertheless emphasized the verbal explanation of her methods. Yet, by promoting eye appeal, Hill, along with other culinary reformers, contributed to shaping a culture of consumption.

In the realm of eye appeal, the use of color constituted a growing aspect of commercial aesthetics by the turn of the twentieth century. William Leach writes that commercial institutions employed color coordination to create an image of a secular paradise blessed with material abundance. For example, the Hotel del Coronado near San

---

[9] Myra Belle Horne Lord, *History of New England Woman's Press Association, 1885-1931* (Newton, Mass.: Graphic Press, 1932), 215.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Janet McKenzie Hill, *Practical Cooking and Serving* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1902), ix.

Diego, California, featured rooms which coordinated the wallpaper, china, and hand towels with one color scheme. One artist also orchestrated the entire Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915 by color. As Artemas Ward, pioneer advertiser and editor of *Fame*, proclaimed, "It (color) *creates desire for the goods displayed*"[12] (emphasis in original). The commercial world rapidly employed color as a medium to rouse a consumer appetite.

Like commercial artists, cooking experts incorporated color into their culinary explorations to enhance the eye appeal of dishes. In addition to Fannie Farmer's recommendation of using color coordination to brighten the mental state of patients (See chapter IV), cooking schools also featured color-coordinated meals. At the Philadelphia Cooking School in 1892, one student organized a "Princeton dinner," where she coordinated all dishes in the school colors, orange and black. She even served a syllabub—a British beverage mixing milk, wine, and sugar—in orange skins completed with black ribbons. To counter the Ivy League rival, one of her classmates later presented a "Harvard breakfast," coordinated with crimson.[13] Cooking teachers and students actively incorporated color schemes into their meals.

The connection between cooking and commerce in the employment of color was best reflected in the table decorations featured at food expositions. The Philadelphia Food Exposition introduced an exhibit of table decorations in 1892, which were connected with Sarah Tyson Rorer's demonstration lectures. One day, the show featured a "Violet Tea,"

---

[12] Artemas Ward, "A Pictorial Presentation of Interborough Medium" (New York, 1925), the New York Public Library; quoted in Leach, 45.

[13] Emma Seifrit Weigley, *Sarah Tyson Rorer: The Nation's Instructress in Dietetics and Cookery* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1977), 85-86.

wherein "the little dining-room was all redecorated in violet—the lamp shades and ribbons of the same color," while another day held the "Blue Lunch," where "the china was blue Viennese, placed upon a white, with blue border table cloth, napkins to match." The "Yellow Dinner" came around the next day, where the "china in white, with a yellow border, was one of the very prettiest, and with a jar filled with pearl roses and many pieces of sparking cut glass, the yellow shades produced effect." [14] Thus food expositions emphasized the aesthetic aspect of dining through the use of color schemes.

No matter how aesthetic color-coordinated tables and other eye-appealing dishes appeared, by employing color in meals and in the kitchen, culinary reformers pointed out two primary means of control. First, consciously or unconsciously, they viewed eye-appealing dishes as part of kitchen management. "Color-coordinated meals were praised for being artistic as well as pragmatic, but what they represented most of all was the achievement of an extraordinary degree of control over the messy, unpredictable business of the kitchen,"[15] argues Laura Shapiro. Culinary reformers were well aware that, more than promoting cooking as an intellectual endeavor, a beautiful appearance of the dishes and cooks would help counteract the idea of kitchen work as drudgery, a perception prevalent among middle-class women.

Second, color-coordinated themes, along with other color schemes, such as using white sauce to whiten the dish, reflected the dominant culture's aim to overcome nature. As Jackson Lears observes, "The industrialization of eating was not merely an economic

---

[14] Imogene Belden, "Table Decorations at Philadelphia Food Exposition," *Table Talk* 7 (February 1892): 45.

[15] Shapiro, 84.

development; it was also an important expression of the nervous desire to control biology. . . . Technological triumph over 'paws and perspiration' became a chief preoccupation of corporate food processors."[16] This taming of nature in the form of processed foods was also reflected in cooking. As Shapiro writes, "Cooking teachers taught their pupils techniques that would help them tame food, rather than bring it to life, and the resulting dishes tended to be laden with the evidence of this domestication."[17] After all, cooking meant mediating between nature and culture by utilizing fire and water as well as such artifacts as pots and pans to "cultivate" food—a product of nature—into products called dishes.[18] Color-coordinated meals provided one method of turning something from nature into culture.

Perhaps this effort to control nature was best reflected in Fannie Farmer's recipes for holiday foods. Farmer coordinated a Valentine's meal with pink and white and molded salmon, Lovers' Sandwiches, and Heart's Ache Pudding all in the shape of hearts. She even concocted "Cupid's Deceits," which hid small pieces of cream-cheese-and-olives between two walnut halves. For St. Patrick's Day, Farmer made an entire meal as green as possible. In 1905 for Christmas Farmer placed in each dish a four-inch-sized wooden doll dressed in a red and green outfit made of crepe.[19] Farmer turned nature (food) into a complete form of cultural artifact in celebrating holidays.

---

[16] T. J. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 171.

[17] Ibid., 95.

[18] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Raw and the Cooked* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 64.

[19] Shapiro, 122.

As "holidays and special occasions were a major focus of consumer culture,"[20] Fannie Farmer celebrated holidays not only in cooking but in the larger context of the consumer culture as well. In the December 1905 issue of *Woman's Home Companion*, the famous cookbook author began her article by writing, "'Christmas is the glad time of the year,' and at this joyous season I never have a more truly holiday spirit than when visiting our large city markets so abundantly supplied with good things. The evergreens and trees, with holly and mistletoe on every side, make me feel like saying, 'Merry Christmas to all.'"[21] Spouting joyful exuberance, Farmer linked Christmas with food abundance in the markets, just as "urban merchandising began to give substance and form to the Christmas rituals"[22] in the effort to create a consumer desire for merchandise.

Fannie Farmer's linking of holiday celebrations to material abundance was best reflected in the food expositions, a food version of the popular world's fairs. Philadelphia spearheaded the trend, holding its first annual pure food exposition in 1889, and many other major American cities soon followed suit. The exposition provided food manufacturers who claimed to be committed to the cause of pure food with the opportunity to set up their own booths and decorate them as creatively and aesthetically as possible to attract the attention of potential customers.

---

[20] Rebecca Edwards, *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 93.

[21] Fannie Merritt Farmer, "Good Things for the Christmas Dinner," *Woman's Home Companion* 32 (December 1905): 20.

[22] Leach, 88.

As with other commercial and entertainment institutions, food expositions employed the notion of a "central idea," a single, unifying theme that ran the show. As William Leach speculates, this concept might have derived from theaters, pageants, or world's fairs,[23] all of which required the cooperation of every participant in creating a show under one unified theme.[24] As a miniature version of world's fairs, food expositions adopted this "central idea," tying decorative booths and halls to music and parades to create a festive atmosphere. The fair usually opened with a parade, like the large street parade . . . by a large number of the exhibitors"[25] in Cincinnati in 1898. That city held both the 1894 and 1898 pure food expositions at its Music Hall and featured a performance by an orchestra,[26] just as other food expositions did. In accordance with the predominance of women at food fairs, the managers of the 1898 Minneapolis Food Exposition intentionally selected a women's music group from Chicago, called "the Miller Ladies' Orchestra."[27] Perhaps even more than the food expositions, a corn festival committed itself to this "central idea." According to the *New England Kitchen Magazine*, "The general features of these exhibits are similar and not unlike many of the food

---

[23] John F. Kasson and David Nasaw write that the Columbian Exposition was coordinated by central planning. In John F. Kasson, *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978), 17-18; David Nasaw, *Going Out: the Rise and Fall of Public Amusements* (New York: BasicBooks, 1993), 67.

[24] Leach, 81-82.

[25] "Pure Food Expo," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, November. 7, 1898, 6 ; "Pure Food," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, November. 8, 1898, 7.

[26] Cincinnati Retail Grocers' Association. *Souvenir Program: The Pure Food Exposition, Music Hall, November 7th to 27th, 1898* (Cincinnati, 1898), Cincinnati Historical Society Library, 7.

[27] "Pure Food Show," *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 11, 1898, 7.

expositions, only Indian corn is made the leading feature, not only in decoration, but also in the literary and musical exercises, and in the restaurant."[28] Whatever the theme of the fair, the expositions coordinated discrete elements into one unified theme to create a festive atmosphere.

Managers of the food expositions and culinary reformers approached the food expositions, which featured commercial art, as purveyors of high culture. Like other recreational and entertainment institutions of the late nineteenth century, such as New York's Central Park and Chicago's Columbian Exposition, food expositions reflected the cultural elite's intention to set the aesthetic standard and to display social responsibility.[29] Believing that even leisure should be instructive,[30] culinary reformers emphasized the edifying nature of the food expositions. Reporting on the World's Food Fair held in Boston in 1894, *New England Kitchen Magazine* wrote, "Most people, even those who are intelligent and well educated on other points, are densely ignorant as to the food they eat, and quite careless as to its possible effect. For such the food fair is often the means of awakening an interest in that most vital question, the quality of the food supply."[31] True to the original and paramount objective of the food fair, the magazine emphasized the educational effect of the exposition on its audience.

---

[28] "Corn Festivals," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 18.

[29] Kasson, 11.

[30] Ibid., 4.

[31] "World's Food Fair," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (October 1894): 3.

Genteel culinary reformers expected food fairs to live up to their standard of aesthetics. As John Kasson writes, members of "high" culture joined forces with members of "middle" culture, such as commercial artists, to reinforce the dominance of a genteel culture.[32] Hence, reporting on food fairs, particularly during their initial years, cooking reformers openly admired the artistic accomplishments. For instance, the October 1894 issue of the *New England Kitchen Magazine* broadly described the World's Food Fair held in Boston as follows:

> The exhibition is an unusually attractive one from the artistic point of view, the decorations of flags and gay buntings which cover up the rough bricks and mortar, or festoon the high ceilings and hang from the great beams, being especially well arranged. Many of the booths are remarkably attractive, some catching the eye by pretty color effects wrought out in delicate muslins or crêpe papers; some showing a startling novelty in design or bizarre decorations; others present a more sober, dignified and substantial front to the public.

The writer (perhaps Anna Barrows, the magazine's editor) approved the standard of commercial aesthetics displayed at the food fair. The article then moved to specifics, looking at booths one by one, describing, for example, the Cleveland Baking Powder Co. booth as "a lesson as to what may be done in decoration with such unpromising materials as baking-powder cans. It is a handsome arrangement in orange and white, and includes a tall chimney piece made entirely of cans in their orange wrappers;" Doliber-Goodable Co's exhibit as "a very attractive pavilion, with green and creamy white decorations, furnished with rugs and comfortable chairs and many pictures of 'Mellin's Food babies';" and, the Walter Baker Co.'s space as "a beautiful cream-colored edifice that reminds one

---

[32] Kasson, 4-5.

of a Pompeian villa with its pillars and potted plants and ferns. . . ."[33] These decorative booths measured up to the aesthetic judgment of the culinary reformers: refined and tasteful, as opposed to vulgar.

Sarah Tyson Rorer also endorsed the use of aesthetics for commercial purposes. During the pure food exhibition of 1890 in Philadelphia, a local newspaper reported, that Rorer took charge of the Cleveland Baking Powder Company's exhibit, in which she not only supervised the making of French crullers and gave them away to visitors but also designed the display of the exhibit, featuring the Princeton colors of orange and black.[34] The article did not indicate why Rorer chose these colors; perhaps they revealed her sense of rivalry with the Boston Cooking School and Harvard University. Nor did the newspaper write whether the company asked Rorer to do the display or vice versa, yet the culinary teacher was definitely fascinated with the aesthetic aspect of food fairs. In one 1900 issue of *Printer's Ink*, an advertising trade magazine, Rorer offered her opinions on samples, one of the popular promotional tools. Perhaps responding to criticism of women visitors scrambling for free samples at food fairs, she wrote, "The grab of samples . . . is not so much that women want so much for nothing. It is due rather to the fact that they are put up in attractive packages." Rorer seemed to accept women's desire for samples as long as consumers were attracted to aesthetics that lived up to her standard. The article closed with her remark on food expositions, asserting, "A good show . . . brings the

---

[33] "World's Food Fair," 5-7.

[34] "Pure Food Exhibit," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 26, 1890, 2.

housewives into close contact with the best of everything."[35] Rorer admitted that commercial aesthetics constituted a primary feature of the food expositions, along with pure food, purportedly the major star of the exhibition.

As the commercial nature of food shows intensified, the events came to serve as sites of tension between the genteel culture and a new culture of mass amusement. As John Kasson writes, P. T. Barnum, the nineteenth-century showman, incorporated elements of high culture—moral elevation and refinement—into his shows in the mid- and late nineteenth century. However, by the beginning of the twentieth century, creators of mass entertainment had actively infused vigor, exuberance and sensuality[36]—elements of "abundance therapy"—into institutions of amusement, most notably Coney Island. If the New York resort, whose amusement park began in 1895 and prospered for twenty or so years, embodied "a harbinger of modernity"[37] or "a harbinger of the new mass culture,"[38] food expositions, which proliferated during the 1890s, marked a mixture of an old genteel culture and a new culture of mass amusement.

This shift from the edifying to the entertaining was reflected in the media reports on the food expositions. No matter how much the cooking experts and manufacturers promoted food expositions as an educational medium, the media portrayed the event as a

---

[35] "Mrs. Rorer on Samples," *Printer's Ink*, April 11, 1900, 11.

[36] New England Retail Grocers' Associations. *World's Food Fair and Home Congress: Mechanics' Building, Boston, Monday, Oct. 5 to Saturday, Nov. 7, 1896* (Boston: Barta Press, 1896), 9, Hagley Museum and Library. Wilmington, Delaware.

[37] Kasson, 8.

[38] Ibid., 112.

festival. Newspapers routinely classified food shows as entertainment; the *Philadelphia Press* placed the announcement for the food exposition under the "Amusement" column in 1894 with an accompanying description: "The biggest show of the season. Everybody likes the food show."[39] This copy showed that the newspaper was promoting the exposition as a venue of entertainment, rather than of education. By the second half of the 1890s, the media's view of the food exposition as amusement intensified. In 1897, the same newspaper reported on a food exposition in an article entitled "The Food Show: A Popular Place": "'Living's cheap in November,' said a seedy chappie one day in New York, 'just have to buy a 25 cent ticket to the Food Show and get three meals'. . . . For the 'feasting and the folly and the fun' that's going on there might be likened into a continuous banquet. . . ."[40] The paper portrayed the exposition as a cheap carnival with no hint of the event's educational effect on its audience. In the same vein, the brochure for the Cincinnati Pure Food Exposition of 1898 promoted the fair as "ATTRACTIONS. Gathered From All Parts of the Country—And Arranged to Please the Eye and Delight the Soul."[41] The managers of food expositions and the media increasingly publicized the fair as amusement by the second half of the 1890s.

The growing perception of food fairs as amusement at the turn of the century coincided with growing prominence of the midway, an amusement district at the world's expositions. Although the Cincinnati Pure Food Exposition of 1898 marked a transitional

---

[39] "Amusements," *Philadelphia Press*, November 6, 1894, 12.

[40] "The Food Show A Popular Place," *Philadelphia Press*, November 12, 1897, 8.

[41] Cincinnati Retail Grocers' Association, 4.

moment between the Columbian Exposition of 1893, at which its managers placed the midway on the fringe of the fairgrounds, and the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904, where the midway existed in the middle of the site,[42] the 1898 food fair's promotion of the midway heavily inclined toward popular entertainment. In publicizing the midway, which was directly transferred from the Omaha Exposition held earlier that year,[43] the brochure of the Cincinnati food fair wrote, "As no Exposition is complete without a Midway, arrangements with the leading attractions at the Omaha Exposition have been consummated and a full-fledged Midway will add its charm to the already replete Programme."[44] The 1898 food exposition displayed no qualms about featuring its midway.

Ebbing dominance of the genteel culture at a food show was reflected in a fictional piece that Walt McDougall, a commercial artist, contributed to a Philadelphia newspaper in 1900. In the story of the fictional Pettigrew family, Mr. Pettigrew explained the food show to his son as "a trap laid by the Grocers, Picklers, Canners and Wheat Crackers' Trust to catch unwary women, baited with samples, raw or cooked, of every form of edible that women serve to their husbands for breakfast."[45] Mr. Pettigrew mocked the food show as a business gimmick, as opposed to the educational opportunity promoted by culinary reformers. He then eschewed accompanying his wife, saying, "No

---

[42] Nasaw, 67-69.

[43] Cincinnati Retail Grocers' Association, 9.

[44] Ibid.

[45] "The Food Show As Artist Walt McDgougall Describes IT," *Philadelphia North American*, November 13, 1900, 2.

crumpled oats nor Uncle Ell's Pancakes in mine," but agreed to go with her after learning that he could get alcohol there. Mr. Pettigrew denigrated the "healthy" foods that the food expositions had to offer and flatly challenged the temperance cause. McDougall ridiculed the high culture that the food exposition purported to promote and was cynical about the commercial aspect as well.

The growing perception of food shows as entertainment, as opposed to education involved the media's growing attention to women —"pretty women" to be precise—as part of commercial aesthetics. A Philadelphia newspaper wrote of a local food fair in 1897, "One can follow the pretty demonstrators from Boston to Chicago, as one follows the singers in light opera. . . ,"[46] thus portraying these "pretty demonstrators" as quasi-celebrities, a trend of the consumer culture that exalted personality over character. In the same vein, a Minneapolis newspaper described that city's food show of 1898 as "a gay and festive appearance. Several dozen booths, large and small, are scattered about over the temporary floor. They are decorated in the best style and filled with attractive packages and pretty women. . . ."[47] Newspapers counted the women who attended the booths as part of the exposition's attractions, along with the decorative booths and packages. The media's attention to "pretty women" also coincided with a growing prominence of childish-looking women in the advertising iconography like the Gibson Girls. Jackson Lears speculates that this infantilization of women in advertising reflected men's fear of sophisticated women, which intensified as the falling birth rate and the

[46] "The Food Show A Popular Place," 8.

[47] "Pure Food Show," 7.

expansion of women's sphere rendered women less domestic and therefore, more intimidating to men.[48]

The feminine and infantilized figures that the media portrayed and the presence of cooking authorities suggested contrasting images of modern women: smiling "pretty girls" on one hand, and seasoned experts in scientific cookery on the other. This polarization was reflected in promotional literature that juxtaposed these two opposing figures. Sarah Tyson Rorer posed for a photo with four smiling "College Singing Girls"[49] at the tent Chautauqua, which provided vaudeville, lectures, and musical performances that were acceptable to high-minded Americans living in small towns.[50] With the solemn-looking Rorer standing statuesquely in the middle of a group of four smiling young women, this photo highlighted the contrast between the two figures, an elderly cooking authority and the young chorus women. In the same vein, a 1915 Jell-O recipe booklet carried facial portraits of six cooking experts and a Kewpie on the same page.[51] A set of these two opposing figures indicated the booklet's practicality and imaginative appeal, although juxtaposing cooking experts with feminine, infantilized figures might have reduced the professional authority of the culinary experts.

Thus the "low culture" of mass amusement had threatened the high culture that culinary authorities cherished by the early twentieth century. They endorsed commercial

---

[48] Lears, *Fables of Abundance*, 187.

[49] James R. Schultz, *The Romance of Small-Town Chautauquas* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002), 63.

[50] Donna R. Braden, *Leisure and Entertainment in America* (Dearborn, Mich.: Henry Ford Museum & Greenfield Village, 1988), 145.

[51] The Genesee Pure Food Co., *Jell-O and the Kewpies: America's Most Famous Dessert* (Le Roy, N.Y.: The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1915), 1.

aesthetics featured at food expositions and actively adopted the core value of visuals—eye appeal—into their culinary schemes. Cooking reformers not only helped develop commercial visuals; they collaborated with food businesses to usher in the age of consumer capitalism as well.

CHAPTER VI

CULINARY REFORMERS AS INTERPRETERS BETWEEN PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

The confluence of industrialization, transportation development, and American overseas expansion at the turn of the twentieth century increased the amount of food production and the variety of foods available to Americans. To introduce new food items into American society, as well as to compete for consumer attention, food manufacturers and trading companies mobilized well-known cooking experts, who compiled advertising cookbooks and publicized new food items in magazines. As Sarah Tyson Rorer had managed a baking powder company's booth, cooking teachers and their students managed company booths at food expositions. Consequently, the *New England Kitchen Magazine* noted the popularity of food expositions in the United States in 1894 and wrote in self-congratulation, "The teachers of cookery have acted as interpreters between producer and consumer, and have thus added much to the success of these expositions."[1] Culinary experts proudly assumed this role of mediator not only at food expositions but in magazine articles and advertising cookbooks as well.

This chapter explores how cooking experts played the role of interpreters between food businesses and consumers. When and how did the collaboration between business and cooking authorities begin? Who sought the endorsement of cooking experts and why? What did they do as intermediaries? Did culinary authorities encounter any problems and difficulties as mediators? If so, why did problems arise? By answering

[1] "Food Fairs," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (October 1894): 43.

these questions, this chapter will illuminate how cooking experts helped stimulate consumer desire for new foodstuffs and thus contributed to shaping a culture of consumer capitalism in the realm of marketing strategies. Cooking experts helped modernize American foodways, which increasingly came to involve foods that traveled a long distance, such as factory-made processed foods and tropical produce. As Richard Ohmann writes, if packaged brand name products widely advertised in national magazines marked the professional-managerial class,[2] so did tropical foods, although these foodstuffs gradually filtered down into the lower classes.

Cooking reformers originally aligned with food businesses in the wake of the scandals over food adulteration and contamination in postbellum America. As industrialization and urbanization progressed, the market became anonymous, which tempted many food manufacturers to adulterate their products with cheap and questionable substances.[3] Many food companies enlisted professional authorities—cooking experts as well as chemists—to legitimize their products in their advertising, including advertising recipe booklets, so that they could shake off the bad publicity that the food industry incurred for its contaminated and adulterated food products.

Among the many food manufactures that enlisted cooking reformers, baking powder companies were the most aggressive. Used in making everyday foodstuffs such as breads, biscuits, and cakes, baking powder, a combination of two powders of alkali and a weak acid, was targeted to housewives; and thus companies sought endorsement

---

[2] Richard M. Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Verso, 1996), 167, 172.

[3] Steven L. Piott, *American Reformers, 1870-1920: Progressives in Word and Deed* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006), 9.

from the culinary experts in order to appeal to women. The Royal Baking Powder Company led the way in 1867. Since Royal could not obtain a patent for its baking powder because of its combination of two powders, many other baking powder companies soon sprang up. As cream of tartar increased in cost, a number of companies used alum, a much cheaper substance, whose wholesomeness became subject to much controversy in the wake of an article in the November 1878 issue of *Scientific American*, authored by Dr. Henry A. Mott, who was then working for Royal.[4] With the baking powder question arising in tandem with the cooking school movement, baking powder companies soon enlisted cooking specialists as well as chemists in their competition to claim the purity and superiority of their own products and a larger market share. For instance, Cleveland's Baking Powder Company mobilized a number of cooking experts in compiling its advertising cookbooks. The 1894 edition featured recipes compiled by as many as 46 cooking teachers mostly from the Northeast but a few from the Midwest. The list of cooking experts resembled a Who's Who of American cookery, ranging from Marion Harland, Mary J. Lincoln, and Sarah Tyson Rorer to their students, Anna Barrows and Fannie Farmer, who graduated from the Boston Cooking School, and Helen Louise Johnson, a graduate of the Philadelphia Cooking School. Thus, by mobilizing a long list of culinary experts, baking powder companies like Cleveland's attempted to demonstrate their product superiority to women consumers.

---

[4] Mitchell Okun, *Fair Play in the Marketplace: the First Battle for Pure Food and Drugs* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986), 232-41.

Fierce competition among baking powder companies produced conflicts of endorsement as exemplified by the case of Marion Harland, one of the household writers food manufacturers actively enlisted. An 1888 advertisement for Royal Baking Powder in the *Ladies' Home Journal* quoted Marion Harland, who stated, "I regard the Royal Baking Powder as the best manufactured and in the market . . . use no other. . . . It is an act of simple justice and also a pleasure to recommend it to American housewives."[5] However, in 1894, Cleveland's Baking Powder carried a testimonial that Harland had made the year before with the company's annotation to her statement as follows:

> Uses "Cleveland's" Only. April 5th 1893:
>
> I wish to say that I use and recommend one and only one baking powder, and that is Cleveland's.
>
> Years ago* I did use others, and spoke favorably of them at the time. In preparing the new edition of "Common Sense in the Household," however, I thought it best to substitute baking powder in the recipes instead of cream-of-tartar and soda, and made a careful investigation of the baking powder question.
>
> Finding Cleveland's Baking Powder to be really the best, I recommend it in "Common Sense in the Household," and now use it exclusively.
>
> Brooklyn, N. Y. Marion Harland
>
> *Certain manufacturers of baking powder still continue to publish the old commendations alluded to, *omitting the date*, and that too in spite of Marion Harland's earnest and repeated protests[6] (emphasis in original).

Cleveland's must have been referring to such companies as Royal, whose *Royal Baker and Pastry Cook*, a promotional booklet published in 1894, a year after the Cleveland's endorsement by Harland, contained her 1888 testimonial. Thatcher's Sugar of Milk

---

[5] Helen Damon-Moore, *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the* Ladies' Home Journal *and the* Saturday Evening Post, *1880-1910* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 51.

[6] Cleveland's Baking Powder Co., *Cleveland's Superior Recipes* (New York: Cleveland's Baking Powder Co., 1894), 4.

Baking Powder ridiculed this competition in its "*How to Test Baking Powder*" (1894). A page that claimed "Most Important Page in this Book!" wrote:

> ***Three Baking Powder Manufacturers have annually spent from $200,000 to $600,000 each through the Public Journals,***
>
> Each announcing that all the highest official authority in the land have, under seal of their Great Trust, settled the question that their Powder is THE STRONGEST, THE PUREST, AND THE BEST. . . .
>
> WHAT AN ABSURDITY!
>
> THREE BEST, ALL OF ONE CLASS!
>
> Some of these Dignitaries, Marian Harland, for example, declares that she does not so Endorse. But the Journals receive such fabulous sums for spreading the Endorsement that her tiny unpaid contradiction dies away in the distance, and, like the moans of Charlie Ross in the hands of his captive, find no sympathetic ear[7] (emphasis in original).

This endorsement conflict showed not only Harland's popularity among women but also the cutthroat competition among baking powder companies to enlist such popular celebrities.

The inaugural issue (April 1894) of the *New England Kitchen Magazine* revealed the conflicting interests among baking powder companies. In explaining all the products advertised in the issue, the magazine wrote of Cleveland's: "The merits of this baking powder speak everywhere for its excellence. Inside the magazine . . . will be found the 'Kitchen Time Table' prepared by Mrs. Lincoln for Cleveland's Baking Powder, and this will bear special consideration."[8] Probably because Lincoln joined the *New England Kitchen Magazine* as a member of the advisory committee, the magazine showed its enthusiasm for the brand. By contrast, in describing Horsford's Baking Powder on the same page as Cleveland's, the magazine sounded somewhat reserved: "The reputation

---

[7] H.D. Thatcher, M.D., ed., *How to Test Baking Powder* (Potsdam, N.Y.: H.D. Thatchr & Co., 1894).

[8] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 55.

achieved by this company (the Rumford Chemical Works) *would* be of itself guarantee sufficient that any baking powder they *would* put upon the market *would* contain a special merit. . ."[9] (parenthesis and emphasis mine). By using an array of "would," as opposed to "will," the magazine revealed a sense of uncertainty about the product. This testimonial closed by writing, "The readers of the NEW ENGLAND KITCHEN can find . . . abundant opportunities for testing this powder for themselves by applying at any grocery store,"[10] which suggested that the magazine had not yet tested the product, but still published its advertisement. Probably the magazine was aware of the ethics questions involved in endorsing two different brands of baking powder on the same page of the same issue.

While baking powder companies competed among themselves, newly invented cooking fat manufacturers actively enlisted cooking experts in their attempt to replace traditional lard. Claiming that any hog products took a heavy toll on digestion,[11] cooking teachers generally welcomed lard substitutes. Sarah Tyson Rorer compiled a twenty-page recipe brochure entitled *How to Use Olive Butter* for a Philadelphia firm as early as 1882, promoting the product as a healthy substitute for lard.[12] The N. K. Fairbank Company, whose Cottolene consisted of cottonseed oil and beef suet, seemed to have no difficulty enlisting some noted cooking experts, such as Juliet Corson, Emma P. Ewing, Marion

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] For example, see Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Philadelphia Cook Book: A Manual of Home Economics* (Philadelphia: George Buchanan and Company, 1886), 142.

[12] Emma Seifrit Weigley, *Sarah Tyson Rorer: The Nation's Instructress in Dietetics and Cookery* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1977), 25.

Harland, and Sarah Tyson Rorer, who offered their recipes and testimonials for Cottolene's advertising recipe booklet.[13] In addition, a sister of Carrie Dearborn, the third principal of the Boston Cooking School, gave demonstrations in various places in Massachusetts during 1896 on how to use Cottolene.[14] In spite of the support from a wide circle of cooking experts, the sales of Cottolene had suffered by 1912, when Procter & Gamble put Crisco, another shortening, on the market. Just as N. K. Fairbank had done, Procter & Gamble turned to the cooking experts for the Crisco campaign, hiring Marion Harris Neil, a cookery editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, and Janet McKenzie Hill to compile its recipe booklets.[15] New processed foods that aimed to replace traditional lard often relied on cooking experts in anticipation of better sales.

In the same fashion, gelatin products competed against traditional desserts. The new processed food took advantage of the criticism against pies among many cooking authorities. Knox's Gelatine declared its superiority over pies in its advertising cookbook, *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People*, with gusto:

> KNOX' GELATINE
>
> IT'S NOT LIKE PIE
> IT'S HEALTHY[16] (capitals in original)

---

[13] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Home Helps* (Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1900).

[14] *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (April 1897): 38.

[15] Marion Harris Neil, *A "Calendar of Dinners" with 615 Recipes: Including the Story of Crisco* (Cincinnati: Procter & Gamble Co., 1915); Janet McKenzie Hill, *The Whys of Cooking* (Cincinnati: Procter & Gamble Co., 1916).

[16] Rose Markward, *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People*, 3d ed. (Johnstown, N.Y.: Charles B. Knox Co. 1896), 6.

Jell-O, which also contained gelatin, capitalized on this negative view of pies. In her 1913 testimonial to Jell-O, entitled as "Jell-O Instead of Pies and Puddings," Sarah Tyson Rorer observed, "Methods of living have undergone great changes in America in the last few years. Elaborate desserts, such as boiled and baked puddings and dyspepsia-producing pies, having given place to the more attractive and healthful desserts made from Jell-O."[17] The creators of new products like Jell-O and Knox Gelatine thus often attacked pie to bring a new form of desserts onto the American table.

These gelatin products, especially Knox Gelatine, enlisted many cooking experts in their efforts to persuade Americans to adopt new cooking and eating habits. *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People* went through multiple editions, each of which contained a list of cooking experts who endorsed the product. Like Cleveland's Baking Powder, the list read like a Who's Who in American Cookery, mobilizing a constellation of renowned names, such as Juliet Corson, Emma P. Ewing, Mary J. Lincoln, Sarah Tyson Rorer, Anna Barrows, Janet McKenzie Hill, and Fannie Farmer,[18] to appeal to potential consumers. The booklet also indicated that Knox Gelatine modified its product at the request of Sarah Tyson Rorer and Mary J. Lincoln, so that the product could be measured in small quantities, which, according to the cooking authorities, was more convenient for household use.[19] This episode showed that cooking teachers were not only passively enlisted by the food businesses, they actively helped shape the businesses as well. In

---

[17] The Genesee Pure Food Co., *What Six Famous Cooks Say of America's Most Famous Dessert* (Le Roy, N.Y.: The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1913), 3.

[18] Markward, 3-4, 7-8.

[19] Ibid., 7.

addition, Mary J. Lincoln lectured at the pure food exposition held in St. Louis in 1894, which was managed by Charles B. Knox, a founder of Knox Gelatine.[20] Knox Gelatine maintained beneficial reciprocal relationships with renowned cooking experts.

In addition to promoting the consumption of new foods, cooking experts offered solutions to certain kitchen problems, part of an advertising strategy to appeal to consumers. An article, entitled "Making Tasks Easier" in a Jell-O booklet read, "Every day a host of brides become housekeepers, each with a man to feed and keep happy. Unfortunately, getting married does not transform the inexperienced girl into a competent housewife. She has a great deal to learn, and whether her married life is to be happy or not depends upon her success in the kitchen and dining room."[21] As Katherine J. Parkin writes, advertisers set pleasing men as a goal of women's cooking and wanted them to worry about their culinary ability.[22] The Jell-O article then introduced "six famous author cooks," including Marion Harland, Mary J. Lincoln, and Sarah Tyson Rorer, who would offer help to helpless housekeepers. Portraying the "six famous cooks" as surrogate mothers for the booklet's intended audience—urban, young newly wed women, many of whom were spatially detached from their elderly female family members—the article asserted:

> A few talented women are making their lifework the teaching of housewives to work effectively and without waste of effort. Among them are the six famous author cooks who tell in these pages how Jell-O helps to lighten women's tasks. . .

---

[20] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 145.

[21] The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1.

[22] Katherine J. Parkin, *Food is Love: Advertising and Gender Roles in Modern America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 51-54.

> . The woman who has to "think up" something good for three meals every day in the year and then to prepare it with her own hands, or see that it is done properly by somebody else, has a task which no man comprehends. It is to this phase of home life that the "six famous cooks" have given especial attention, and they tell housekeepers about the best things to serve and how to prepare and serve them.[23]

This condescending remark exemplified one characteristic of advertising: creating a problem and offering its solution simultaneously. The Jell-O advertising cookbook presented a problem—the difficulty of devising menus and cooking—and offered its solution by introducing six famed cooking experts who confirmed Jell-O's ability to solve the problem. Sarah Tyson Rorer proclaimed authoritatively, "These desserts are economical both in money and time. The question always comes to my mind, WHY SHOULD ANY WOMAN STAND FOR HOURS OVER A HOT FIRE, MIXING COMPOUNDS TO MAKE PEOPLE ILL, WHEN IN TWO MINUTES, WITH AN EXPENSE OF TEN CENTS, SHE CAN PRODUCE SUCH ATTRACTIVE, DELICIOUS DESSERT?"[24] (emphasis in original). Rorer and other cooking experts helped devise Jell-O's advertising strategy to emphasize the product's convenience and time-saving effects.

As interpreters between producers and consumers, culinary experts emphasized consumers' agency to guard themselves against corrupt business practices, rather than attempting to reform them. While giving a lecture on "Marketing" during a one-week exhibit on household economics in January 1894, Anna Barrows lamented that women's choice of food items depended on market men, not on their own knowledge or

---

[23] The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1.

[24] Ibid., 3.

experience.[25] She directed her criticism to women purchasers, rather than to market grocers. Partly because they had no control over what products were put on the market, and partly because they extolled self-education, cooking teachers were determined to teach purchasers how to select food items, claiming that purchasers' ignorance allowed sellers to carry out corrupt business practices. When Sarah Tyson Rorer lamented, during her demonstration lecture at the 1894 Philadelphia Food Exposition, "Hundreds of housekeepers buy lamb's liver, paying a calf's liver price for it, and believe it to be calf's liver because the butcher says it is,"[26] she was castigating the purchasers rather than the market merchants. Assuming that business was corrupt, culinary reformers like Rorer thus saw one of their roles as teaching women how to defend themselves against such corrupt commerce.

While culinary experts attempted to educate purchasers on how to choose food products at local markets, cooking teachers professedly served as guardian angels of advertising. While they could exert no influence over local markets, cooking experts apparently claimed that they could control the advertisement pages of their own magazines. Sarah Tyson Rorer's *Household News* proclaimed in 1896, "Its advertising pages have been entirely free from quackery and fraud. It has refused to enrich itself at the expense of its patrons' health and moral, and it has succeeded."[27] The magazine claimed that it served the interest of readers by rejecting what the magazine considered

---

[25] "An Exhibit in Household Economics," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 23.

[26] "Substantial Food for Workingmen," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 20, 1894, 7.

[27] "*Household News* and its Progress," *Household News* 4 (July 1896): x.

dubious products. The *New England Kitchen Magazine* followed in the footsteps of *Household News*. The inaugural issue (April 1894) of the *New England Kitchen Magazine* carried a five-page-long "Department of Business Notice," which gave detailed descriptions of the products advertised in the issue. For instance, the magazine wrote about a flour company, "ON the fifth page of this magazine is to be found the advertisement of the Washburn, Crosby Company whose flour mills in Minneapolis are doing a better business than almost any other concern of the kind in the country. The quality of their flour has been abundantly approved. See advertisement"[28] and about a biscuit, "ON the inside of the cover will be found the attractive announcement of Kenney's 'Whist Biscuit.' An odd name indeed, but it is said this particular biscuit by any other name would be just as good. Buy them and try them, and you will doubtless buy them again."[29] By going over each advertised product meticulously in its inaugural issue, the *New England Kitchen Magazine* set the tone for the magazine: its profession as a gatekeeper of advertised products. In the same vein, the *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* boasted of its advertising pages in 1904: "Frequent reference to our advertising department is quite unnecessary. The advertisements speak for themselves. In character and quality and reliability they are above criticism and unexcelled. No complaint has ever been made to us of a single article here represented." In line with the prevalent belief in middle-class women's moral duty, culinary authorities made a conscious effort to present their periodical to their readers as clean regarding advertisements.

---

[28] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 52.

[29] Ibid., 55.

In promoting food products, well-known cooking authorities took part in branding in two primary ways. On the one hand, their fame helped ensure the quality of products; if culinary experts endorsed food products, businesses could use their familiar names to ensure the purity and wholesomeness of the products, whether consumers trusted the cozy relationship between the cooking teachers and the businesses or not. On the other hand, cooking experts' names helped establish personal relationships with consumers in a way that local grocery stores did through personal contact.[30] By employing famed cooking authorities, food manufacturers could fulfill these two objectives in their sales promotion.

Some famed cooking teachers carried out these two major goals of branding by lending their names directly to commercial endeavors. The titles of their cookbooks often indicated the power of brand recognition: *Miss Parloa's New Cook Book* (1882), *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book* (1884), *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book* (1902), and *Marion Harland's Complete Cook Book* (1903). Fannie Farmer also joined this elite group of culinary authorities, for her bestselling *Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* was often referred to as "Fannie Farmer's Cook Book."[31] Farmer also opened Miss Farmer's School of Cookery in 1902, which indicated Farmer's name value to draw in potential students. A few cooking teachers also boasted of food products that featured their own names. By 1899, Mary J. Lincoln had served as a secretary for the company bearing her own name,

---

[30] Susan Strasser, *Satisfaction Guaranteed: The Making of the American Mass Market* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 28.

[31] Jessamyn Neuhaus, *Manly Meals and Mom's Home Cooking: Cookbooks and Gender in Modern America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 23.

Mrs. Lincoln's Baking Powder Company, which manufactured cream of tartar baking powder. Sarah Tyson Rorer promoted a gas stove called Mrs. Rorer's Gas Range[32] at the beginning of the twentieth century, opened "Rorer Restaurant" in Manhattan in 1905, and produced "Mrs. Rorer's Own Blend of Coffee" manufactured by The Climax Coffee and Baking Powder Company of Indianapolis in 1911.[33] Rorer's popularity also manifested itself in one of the pamphlets compiled by Thatcher's Baking Powder, which introduced one of her students as a graduate of "Mrs. Rorer's Cooking School, Philadelphia," instead of the official "Philadelphia Cooking School."[34] Thatcher probably employed "Mrs. Rorer" on purpose, aware that Rorer's name would convey credibility. Canadian-born Frank O'Conner opened a candy shop in Rochester, New York, called "Fanny Farmer" (not "Fannie" Farmer) in 1919, thus relying on the name of the famous cooking authority four years after her death in 1915. Famed cooking teachers served a commercial value to attract potential consumers and brand loyalty.

In addition to individual names, major cooking schools, especially the Boston Cooking School, served as a publicity tool. Laura Shapiro writes that the school quickly gained a national reputation "in part because any teaching institution located in Boston won a certain credibility from the address alone, and possibly because its founders publicized out of all proportion a rather tangential connection with Maria Parloa, the personable author of *The Appledore Cookbook*, who had recently given a popular series

---

[32] Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1986), 144-45.

[33] Weigley, 155-58.

[34] Thacher, 11.

of cooking classes in Boston."[35] The June 1886 issue of the *Anti-Adulteration Journal* exploited this high regard for the Boston Cooking School and Maria Parloa in this testimonial: "Miss Parloa, of the famous Boston Cooking School, says: 'I have used Horsford's Baking Preparations with perfect success for bread, biscuit, and cake.'"[36] This testimonial was problematic, given that Parloa had left Boston by 1886. She had moved to New York City in 1882 and opened her school there the following year. She probably remained in the Big Apple in 1886.[37] Parloa's brief connection to the Boston Cooking School was blatantly exploited as late as 1894, when Thatcher's Baking Powder introduced Parloa as "Principal of the Boston Cooking School"[38] in one example of its promotional literature. Not only was Fannie Farmer the school's principal in 1894, but Parloa never had been the school's principal. These baking powder companies probably used Parloa's brief connection to the Boston Cooking School to heighten her credibility in cooking.

In addition to branded packaged foods, tropical produce had enriched the American table by the early twentieth century. A growing consumption of tropical foods was the product of the combined forces of economic and transportation developments and American overseas expansion. Industrial growth in postbellum America produced wealth for investment in foreign countries, while the development of transportation, such as

---

[35] Shapiro, 48.

[36] *Anti-Adulteration Journal* 2 (June 1886): 1.

[37] "Miss Maria Parloa," *Journal of Home Economics* 1 (October 1909): 379.

[38] Thatcher, 8.

steamships and an extensive railroad network, as well as the invention of refrigerated cars, enabled the rapid transportation of food from production to consumption. In the meantime, the United States government intervened in foreign affairs to protect its business interests. This governmental intervention triggered the Spanish American War in 1898, and in the period between 1900 and 1917, the government made military interventions into Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Haiti to protect American investments and businesses.[39] Consequently, import of tropical foods like sugar and bananas into the United States soared by the beginning of the twentieth century. With cane sugar from Cuba and Hawaii, together with the domestic beet sugar industry and beet sugar from Europe, American sugar consumption dramatically increased.[40] So did the American taste of bananas, as the United Fruit Company's 1904 pamphlet, *A Short History of the Banana and a Few Recipes for Its Use*, observed, "Until within the last twenty-five years the fruit of the so-called banana tree had been looked upon by people of northern climes with something akin to reverence and awe. But now, with our improved facilities of transportation, this same fruit, the food of millions in the tropics for ages, has been brought within easy access at all seasons to the housekeepers of the world."[41] United Fruit gave due credit only to its "improved facilities of transportation," but military intervention assured the steady supply of tropical foods into

---

[39] Virginia Scott Jenkins, *Bananas: The American History* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 19.

[40] Wendy A. Woloson, *Refined Tastes: Sugar, Confectionery, and Consumers in Nineteenth-Century America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 2002), 5.

[41] Janet McKenzie Hill, *A Short History of the Banana: And a Few Recipes for Its Use* (Boston: United Fruit Company, 1904), 11.

the United States as well. The growing availability of tropical foods like bananas represented what Robert Rydell calls "a culture of imperial abundance"; the material abundance of American society was closely intertwined with its overseas expansion.[42] Consequently, American foodways diversified by the time of World War I. "AMERICAN cookery has become cosmopolitan in its character. The New England cookery of colonial times has been superseded by cookery that has culled the best from every land and clime,"[43] (capitals in original) observed Janet McKenzie Hill approvingly in 1914.

Cooking experts helped shape this culture of imperial abundance by promoting the consumption of fruits. As nutrition meant calories and protein before the discovery of vitamins in the 1910s,[44] cooking experts and nutrition scientists recognized only that fruits (and vegetables) cleansed the blood and helped digestion. As the author of the *New England Cook Book* (1905) observed, "Fruits do not take an important place as nutrients. They belong rather among the luxuries, and yet, as an agreeable stimulant to digestion, they occupy a front rank."[45] Cooking experts thought highly of fruits for their digestibility and recommended their consumption for desserts. Mary J. Lincoln wrote in her *Boston Cook Book*, "It is so hard for some people to break away from old customs

---

[42] Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 35-36.

[43] Janet McKenzie Hill, *The American Cook Book: Recipes for Everyday Use* (Boston: The Boston Cooking-School Magazine Co., 1914), Preface.

[44] Nancy Duran, "Farmers' Bulletins Advice to Women on Diet, Food, and Cooking," *Journal of Agriculture & Food Information* 6 (2005): 62.

[45] Alice M. Turner, The *New England Cook Book* (Boston: Chas. E. Brown Publishing Co., 1905), 30.

that it will be long before housekeepers generally will be content to serve the queen of all fruits, the apple, in its natural state instead of making it into the 'persistent pie'. . . ."[46] Lincoln exhorted her readers to replace pies with apples for dessert, although she accepted eating pies on some occasions as part of the New England tradition.[47] Unlike Lincoln, Juliet Corson flatly rejected pies, calling them "the bane of American Cookery."[48] Promoting fresh fruits for dessert, Corson recognized that they "cannot fail to decrease the deplorable prevalence of that objectionable national compound, the pie," yet still added a new chapter on serving fresh fruits for desserts to a revised version of her cookbook.[49] In the meantime, Sarah Tyson Rorer, another anti-pie advocate, promoted the consumption of fruits as one route to "a truly Epicurean simplicity" during one of her demonstration lectures at a food exposition in New York in 1895. When asked what to eat for lunch, Rorer answered:

> "If you are hungry at noon? Well, eat fruit." "It is not very sustaining," murmured a voice in the audience. "Oh, but think how clear it makes your complexion," said Mrs. Rorer, with enthusiasm. "It clears your blood and keeps you in a perfectly healthy condition." . . . "Why must you eat at noon?" queried Mrs. Rorer. "Because we are hungry," answered one of the older matrons, meekly. "Well," said Mrs. Rorer, triumphantly, "I am not ashamed to say that I can eat six apples and five oranges at noon."[50]

---

[46] Mary J. Lincoln, *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book: What To Do and What Not To Do in Cooking* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1916), 391.

[47] Mary J. Lincoln, "Christmas Pies and Pastry," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 131.

[48] Juliet Corson, *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six* (New York: The Author, 1877), 42.

[49] Juliet Corson, *Twenty-Five Cent Dinners for Families of Six*, 13th ed. (Orange Judd Company, New York, 1879), Preface to the Revised and Enlarged Edition.

[50] "Too Many Meals Are Eaten," *New York Times*, October 29, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9F0DE5DE1139E033A2575AC2A9669D94649ED7CF.

Other advocates of scientific cookery might have disagreed with this "fruit lunch," but they surely agreed with Rorer that Americans should eat more fruit.

Calling for increasing the consumption of fruit, cooking experts introduced new tropical fruits to American consumers in three primary ways. First, cooking teachers often wrote articles on new foods in the magazines and newspapers. The April 1897 issue of the *American Kitchen Magazine* carried an article that one woman wrote while she was in Jamaica on "the embryo cocoanuts and bananas, the nutmegs and limes." The June issue of the magazine reported that, upon her return to Boston, the writer visited the office of the magazine with these food items to show them off to cooking teachers of Boston public schools.[51] This episode indicated that these tropical foods were still rare, at least in Boston in 1897, and deserved space in the magazine.

Second, some cooking experts compiled advertising cookbooks for food import corporations. Janet McKenzie Hill offered a variety of dishes using bananas in an advertising cookbook of the United Fruit Company, a multinational banana trading company. Hill wrote in the book, "In the Northern markets (as opposed to tropical countries) the greatest part of the fruit (bananas) is now eaten raw, and it is the main purpose of this little book to teach people to use it cooked as a vegetable"[52] (parentheses mine). Hill made clear her role in compiling this advertising recipe booklet; she was a teacher who showed how to adopt bananas into the everyday diet. When "the United Fruit Company and its competitors transformed bananas from a Victorian luxury item

[51] *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (June 1897): 77.

[52] Hill, *A Short History of the Banana*, 7.

into the most commonly consumed fruit in the United States in the early twentieth century,"[53] Hill participated in this commercial endeavor as a bridge between importers and consumers.

Third, cooking reformers incorporated fruit into some dishes, mostly salads and desserts, in their cookbooks. Mary J. Lincoln included recipes using bananas, such as "banana sherbet," "banana ice cream," and "bananas with fruit sauce" in her Mrs. Lincoln's *Boston Cook Book.*[54] Given that the book was published in 1883, before the widespread use of tropical foods, these recipes indicated that the cookbook's target included the wealthy. Along with bananas, pineapples were growing popular among cooking teachers like Fannie Farmer, who used the fruit to concoct her famous Los Angeles Fruit Salad and Ginger Ale Salad.[55] Farmer's inclination to novelty probably prompted her to use pineapples in salads. Through these three major ways— cookbooks, advertising cookbooks, and magazine articles—cooking authorities introduced tropical foods to American consumers.

Cookbook authors often combined two or more tropical foods into one dish, thus multiplying the consumption of these foods, particularly sugar. Some cooking experts did fret about adding sugar to fruits, pointing out the natural sugar content in fruits. The author of *Fruits, and How to Use Them* (1890) wrote, "It is only a perverted taste which demands sugar to make palatable perfectly ripened fruits and such a person knows

---

[53] Kristin L. Hoganson, *Consumers' Imperium: The Global Production of American Domesticity, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 115.

[54] Lincoln, *Boston Cook Book*, 549, 551, 554.

[55] Shapiro, 205.

nothing of the enjoyment to be derived from unmixed natural flavors skillfully compounded by the Great Chemist in nature's own laboratory."[56] Sarah Tyson Rorer agreed with her: "All fruits contain sufficient sugar; that is, according to nature's way of doing. If they are too acid to be palatable they are too acid to be eaten. This is nature's way of warning us against unwholesome foods. Sugar in no way corrects an acid. . . . Together they are more dangerous than when taken alone. Sugar with the fruit is very liable to fermentation."[57] Drawing on nature's laws, some advocates of scientific cookery admonished against the addition of sugar to fruits.

However, others did not mind mingling the two. Mary J. Lincoln's *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book* contained "Tropical Snow," which comprised, among others, coconuts, red bananas, and powdered sugar.[58] Janet McKenzie Hill presented "Tapioca and Banana Sponge," which also included sugar, in her 1899 cookbook.[59] These recipes, coupled with the practice of adding sugar to coffee, surely helped stimulate the consumption of tropical produce, particularly sugar. The consumption of sugar dramatically increased in the United States in the late nineteenth century, as Sydney Mintz writes, "Those interested in the rise of North American imperialism could do

---

[56] Hester Martha Poole, *Fruits, and How to Use Them* (New York: Fowler & Wells, 1890), 11.

[57] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book: A Manual of Housekeeping* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1902), 543.

[58] Lincoln, *Boston Cook Book*, 393.

[59] Janet McKenzie Hill, *Salads, Sandwiches and Chafing-dish Dainties* (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1899), 239-40.

worse than looking carefully at the history of U.S. sugar consumption."[60] If American overseas expansion, coupled with transportation development, contributed to a growing importation of sugar and other tropical foods into the United States to meet a growing consumer demand, cooking experts certainly helped stimulate the desire.

By promoting gelatin like Jell-O, cooking experts helped democratize once expensive food products, such as gelatin and tropical fruits. As a biographer of Jell-O writes, "Jell-O actually democratized gelatin. Before it, gelatin dessert-making was a daylong, multi-step ordeal that involved straining and skimming. . . . No one without servants would attempt it. That's why gelatin was a sign of wealth in the Victorian era. . . ."[61] The widespread use of gelatin went hand in hand with the democratization of tropical foods, such as bananas, pineapples, tapioca, and sugar. Cooking experts incorporated these tropical foods into gelatin desserts, which epitomized what they called dainty dishes (See chapters VII and VIII). Janet McKenzie Hill listed "pineapple jelly," "coconut cream," "banana sponge," as well as dishes that used other fruits in the 1915 edition of *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People.*[62] If the modernization of American eating habits involved the democratization of many food items, which derived from the joint forces of industrialization, technical development, and American imperialism, cooking experts played a significant role in this process of modernization.

---

[60] Sydney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 188.

[61] Carolyn Wyman, *Better Than Homemade: Amazing Foods That Changed the Way We Eat* (Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2004), 113-14.

[62] Charles B. Knox, Co., *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People: Knox Gelatine* (Johnstown, N.Y.: Charles B. Knox, Co., 1915), 9, 12, 13.

In this modernizing process, cooking teachers participated in what Kristin L. Hoganson calls the "consumers' imperium," the role of imports in creating American domesticity.[63] Consumer power represented the intersection between American imperialism and consumer culture, which not only led to the purchasing of tropical foodstuffs but also embodied the notion of novelty. As Hoganson writes, "Those who advocated foreign recipes and novel foodstuffs bought into the consumers' imperium. . . . They turned foreign into the harmless stuff of pleasure. . . ."[64] Culinary reformers played a great role in shaping this middle-class consumer domesticity that intertwined American imperialism and the culture of consumer capitalism.

In addition to the "consumers' imperium," the food exposition was another medium where culinary teachers joined forces with the public and private sectors to shape a culture of consumer capitalism. Merchants who managed food expositions held a close relationship with governors and politicians, who often opened the shows. For instance, the governor of Pennsylvania made an opening speech in the first Philadelphia Food Exposition held in 1889.[65] Nine years later in Minneapolis, its mayor gave an opening speech.[66] The Philadelphia fair of 1891 also enlisted the railroad in its effort to increase the number of attending. Through a trade organization, the fair committee made arrangements with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Philadelphia and Reading

---

[63] Hoganson, 11.

[64] Ibid., 134-35.

[65] "To Improve Our Food," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, February 25, 1889, 2.

[66] "Pure Food Show," *Minneapolis Tribune*, Jan. 11, 1898, 7.

Railroad Company to advertise the fair in all the stations along the lines that were connected to the city and ran special trains that offered passengers a discount rate. The committee intended to extend the outreach by making arrangements with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company as well.[67] In the meantime, newspapers assumed the role of publicizing the event, announcing and reporting on the fair. Cooking teachers and their students, who conducted demonstration lectures and managed the company booths at the fair, completed this extensive network that made the exposition happen.

Although cooking experts often collaborated with business, the relationship occasionally involved conflicts. The editorials of the May 1895 issue of the *New England Kitchen Magazine* criticized associations of grocers and manufacturers, who had sponsored some food fairs in Boston, for their lukewarm commitment to the cause of pure food. The magazine asked, "There comes afresh the doubt in our minds. . . . Has any one of these that are so-called (a pure food exposition) been strictly devoted to an exhibit of *pure foods* to the exclusion of everything that has no possible bearing on the food question. . . ?" This frustrated writer (perhaps Mary J. Lincoln, judging from the tone of the article) suggested that at least some manufacturers did not live up to the standard of purity set up by the writer. The editorial then compared the official name of two Boston food expositions—World's Pure Food Exposition of 1891 and the World's Food Fair of 1894—and pointed out that the disappearance of the term "pure" from the latter suggested a downward trend in the food industry.[68] This suspicion about business

---

[67] "Pure Food Display," *Public Ledger*, November 21, 1891, 2.

[68] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 3 (May 1895): 87.

practices might have reinforced cooking reformers' belief in women's role as the moral guardians who exhorted businesses to live up to higher standards.

Of the culinary authorities, Sarah Tyson Rorer seemed to have the most conflicts with both businesses and consumers, partly because she believed that certain food items were intrinsically unhealthy and partly because she apparently enjoyed admonishing people against their favorite foods. "Mrs. Rorer Talks of Desserts and Mildly Scolds Her Auditors for Liking Sweets,"[69] read the headline of the article in the *New York Times*, which reported her appearance at the food exposition in New York City in 1895. The article said sarcastically, "It was a day of special enjoyment for both Mrs. Rorer and her audience in the Madison Square Garden Concert Hall yesterday afternoon. Hot desserts was the subject, and as Mrs. Rorer has made it plainly understood, she disapproves of all sweets. The audience enjoys her pointed, soft-voiced little scoldings as she prepares the dainties in the very nicest possible way."[70] Rorer often made compromises, probably with both manufacturers and audiences, who defied her warning against sweets. At the 1900 Philadelphia Food Exposition, Rorer had to conduct at least two public demonstrations against her will. One day, a local newspaper reported, "Mrs. Rorer does not believe in any one eating lobsters, as they are nothing more or less than scavengers, like vultures or eagles. But for those who relish this animal she showed how to cook it."[71] Rorer, who

---

[69] "Mrs. Rorer Talks of Desserts," *New York Times*, November 1, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9407E7DD1139E033A25752C0A9679D94649ED7CF.

[70] Ibid.

[71] "Lobsters Are Scavengers," *Philadelphia Press*, November 10, 1900, 6.

was inclined to criticize New England specialties like lobsters and pies, still acquiesced to popular demand. A few days later, after showing how to make Charlotte with Chocolate Sauce, Rorer denigrated the dish, asserting, "All these things look so good, but they are so deadly."[72] This remark typified her public presentations that often mixed wit and sarcasm. Rorer, who conducted cooking demonstrations at Gimbel's Department Store in Philadelphia every year from 1904 to 1910, except in 1909,[73] still stood strong in her dietetic belief. When the store admitted, "Mrs. Rorer doesn't endorse everything in this Pure Food Store—but she does endorse its aims and purposes,"[74] perhaps the store referred to such food articles as sugar, potatoes and fried foods, which the Philadelphia cooking teacher publicly denounced as unhealthy. Rorer might have enjoyed this conflict, because she seemed to purposely shock the audience by attacking their favorite foods.

Even if cooking experts agreed with business, using the names of cooking authorities did not automatically stimulate big sales. Although Cottolene's manufacturer, the N. K. Fairbank Company, secured endorsements and recipes from many big-name culinary authorities in its *The 600 Selected Recipes* (1892), its sale was sluggish. Susan Strasser speculates that the public could not trust the soap company's production of pure food in the midst of the food adulteration scare or that cooks were content with lard; but whatever its reasons for failing, mobilizing a galaxy of cooking experts did not secure the

---

[72] "'Desserts Are Deadly,' Says Mrs. Rorer," *Philadelphia Press*, November 16, 1900, 6.

[73] Weigley, 147.

[74] *Philadelphia Press*, March 30, 1906, 14; *Public Ledger*, March 30, 1906, 5.

commercial success of Cottolene. [75] Sarah Tyson Rorer's business ventures also failed. Rorer Restaurant experienced some difficulties. The *New York Times* reported that, estimating the liabilities at 26,000 dollars, an attorney for some of Rorer's creditors filed a petition in bankruptcy against Rorer in 1907, two years after the opening of the restaurant.[76] The next month, the *New York Times* reported that twenty-one waiters at the restaurant went on strike without warning and did not even state the cause of the strike. Her coffee, which debuted in 1913, also ceased its production soon. Cooking experts like Rorer boasted of best-selling cookbooks, yet the failure of her commercial ventures suggested name alone did not guarantee a commercial success.

Their appeal to consumers might have been limited, but cooking authorities still helped modernize American foodways, if modernization meant consuming foods that were produced abroad and traveled long distances. By mediating between businesses and consumers, culinary experts joined the economic and political forces of industrialization, transportation development, and American overseas expansion to democratize many food items, such as gelatin and tropical foods. These new foods, often combined with one another, diversified the American table. This modernization of American eating habits was predicated on one major social expectation: the role of women to manage the family meals.

---

[75] Strasser, 8-9.

[76] "Mrs. L. T. Rorer Fails in Business Venture," *New York Times*, September 26, 1907, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9502E3DC103EE033A25755C2A96F9C946697D6CF; "Creditors and Mrs. Rorer," *New York Times*, September 27, 1907, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9D07E0DA1F30E233A25754C2A96F9C946697D6CF; Weigley, 155-57.

CHAPTER VII

PURCHASING FOODS AND COOKING: A STRUGGLE TO ACHIEVE "LUXURIOUS ECONOMY"

When cooking teachers worked as intermediaries between production and consumption, they assumed that consumers—that is, purchasers—were women. Culinary experts certainly expected women to do the cooking, but many did not. Upper- and middle-class women's kitchen work did not fall into the "natural" order of things during the nineteenth century. The genteel culture scorned food-related tasks, and many women hired servants to go to local markets to purchase and then to cook their foods. Coupled with their uneasiness about eating (See chapter VIII), middle-class women kept their distance from food in many ways during the nineteenth century.

Defining consuming as purchasing and using foods for preparing meals, this chapter examines how cooking teachers attempted to bring kitchen labor and middle-class women together. Why did culinary reformers exhort women to perform cooking tasks in the first place, even if they could afford to hire servants? How did culinary experts persuade genteel women to take up cooking? In addition to this issue of women and food-related tasks, which included purchasing foods, this chapter also explores how culinary authorities helped shape and reinforce the popular perception of women as consumers, that is, shoppers, a view that lingers even today. Exploring these questions will illuminate how cooking experts handled the two dominant and conflicting cultural values of middle-class America during the nineteenth century: the Protestant ethic, which extolled work and self-control on the one hand, and gentility, which embraced leisure and

art on the other. Turning women into consumers of food involved the tensions and interactions between these cultural streams of the nineteenth century.

As producing meals entailed consuming foods, the distinction between production and consumption—and between producers and consumers—often blurred. Discussing the industrial development of the early nineteenth century, Richard Ohmann writes, "Making and maintaining things at home increasingly meant using things made in factories; producing was consuming."[1] This dual nature certainly applied to cooking, particularly for those urban, middle classes, who purchased most of the foodstuffs at local markets and grocery stores and used them to produce meals. Just as production and consumption often blurred, the gender roles in these two activities—stereotypical views of male producers and women consumers—often became muddled. Mark Swiencicki notes that, although men have shopped less at retail stores than women, men spent money on, among other things, playing sports, which required gear, attending athletic games, and holding banquets and drinking parties at male clubs.[2] Why, how, and when did the polarized view of men as producers and women as consumers arise? And why did this view become predominant?

The perception of women as consumers originated with the growth of industry in the early nineteenth century. This massive change in manufacturing methods spawned an organized form of production which was detached from the home. This physical

---

[1] Richard M. Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Verso, 1996), 165.

[2] Mark A. Swiencicki, "Consuming Brotherhood: Men's Culture, Style and Recreation as Consumer Culture, 1880-1930," in Lawrence B. Glickman, ed., *Consumer Society in American History: A Reader* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999), 217-27.

separation of the workplace led to a division between the male-dominated factories as public places of production and the home as women's place of consumption.[3] Based on market criteria, the term *producers* often referred to those who engaged in economic activities that contributed to family income, while *consumers* were those who obtained commercial goods, the fruits of production, through monetary exchanges. Consequently, in *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* (1841), Catherine Beecher assumed women's role as that of buying products that men manufactured outside the home.[4] The identification of women as consumers seemed to be swiftly embedded in antebellum America.

In addition to gender, this dichotomization of men's production and women's consumption entailed middle-class connotations, as rural and working-class women continued to contribute to the family income.[5] Writing in *Good Housekeeping* about German women workers at markets, Maria Parloa noted, "We have comparatively little of this element in New England, but in New York, Pennsylvania and the West, the German women give a peculiar tone to the market. In the South, too, both colored and white women do their share toward producing, and afterward selling in the markets, such things as butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, vegetables, fruits and flowers."[6] Parloa viewed the

---

[3] A. Fuat Firat, Summary of "Gender and Consumption: Transcending the Feminine?," 96, in *The Consumer Society*; Swiencicki, 228.

[4] Peter Edward Samson, "The Emergence of Consumer Interest in America, 1870-1930" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1980), 9.

[5] Wm. Alex McIntosh and Mary Zey, "Women as Gatekeepers of Food Consumption: A Sociological Critique" in *Food and Gender: Identity and Power*, ed. Carole M. Counihan and Steven L. Kaplan (Amsterdam, The Netherland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998), 127.

[6] Maria Parloa, "The Household Market Basket," *Good Housekeeping* 17 (July 1893): 1.

women market workers from the magazine readers'—that is, consumers'—point of view and saw women workers at markets as "others."

Cooking experts intertwined middle-class women's role as purchasers with their responsibility as a bulwark of the Protestant ethic of self-control and frugality. Hence, although culinary reformers recognized the difficulty of generalizing as to an amount, since prices of commodities varied from place to place,[7] their advice on how to minimize spending proliferated in cookbooks and magazines. For example, two years after Juliet Corson compiled *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six* for the working poor in 1877, she published *Twenty-Five Cent Dinners for Families of Six* for middle-class families who earned "a very moderate income."[8] Corson wrote that the booklet "is a practical guide to the economical, healthful preparation of food, and will serve to show that it is a possible to live well upon a very moderate income."[9] Corson implied that, rather than emulating the wealthy, the middle class should be content with the present economic status. Echoing Corson, Maria Parloa told her *Ladies' Home Journal* readers in 1903, "No matter what the income, a certain amount of care and economy must be practiced in every well-regulated household."[10] Cooking reformers like Parloa and Corson often infused traditional values of thrift into women's role as consumers and emphasized economizing foodstuffs in providing nutritious meals.

---

[7] For example, see Juliet Corson, *Twenty-Five Cent Dinners for Families of Six*, 13th ed., rev. and enl. (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1879), II.

[8] Ibid., III.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Maria Parloa, "The Woman with No Servant," *Ladies' Home Journal* 20 (September 1903): 36.

Hence, advocates of scientific cooking dismissed the complaint that blamed price increases for food, a trend that intensified at the beginning of the twentieth century, for the difficulty of providing nutritious meals. Ellen Richards did recognize that food prices as a whole increased 48.8% from 1896 to 1910,[11] yet, in 1908, seven years after originally publishing *The Cost of Food* , Richards began the preface to its second edition by proclaiming, "In reply to the many questions asked, the author wishes to state here that because the cost of the *accustomed* food of the average family has increased since the book was written, and because the price of board in restaurant and boarding-house increased thirty per cent or more, it does not follow that all food has so risen in value. . . . [I]t is pretty certain that the cost of nutrition has not advanced so much as the current opinion calls for"[12] (emphasis in original). Richards suggested that if the public learned to eat according to nutrition, not tradition, the cost of food as a social issue would disappear. Richards concluded this preface by writing, "There is nothing in the discussion of costs which the author wishes to 'take back,' and certain conclusions are only confirmed by seven years' experience and observation."[13] Richards thus dismissed the outcry over the rising cost of food and called for changes in the approach to diet.

This appeal to thrift attested to the coexistence of modernity with tradition within scientific cookery. As cooking experts often quoted John Ruskin, who reportedly

---

[11] Ellen H. Richards, *The Cost of Living as Modified by Sanitary Science*, 3d ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1915), iv; Richards mentioned noted this increase in the preface, which she wrote in 1910, a year before she died.

[12] Ellen H. Richards, *The Cost of Food: A Study in Dietaries*, 2d ed. (New York: Robert Brummond and Company, 1908), iii.

[13] Ibid., iv-v.

remarked, "It (cookery) means the economy of your great-grandmothers and the science of modern chemists,"[14] culinary reformers looked to the future in terms of cooking and eating according to nutrition science, yet, as far as spending on food was concerned, they modeled on the past generation. Embracing modernity did not necessarily entail abandoning tradition. Rather than the new overriding the old, modernity coexisted side by side with tradition; the former functioned as a tool to perpetuate the latter, as discussed in chapter III. Advocates of scientific cookery expected all American (and immigrant) women to acquire the skills of cooking in accordance with scientific principles and to practice the old value of thrift, regardless of wealth.

Since cooking reformers counted knowledge and skills, rather than wealth, as requirements for good meals, they actively taught the working class how to manage their limited income. Juliet Corson compiled *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six* in 1877, her response to the economic recession symbolized by the great railroad strike of that year.[15] Corson distributed five thousand copies of the pamphlet for free to working-class women to show them how to achieve both nutrition and economy in their diet in a time of economic difficulty.[16] Echoing Corson, Sarah Tyson Rorer proclaimed, "Wise forethought, which means economy, stands as the first of domestic duties. Poverty in no way affects skill in the preparation of food."[17] Cooking experts like Rorer and Corson

---

[14] Anna Barrows, "Talks with Girls about Cooking," *Christian Union*, September 27, 1888, 326.

[15] Juliet Corson, *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six* (New York: The Author, 1877).

[16] "The New York Cooking School," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 355 (December 1879): 22.

[17] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Made Over Dishes* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1898), 5.

engaged in various charity works (See chapter II), mostly because they believed that if women acquired the knowledge and skills of cooking they would be able to cook nutritious meals even with a limited income.

Seeing the intake of enough nutrition as an individual dietary goal, cooking reformers suggested, for example, lentils and macaroni as substitutes for meat, which was relatively expensive. In her 1879 cookbook, Juliet Corson praised lentils: "The half pound of meat in boiling will lose about one-fourth of its substance, while the lentils will be augmented at least three times in volume, so that it will be seen that the quantity of food when cooked must be considered, as well as its price."[18] Corson suggested that lentils were more economical than meat, given that food would change its bulk in cooking. This piece of advice also implied that women should acquire the knowledge of food chemistry that cooking experts like Corson could supply. In the same manner a writer for *Table Talk* praised macaroni's efficiency, that is, its economical and nutritive values, writing, "Macaroni is a cheap, and wholesome food, and if served with cheese, forms a dish sufficiently nutritious to do away with the heavier meats."[19] By promoting macaroni and lentils, cooking reformers sent a message to the public, which was likely to believe that meat supplied the most nutrition, that other foodstuffs were as nutritious as meat and cost less

Perhaps more than lentils and macaroni, soup embodied domestic scientists' ideas of efficiency. The liquid food was economical, using mostly food scraps that might

---

[18] Juliet Corson, *Cooking School Text Book: And Housekeepers' Guide to Cookery and Kitchen Management* (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1879), 222.

[19] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "How to Live on a Thousand a Year," *Table Talk* 3 (October 1888): 432.

otherwise have ended up in waste; soup was relatively easy and simple to make; and, most importantly, soup, if properly made, provided plenty of nutritive value. By eating soup, cookery reformers argued, Americans could simultaneously save money and achieve health. As Claude Levi-Strauss notes and cooking reformers would have agreed, "Boiling provides a method of preserving all the meat and its juices, whereas roasting involves destruction or loss. One suggests economy, the other waste; the second is aristocratic, the first plebian;"[20] soups, therefore, might have been healthier and more economical than, say, roast beef. In her 1900 cookbook, Marion Harland observed, "It is a progressive age and the average American housewife is slowly coming to some appreciation of the nutritive value of soups as an article of daily food."[21] From both the nutritious and economic points of view, soup boasted of its efficiency, a quintessential Progressive value. Consequently, in a chapter entitled "Soups" in her *Family Living on $500 a Year*, Juliet Corson began the section by asserting, "In the range of economical cookery there is no more important dish than soup."[22] Cooking experts like Corson exalted soup as the most effective way to consume foods, not only in eating but also purchasing and cooking.

Cooking teachers insisted that women who employed servants get acquainted with the process of preparing meals, even if they did not perform the actual tasks. Culinary reformers surely admired Caroline Webster Schermerhorn Astor, whose personal chef

---

[20] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Origin of Table Manners*, Vol. III (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 484.

[21] Marion Harland, *Marion Harland's Complete Cook Book* (St. Louis: The Marion Company, 1903), 303.

[22] Juliet Corson, *Family Living on $500 a Year* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1887), 192.

praised her: "Ah! Mrs. Astor knew everything about her kitchen. She knew that nothing went to waste. If part of a chicken or capon was left over from one day, she would make arrangements for its use the next day. I would make out the bill of fare for the day, and take it to her; and then we would read it together, and she would make changes, perhaps. . . . She knew the importance of good cooking. . . ."[23] Although Astor did not "get her hands dirty," the chef claimed that she acted as a competent household manager, ensuring that food was consumed properly in every step. Cooking teachers attempted to infuse this quality into every housekeeper.

Although cooking teachers seemed to know that many upper- and middle-class women would not listen to them, they still reiterated the importance of housewives going to market themselves, reinforcing the role of women as purchasers. Calling for her *Good Housekeeping* readers to go to market themselves, Maria Parloa wrote in 1893:

> Women, by going personally to the market, are able to supply their tables with a greater variety and with articles of better quality than if the order were given at the door. It is impossible for the man who calls at your house, to remember all the little things there are in the market; more than that, he does not have the same idea that you do of what is a good quality and what an inferior. Then, too, if one go [sic] to the market she will see many things that will suggest changes and combinations to her.[24]

Parloa told women to choose foodstuffs themselves and not to depend on workers at markets. (And cooking experts like Parloa served as purchasers' guides to teach them how to tell the best quality of foods at markets.) Twenty-three years later in 1916, Janet McKenzie Hill echoed Parloa, writing, "Learn to market by marketing. There is no sure

---

[23] "A Millionaire's Kitchen," *Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* 6 (October 1901): xx.

[24] Maria Parloa, "The Household Market Basket," *Good Housekeeping* 17 (January 1893): 2.

way to distinguish the various cuts of meat but by seeing them cut from the side of beef or lamb and then by handling them yourself. Soon you will know by the external appearance whether you are buying bone, fat or lean meat, or whether the cheap cut which you plan to buy is of such quality as it should be."[25] Culinary experts thus emphasized that marketing would require "on the job training."

Cookbooks reflected the authors' emphasis on marketing[,] as a student of consumer culture writes, "The cook book was, perhaps, the first genre to systematically include consumer information.[26] A cookbook that came out as early as 1807 already included directions on how to choose food at a public market,[27] reflecting the urbanization which prompted women to purchase food at a local market, rather than growing it on their own. As industrialization and urbanization progressed, cookbooks of the late nineteenth century developed this theme of "marketing."[28] A year after opening the New York Cooking School in 1876, Juliet Corson compiled *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six*, whose first chapter was devoted to "Rules for Marketing."[29] Targeting the pamphlet to the working poor, who were hit hard by the economic depression of the time, Corson assumed that, for those who lived in the city, cooking began with buying produce at local markets. In the same vein, by entitling one of her cookbooks as *Miss*

---

[25] Janet McKenzie Hill, "Suggestions to Young Housekeepers on Economy and the Use of Left-Overs," *Nyal Cook Book* (Boston: The Boston Cooking-School Magazine, Co, 1916).

[26] Samson, 11.

[27] Ibid.

[28] At the turn of the twentieth century, "marketing" meant going to a local market to buy food produce.

[29] Juliet Corson, *Fifteen Cent Dinners*, Chapter I.

Parloa's New Cookbook: A Guide to Marketing and Cooking (1881), the author juxtaposed cooking and marketing, thus placing marketing on a par with cooking. Cookbook authors regarded marketing as a critical part of scientific cookery.

Exploring the question of who did the marketing—or, whom society considered as appropriate to going to market—illuminates the complex cultural, social, and economic interactions throughout the nineteenth century. Associating any transaction that involved money with men's sphere, colonial America assigned men to purchase household goods.[30] Even when women assumed the role of purchasers in antebellum America, markets displayed qualities antithetical to respectable women, such as harboring frauds and serving as slaughterhouses where butchers processed animals. Consequently, as Maria Parloa lamented, "Many think the market not a pleasant or proper place for ladies,"[31] who then sent their servants to markets. However, economic changes encouraged those "ladies" to go to markets and other places to purchase foodstuffs. Purchasing meat became more hygienic, with meat shops replacing public markets in New York City in the 1840s and refrigerated cars enabling the transportation of meat from the Midwest, where slaughterhouses were located. In addition, as Faye Dudden speculates, the variety of foods and elaboration of cookery among the middle class

---

[30] Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 243; Susan Williams, *Food in the United States, 1820-1890* (West Port, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006), 105.

[31] Maria Parloa, *Miss Parloa's New Cookbook: A Guide to Marketing and Cooking* (Boston: Dana Estes And Company, 1880); quoted in The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Miss Parloa," http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_parloa.html.

demanded skills in choosing foods.[32] In addition, a shortage of servants—the demand for servants outpaced their supply—created a social climate where middle-class women increasingly did the buying of the household goods, including food.[33]

Even as many middle-class women took up the habit of going to markets, the advent of the telephone in the late nineteenth century provided them with an option to order foods without going to market. Mary J. Lincoln lamented in 1896, "True a few of the wealthier women go once or twice a week to order from their favorite dealers, but the telephone order is rapidly taking the place of personal inspection, and the larger number of women one would encounter in a morning stroll would be the foreign women of the poorer classes."[34] Echoing Lincoln, Janet McKenzie Hill criticized telephone ordering in 1916: "Do not give orders by telephone or through the boy sent from the market. . . ."[35] This admonition suggested that many middle-class women still preferred not going to markets even during World War I.

What was behind genteel women's hesitation in going to market might be illuminated by comparing markets with department stores, both of which represented public spaces where women purchased foods and other goods. During the last decades of the nineteenth century, department stores were founded in major American cities with the intention of attracting women shoppers. Department stores represented the leisure and

---

[32] Faye E. Dudden, *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 137.

[33] Strasser, 243-44.

[34] Mary J. Lincoln, "A Symposium—The Markets of Some Great Cities," *The Chautauquan* 24 (December 1896): 332.

[35] Janet McKenzie Hill, *Nyal Cook Cook.*

service industries, which employed modern commercial aesthetics of color, glass, and light. One went to a department store to "shop," which indicated leisure. By contrast, one went to a local market to "purchase" foodstuffs as part of kitchen work, which the genteel culture denigrated.

The tendency to glamorize department stores and scorn food markets paralleled the elevation of dining rooms and parlors and the denigration of kitchens within middle-class homes. Dining rooms and parlors represented leisure, antithetical to the kitchens, where servants engaged in domestic labor. Genteel women decorated parlors and engaged in honing their aesthetic sensibilities by, among other things, reading and playing the piano.[36] In sharp contrast, Americans likened kitchen work with the lower class, or even slavery. As Joan Jacobs Brumberg writes, many women of respectable families associated food with drudgery.[37] Helen Campbell, a home economist, recalled that when she opened a cooking school in Raleigh, North Carolina, in 1879, local women widely regarded cooking as "niggers' work."[38] Southerners might have more widely equated kitchen work with slavery than Northerners. Yet, as the *New England Kitchen Magazine* observed, "There seems to be a subtle connection between slavery and domestic service which has played no small part in the degradation of domestic duties;"[39] the denigration

---

[36] Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 411.

[37] Joan Jacobs Brumberg, *Fasting Girls: The History of Anorexia Nervosa* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 175.

[38] The United States Bureau of Education. *Industrial Education in the United States: A Special Report* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883), 290.

[39] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 149.

of kitchens seemed rampant even in the North. In response to this identification of kitchen work with slavery, a contributor to the *American Kitchen Magazine* wrote, "Women will never be emancipated—whatever that may mean—until she is master of the situation in her own household,"[40] resorting to the metaphor of slavery in calling for women to run their home systematically. Domestic scientists lamented the American tendency to scorn kitchens.

To change these images of food-related tasks, cooking reformers employed several strategies. First, some cooking experts expected genteel women to instill the producer ethic into lower-class women. Helen Campbell, a social reformer and home economist who had learned cooking from Juliet Corson, proclaimed, "Until a new sense of the dignity of labor has reached the masses in the only way possible, that is, through its indorsement [sic] by the better class, the work of overcoming such prejudice will be difficult and well-nigh impossible."[41] Campbell suggested if women of "the better class" learned to honor domestic work, "the masses" would follow their example. Agreeing with Campbell, Anna Barrows spoke at the National American Woman Suffrage Association in 1900, "There is need . . . of trained women to lead public sentiment to recognize the dignity of manual labor."[42] Perhaps this conviction motivated Barrows to launch a culinary magazine and teach at Chautauqua, both of which targeted middle-class women,

---

[40] Ellen Coit Elliott, "Simplification in the Home," *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (November 1897): 43.

[41] The United States Bureau of Education, 291.

[42] Anna Barrows, "New Professions for Women Centering in the Home," NAWSA Convention, Washington, D.C., February 8-14, 1900 in *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper*, ed. Mari Jo and Paul Buhle (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 370.

whose influence would then, she may have expected, filter into the lower rank of society. Hence, culinary teachers often targeted "ladies" to reform cooking and dietary habits. Writing of her Saturday evening course at Cooper Union, Juliet Corson noted, "An important fact in connection with this instruction is that it has frequently been given in direct connection with young ladies' schools."[43] Corson expected the course to change the perception of cookery entertained by young "ladies," that is, girls from the middle or higher class, who might grow into adults with no prejudice against cooking.

Second, some culinary authorities asserted that kitchens were no less important than parlors, if not more. Just as Marion Harland emphasized the importance of kitchens, rather than parlors, as the key to a married life (See chapter VI), Emma P. Ewing asserted, "Kitchen must rank with the parlor in neatness and dignity. . . . Books, pictures, music, flowers, bric-a-brac, and articles of vertu [sic] are all educating and refining in their tendency, and the taste for them should be cultivated and encouraged; but none of them is such a vital necessity as well-prepared food. . . . And the physical needs of those under her charge should be cared for as sacredly as their mental or spiritual needs."[44] Ewing argued that kitchens, where women cooked to satisfy the physical needs of her family members, should rank with the parlor, which nurtured the mind.

Third, cooking experts attempted to appeal to class consciousness by promoting cookery as an intellectual endeavor. As some food historians point out, science entailed

---

[43] The United States Bureau of Education, 286.

[44] Emma P. Ewing, "Home-Making," Date unknown (1888 or after), 11, Emma P. Ewing Collection, Iowa State University.

class connotations and appealed to the middle class at the turn of the twentieth century.[45] Hence Ellen Richards and her coauthor asserted in *The Chemistry of Cooking and Cleaning*, "Cooking has . . . become an art worthy of the attention of intelligent and learned women. . . . The laws of chemical action are founded upon the laws of definite proportions. . . ."[46] Perhaps this remark reflected Richards's class (and racial) bias derived from her experience in the New England Kitchen in the immigrant neighborhood of Boston during the early 1890s. Richards and other managers of the kitchen were dismayed by the lack of enthusiasm among immigrants for the foods offered, which, the managers claimed, were devised according to scientific principles. Eventually, the managers dismissed those lower-class workers for their lack of ability to understand science and turned their attention to the middle class instead.[47] Other domestic scientists probably followed suit, emphasizing the scientific aspect of cooking in order to appeal to a middle-class consciousness.

The fourth strategy to change the perception of kitchen work, and perhaps the most popular among cooking reformers, pointed to the fusion of the artistic elements of the parlors with domestic labor; women making "dainty dishes" or "dainty meals" in "dainty clothes" signified this blend. As Sherrie Inness writes, "'Daintiness' suggested a

---

[45] Harvey Levenstein, *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 210; Jessamyn Neuhaus, *Manly Meals and Mom's Home Cooking: Cookbooks and Gender in Modern America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 2003), 21.

[46] Ellen H. Richards and Sophronia Maria Elliott, *The Chemistry of Cooking and Cleaning: A Manual of Housekeepers*, 3d ed., rev. and enl. (Boston: Whitcomb and Barrows, 1907), 62.

[47] Levenstein, 59.

whole feminine ethos about how women should look and act,"[48] yet the word also implied a higher class status, as will be discussed later. Probably aware that public demonstrations provided them with the best opportunity to impress an audience, who "think an ugly or shabby attire is a necessity in the kitchen,"[49] cooking experts like Sarah Tyson Rorer and Mary J. Lincoln self-consciously appeared in front of the crowd in dainty clothes. During the 1893 Philadelphia Food Exposition, Rorer dressed herself "with dainty lace-trimmed apron, kerchief and cuffs, which no ordinary woman would dare to wear in the kitchen. . . ,"[50] while, in 1900, she spoke of cooking as "the daintiest, easiest, cleanest work a woman can do. . . ."[51] In the same manner, reporting on a local food fair of 1894, a St. Louis newspaper noted: "Mrs. Lincoln makes a very dainty appearance on the stage in a fresh gingham dress with white cap and apron."[52] Thus, cooking experts like Lincoln and Rorer ensured that they would present themselves as dainty to the public. They knew that daintiness would appeal to genteel women, so much so that Rorer even proclaimed that drawing a chicken was the daintiest task. Explaining how to draw a chicken during the 1893 Philadelphia Food Exposition, she said, "I wish I could photograph the expression of your faces." Acknowledging the audience's perception of drawing chickens as unclean, Rorer then proclaimed, "But I assure you

---

[48] Sherri A. Inness, *Dinner Roles: American Women and Culinary Culture* (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 2001), 55.

[49] "World's Food Fair," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (October 1894): 3-4.

[50] "Fish, Frying and Economy," *Philadelphia Times*, November 18, 1893, 4.

[51] "Simple Way to Fool Man with Left-Over Meat," *Philadelphia North American*, November 15, 1900, 11.

[52] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 145.

drawing a chicken is the daintiest thing to do, and a great deal cleaner work than making a loaf of bread"[53] and went on to show how to do it. Cooking experts placed high hopes on claims of daintiness, expecting it to eliminate the image of kitchen drudgery.

Cooking reformers' efforts to blend artistic elements with domestic labor culminated in what they called "dainty dishes," which referred to the aesthetic and delicate-looking foods of mostly salads and desserts, but other dishes as well (See chapter VIII). Just as women became responsible for decorating their houses in the nineteenth century,[54] they began to garnish their foods. "Garnishing is a mode of expression calling for originality, appreciation of beauty, and an artistic nature. We can express our ideas of form and color in garnishing and become the artist, as the painter does working on his canvas,"[55] wrote a contributor to *Good Housekeeping*. Decorating foods blended kitchen labor with the artistic nature of parlors. Thus, dainty foods embodied Catharine Beecher's attempt to achieve, in the words of Richard Bushman, "domestic refinement," which combined "neatness, order, and industry with taste and elegance."[56] Concocting dainty dishes required a systematic approach to recipes that were calculated for their nutrition, yet also emphasized artistry in their appearance.

Thus dainty dishes blended the new notion of science with the old culture. Dainty foods embodied the culture of refinement, which originated in the Renaissance and soon

---

[53] "[Unreadable] A Cingalese Cook," *Philadelphia Times*, November 19, 1893, 7.

[54] Bushman, 441.

[55] Jessamine Chapman, "When to Garnish," *Good Housekeeping* 57 (October 1913): 552.

[56] Bushman, 305.

spread to the European court. Referring to the ideals of politeness and civility, which encompassed both behavior patterns of speech, manners, and postures and material possessions of, among others, dress and houses, the genteel culture gripped middle-class America in the nineteenth century.[57] Dainty dishes reflected the surge of this culture, which emphasized aesthetics. Just as cooking experts blended old cultural values of self-control and management with the new ideas of science and system in promoting scientific cookery, they infused what they claimed as science into gentility in making dainty dishes.

As a product of the genteel culture, dainty dishes certainly stimulated social aspirations among middle- and lower-class women. If, as Harvey Levenstein writes, "To be accepted, new ideas about food must also fit in with people's social and economic aspirations,"[58] dainty dishes did fulfill this role. Vegetables and fruits, which dominated dainty dishes, were relatively expensive (See chapter VIII), and the poor did not have the luxury of worrying about the appearance of foods.[59] If, as Susan Williams notes, "Food and its presentation offered an important way to demonstrate one's command of the fundamentals of high-style culture,"[60] dainty dishes, coupled with elegant tableware, embodied the upper social rank. If the middle class came to aspire to a genteel life but lacked the means to invest in expensive stuffs, dainty dishes served as "less expensive

---

[57] Ibid., Introduction.

[58] Levenstein, 211.

[59] Inness, 58.

[60] Williams, 155.

substitutes."[61] In addition to an upper-class association, as daintiness took on feminine connotations, these foods, particularly salads, symbolized upper-class womanhood. Laura Shapiro writes that Americans associated salads with "ladies," that is, upper-class women, so much so that, even if they had servants, housewives often made salads themselves.[62] Mary J. Lincoln wrote, "Surely no lady who has a hand and knows how to use it deftly and gracefully would be willing to relinquish this most fascinating part of the dinner service . . . ."[63] By referring to "lady," Lincoln assumed that making salads was appropriate for upper- and middle-class women, who otherwise had their servants prepare meals.

Seemingly aware of the conflicts between dainty meals and the gospel of economical cooking, culinary authorities attempted to solve this problem by combining two seemingly opposing elements. The January 1887 issue of *Table Talk* featured Juliet Corson's article subtitled "Luxurious Economy." "These initial words will raise the question of possibilities in the mind of every practical housekeeper,"[64] began Corson, admitting the oxymoronic nature of the title. She then acknowledged, "Although a great change has taken place in American opinion concerning domestic economy within the last decade, many persons will be disposed at the outset to pronounce our title a

---

[61] Bushman, xiii.

[62] Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1986), 97-100.

[63] Ibid., 97.

[64] Juliet Corson, "Kitchen Economy of the New Year," *Table Talk* 2 (January 1887): 1.

paradox,"[65] because "In this country the axiom still obtains with many an admirable housekeeper that a good table never can be made economical."[66] Corson probably coined this oxymoron deliberately in order to draw the attention of readers. After all, Corson wrote the article "to indicate the possibility of preparing a good dinner at a low cost."[67] The menu she introduced consisted of "Purée of vegetables. Breast of veal, with brown sauce. Haricot beans, stewed. Rice, with lemon sauce,"[68] which readers of *Table Talk* were unlikely to regard as "luxurious." Corson did not intend to introduce "luxurious" meals by any standard, but to challenge her readers' assumption that a "good dinner" would cost a substantial sum of money.

Even if luxury meant different things to different people, the term "luxurious economy" appealed to cooking experts like Sarah Tyson Rorer, who inclined toward blending two different cultural values. In response to Juliet Corson's aforementioned article subtitled "Luxurious Economy," *Table Talk* editorialized:

> This attractive title, employed by Miss Corson in her articles, gives a concise idea of *Table Talk*'s methods and purpose. . . . The sense of taste was given to us for enjoyment as well as for use, and dainty, palatable, and varied food enhances the influence of every home. It is an worthy ambition for the house-wife to have her table so attractive and appetizing that when her husband lunches at the aristocratic café he still thinks longingly and affectionately of his "own table." To assist housewives to accomplish this object is one purpose of *Table Talk*. . . .[69]

---

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid., 2.

[68] Ibid.

[69] "Luxurious Economy," *Table Talk* 2 (January 1887): 27.

This editorial, probably penned by Rorer, defined "luxurious" as "dainty," "palatable," "varied," "attractive," and "appetizing," which collectively suggested dainty foods. Even if Rorer endorsed the "luxurious" side of cookery, the editorial quickly added, "But an equally important one is to show how this can be accomplished at the least possible cost, and to discourage the waste of a single scrap which can be profitably utilized."[70] Rorer and Corson surely shared the passion for economizing cooking, even if they differed in their definitions of luxury. Rorer became so fond of the term "luxurious economy" that she delivered a demonstration lecture during the 1897 Philadelphia Food Exposition with that title.[71] She also emphasized her idea of "luxurious economy" in her article on dainty meals in the *Ladies Home Journal.* Rorer lamented, "If the American housekeeper has a fault it is that . . . small left-overs are seldom utilized"[72] and offered her suggestions on "Utilizing Vegetables Which Are Left Over,"[73] as a subtitle read. Rorer ensured that cooking dainty meals did not equate to extravagant spending.

Just as she stressed economy in dainty dishes, Rorer preferred to view that daintiness and simplicity were not mutually exclusive terms. Although the title of her *Mrs. Rorer's Key to Simple Cookery* (1917) showed only the term *simple*, the author juxtaposed the word with *artistic* several times in the book. For example, she proclaimed, "Serve every meal, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, in a simple, artistic

---

[70] Ibid.

[71] "Luxurious Economy," *Philadelphia Press*, November 11, 1897, 9.

[72] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Dainty Meals for Small Families," *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (September 1899): 24.

[73] Ibid.

manner."[74] Did simplicity and artistry go hand-in-hand? David Shi observes in his *The Simple Life*, "One could live plainly yet well in modern America, but this meant developing a carefully considered taste for the essential, the beautiful, and the good. Simple living—spending time and money wisely, tastefully, and moderately—was an ethic of self-conscious discrimination and limitation. . . ."[75] The simple life pointed not to mere frugality but to combining careful management of time and money with taste.

Other culinary authorities echoed this spirit of simplicity. Maria Parloa wrote, "Extravagance and waste are most demoralizing. On the other hand, penuriousness is likely to warp and harden a character."[76] The simple life pointed to neither squandering income, nor living like the poor, but managing expenditure carefully. Hence, cooking reformers were likely to condemn big banquets featuring many courses of heavy and indigestible foods as a lack of simplicity. Emma P. Ewing lamented, "A needless display of either viands or table furniture is always a banquet of many courses, with an unlimited supply of wines and liquors between each course, implies a crude state of civilization. . . ."[77] Such a banquet lacked a deliberate attempt to moderate meals, which went against the principle of simplicity.

By exhorting women to cook nutritious meals economically and artistically, cooking reformers reinforced their raison d'etre. Just as advertising presented problems

---

[74] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's Key to Simple Cookery* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1917), 19.

[75] David Shi, *The Simple Life: Plain Living and High Thinking in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 177.

[76] Maria Parloa, "The Young Couple with a Maid," *Ladies' Home Journal* 22 (September 1905): 36.

[77] Emma P. Ewing, "The Ideal Bill of Fare," *The Chautauquan; A Weekly Newsmagazine* 14 (November 1891): 212.

and their solutions simultaneously (See chapter VI), cooking reformers presented (or created) a problem—how to maximize nutrition and add artistry with the least possible cost—and offered its solution. Cooking teachers aptly claimed that cooking in such a scrupulous manner in every step of providing meals would require knowledge and skills. Given that cookbooks and magazine articles on cooking proliferated and some even made the best-seller lists at the turn of the twentieth century, many middle-class women sought cooking advice, including recipes for ornamental dishes.

Even if dainty dishes attracted women into kitchens, making such dainty and decorative dishes complicated the cooking process and prolonged the time women spent in the kitchen, a trend contradictory to the goal of many cooking reformers. Sherrie Inness writes, "Daintiness . . . encouraged women to stay in their kitchens because it was such an elusive goal to achieve—one that required thought and much effort in order to produce a splendid feast. . . ."[78] She might disagree with the aforementioned newspaper article on "Luxurious Economy," which reported Rorer's emphasis on economizing time, writing, "The idea of modern cooking, Mrs. Rorer noted in connection with simplifying the making of sauces, is to put enough science into cookery to make things wholesome, and to teach one how to do them quickly. The economy of time was one upon which she insisted strenuously."[79] Rorer's emphasis on economizing time might have been only half true, given that she also underscored the appearance of dishes, which probably encouraged women to stay in the kitchen longer. The *New England Kitchen Magazine*

---

[78] Inness, 57.

[79] "Luxurious Economy."

criticized the popularity of ornamental foods in its editorial entitled "Mission of the Cooking School" in 1894:

> In these days, when there is so much to be learned and enjoyed in our short lives, it is a wicked waste of time and opportunities to spend so much effort on petty details, when previous instruction would have made easy work of what is otherwise drudgery. Therefore a large part of the work of the cooking schools should be given to studying how best to reduce labor by use of suitable utensils, by systematic order of work and by simplifying details in recipes.[80]

This editorial, probably penned by Mary J. Lincoln, might have alluded to Fannie Farmer, who headed the Boston Cooking School at the time, and her penchant for decorating foods in detail. Even if cooking reformers seriously worked on simplifying domestic labor, concocting dainty dishes was likely to prolong kitchen work.

Perhaps women did not mind spending time in the kitchen cooking aesthetic dishes, since these foods satisfied the appetite for status symbols. Dainty dishes represented what Thorstein Veblen called "conspicuous consumption," one mark of the advent of a modern consumer culture. In *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899), Veblen extensively discussed women's spending habits as a way to show their social status and wrote, "The housewife's efforts are under the guidance of traditions that have been shaped by the law of conspicuously wasteful expenditure of time and substance. . . . The more reputable, 'presentable' portion of middle-class household paraphernalia are . . . items of conspicuous consumption."[81] Veblen alluded to the culture of refinement, and whether he was aware or not, "items of conspicuous consumption" included dainty dishes, the product of such a tradition. This practice of "conspicuous consumption"

---

[80] "Mission of the Cooking School," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July, 1894): 189.

[81] Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (London: The MacMillan Company, 1899), 82-83.

marked the advent of a new era, as William Leach notes, "Desire to show things off . . . marked a critical moment in the formation of a new culture of consumption."[82] Dainty dishes both reflected and reinforced this new consumer culture.

Hence, delicate, aesthetic foods contributed to accelerating capitalism. As Richard Bushman writes, "Gentility and capitalism collaborated in the formation of consumer culture, gentility creating demand and capitalism manufacturing supply."[83] A fusion between gentility and capitalism manifested itself in Knox Gelatine's 1901 advertisement to Chautauqua. In *Chautauquan*, the institution's monthly organ, the company's message read, "CHAUTAUQUAN readers are a refined, intellectual class. We want to interest CHAUTAUQUAN housewives in our interesting little booklet, 'Dainty Desserts for Dainty People'"[84] (emphasis in original). Knox correctly pinpointed its audience: gelatin desserts were designed for women such as those who were attracted to Chautauqua, an embodiment of the genteel culture. Attracting a large number of upper-middle-class women who sought an opportunity for self-education, Chautauqua possessed a relatively homogeneous population, who shared an interest in "high culture" and self-improvement.[85] This nature of Chautauqua provided Knox Gelatine as well as cooking teachers with the opportunity to shape the perception of kitchen work as a refined job among genteel women. By endorsing gelatin desserts and providing recipes to its

---

[82] William R. Leach, "Transformations in a Culture of Consumption: Women and Department Stores, 1890-1925," *Journal of American History* 71 (September 1984): 325.

[83] Bushman, 407.

[84] "Dainty Desserts," *The Chautauquan* 32 (February 1901): 553.

[85] Jeanne Halgren Kilde, "The 'Predominance of the Feminine' at Chautauqua: Rethinking the Gender-Space Relationship in Victorian America," *Signs* 24 (Winter 1999): 465-68.

advertising booklets, cooking experts helped turn Chautauqua's supreme aim of "high culture" into a commercial market of gelatin desserts for women consumers.

Knox Gelatine's 1915 edition of *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People* also embodied this fusion between gentility and capitalism. Featuring an illustration of the European court in their recipe booklets, Knox Gelatine attached the air of gentility to their mass-produced packaged products. In addition, making dainty dishes probably increased the demand for exotic fruits and gelatin, as well as cooking utensils and table wares, such as Wedgwood, which would display such aesthetic foods. As Helen Damon-Moore notes, "Designating consuming as women's work and urging women to do it more often actually shored up capitalism and aided in the further development of national markets."[86] By supplying a number of dainty dishes to Knox (See chapter VI), many cooking experts contributed to reinforcing the relationship between gentility and capitalism dependent on women consumers.

Food expositions epitomized marketing—that is, commercial activities aiming to maximize the sales of commodities—that targeted women. The fair managers obviously conceived these events, which featured processed food products, with women as their audience. On the opening night of the Minneapolis Food Exposition of 1898, a local newspaper captured the feminine feature of the fair: "Of the visitors, fully three-fourths were women. In fact, it is distinctively a woman's affair. The booths are presided over by women, the lecturing and demonstrating is done by women, and the music is supplied by

---

[86] Helen Damon-Moore, *Magazines for the Millions: Gender and Commerce in the* Ladies' Home Journal *and the* Saturday Evening Post, *1880-1910* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 49.

women musicians."[87] In this women-dominating atmosphere, the newspaper advised men, "If the men want to embrace the opportunity to see a thoroughly interesting and educating entertainment, largely conceived and carried out by women, the big pure food exposition is the place to see."[88] The paper portrayed men as outside spectators of the food exposition, in which women were participants. Fair managers reinforced this feminine nature of the food fair by appealing only to women. A Philadelphia newspaper carried the following advertisement of the local food exposition of 1896, which read: "SOUVENIRS—Handsome and costly souvenirs . . . presented to the first 300 ladies purchasing box-office tickets."[89] This advertisement both reflected and reinforced the feminine nature of food fairs and the association of women with food.

Probably more than food expositions, women's magazines contributed to establishing the practice of marketing to women. The established link between femininity and writing for magazines provided a fertile cultural ground for advertisements that targeted women. As Helen Damon-Moore argues, the notion of gender provided a means for advertisers to help personalize their business contacts with potential customers.[90] This concept of gendered marketing attracted the publishers of women's magazines, such as Cyrus Curtis and Luisa Knapp Curtis, who founded the *Ladies' Home Journal* in 1883. The couple capitalized on this commercialized view of

---

[87] "Pure Food Show," *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 11, 1898, 7.

[88] Ibid.

[89] *Philadelphia Inquirer*, December 3, 1896, 9; December. 4, 1896, 9; December 10, 1896, 4.

[90] Damon-Moore, 24.

gender and enticed a number of advertisers, including those of food manufacturers who targeted women consumers.[91] Edward Bok became the magazine's editor in 1889 and recruited Maria Parloa in 1891, Sarah Tyson Rorer in 1897, and Janet McKenzie Hill in 1899 into the magazine's household writers' team. By giving advice on cooking and other housekeeping problems, including spending, in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, which carried a myriad of advertised household goods targeting women, these cooking experts contributed to the magazine's marketing efforts.

Perhaps the surge of cooking magazines in the 1890s—most notably *Household News* (inaugurated in 1893), the *New England Kitchen Magazine* (1894), and the *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* (1896)—attested to the ingrained perception of women as consumers, especially grocery shoppers. Culinary authorities probably founded their magazines on the premise of this view, which ensured the periodicals' financial profits through advertising revenue. Thus, culinary reformers joined "the campaign to transform women into consumers, in the phrase of Swiencicki.[92] Although cooking teachers were quick to deny their pecuniary motives and association with commercialism altogether, their belief in women's role as consumers helped render their cooking magazines financially viable.

Cooking reformers' role in "the campaign to transform women into 'the consumers'"[93] manifested itself in the *American Kitchen Magazine*'s message to

---

[91] Ibid., 24-5.

[92] Swiencicki, 231.

[93] Ibid.

advertisers in 1899. The message began: "Women do the buying for the Household. We reach intelligent Women in their Homes. Therefore: Anything of the interest to women can be profitably advertised in the *American Kitchen Magazine*" (capitals in original). By saying "intelligent women," the magazine alluded that its readers were upper- and middle-class women, who made purchase decisions carefully. To put it the other way around, the magazine implied that it was seeking advertisements that measured up to those "intelligent women." The solicitation then claimed, "Ninety-nine per cent of everything purchased, from steamships to desks, and from underwear to silverware, is purchased directly by the woman, or is controlled by her not always silent influence." Without indicating the source of "ninety-nine percent," the magazine had certainly inflated that number. This message concluded by proclaiming, "When you advertise to reach the man you reach only the man. When you advertise to reach the women you reach the man and the woman."[94] Although the question of who made major purchasing decisions remained a controversial topic throughout the 1890s,[95] the *American Kitchen Magazine* apparently chose to adhere to the growing perception of women as purchasers, so that the periodical was able to attract advertisers.

The perception of women as consumers seemed to have been embedded in American society by 1899, given that, in addition to the above magazine message and *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, two women's groups that presupposed women's role as consumers were founded in 1899. Florence Kelley and some other women of socialist

---

[94] *American Kitchen Magazine* 11 (September 1899), back of the front cover.

[95] See Strasser, *Never Done*, 244-45.

sympathies founded the National Consumers' League (NCL), aiming to reform the working conditions of women and children, as well as to eliminate harmful and defective products from the market. In the meantime, in the summer of 1899, some domestic scientists and their sympathizers gathered in upstate New York to hold the first Lake Placid Conference (LPC). Eleven people attended the conference, including Maria Parloa, Anna Barrows, who served as a secretary, and Ellen Richards as a chairperson. The annual conferences continued until 1908 and culminated in the formation of the American Home Economics Association in 1909. While these two groups held different reform targets, they shared the assumption that women were consumers, that is, they were responsible for purchasing commercial goods. Kelley proclaimed in 1899, "The one great industrial function of women has been that of the purchaser."[96] In the same fashion, the LPC presupposed women's role as consumers. Speaking on the standard of living at the first LPC, Ellen Richards emphasized the need to educate middle-class women, many of whom, Richards claimed, were not skillfully managing the household budget.[97] The fact that these two group activities began in 1899 attested to the established view of women as consumers.

This identification of women as consumers at the turn of the twentieth century was reflected in a growing iconography of women in advertising as moral guardians and

---

[96] Kathryn Kish Sklar, "Two Political Cultures in the Progressive Era: The National Consumers' League and the American Association for Labor Legislation," in *U.S. History as Women's History: New Feminist Essays*, ed. Linda Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 43.

[97] *Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics, Proceedings of the First, Second and Third Conferences* (New York: Lake Placid, 1901), 6.

beneficiaries of male production. As Jackson Lears writes, in the commercial world, women's function shifted from the source of abundance to its beneficiaries and the guiding spirits that led technological development.[98] For example, a newspaper advertisement for the Cincinnati Pure Food Exposition of 1894 featured a mythic female figure, surrounded with a cornucopia of objects, ranging from corn, vegetables, and fruits to the heads of animals, which surely indicated meat. Below this female figure were the illustrations of men engaging in food production, such as those who were slashing the bellies of suspended animals and working at a factory surrounded with packaged products. The female figure was visibly detached from the male producers who "were getting their hands dirty." By the same token, the United Fruit Company's 1904 advertising recipe booklet for bananas, compiled by Janet McKenzie Hill, featured an illustration of an ethereal mermaid sitting on the back of a dolphin and navigating it into North American ports.[99] Advertising thus placed women outside of production and portrayed them as goddesses of male technological and industrial prowess, which brought food abundance to American society.

Sarah Tyson Rorer articulated this process of making women consumers during her speech at the Women's World Exposition held in Chicago in 1925. Rorer, who spent her girlhood in Buffalo, New York, in the mid-nineteenth century, testified: "No one ever heard of a man canner when I was a girl. My mother did all her own canning. My mother

---

[98] T. J. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of American Advertising* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 107-11.

[99] Janet McKenzie Hill, *A Short History of the Banana: And a Few Recipes for Its Use* (Boston: United Fruit Company, 1904), 30.

made her own soap, and cured hams as well. She sent for women tailors, who came into the house and made the clothes of the man in the family." Rorer suggested that many middle-class women produced household stuffs in the mid-nineteenth century. As illustrated in the previously mentioned *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* (1841), in which Catharine Beecher assumed a binary division of male producers and women consumers, the middle decades of the nineteenth century marked a transitional period for women's roles. Rorer then went on to discuss how the times had changed, observing, "Those days are gone forever. Today men make the soap; men examine the milk. A woman buys a skirt in the store, but wants it lengthened; a man steps forth. . . ."[100] Rorer thus implied that the perception of men as producers and women as consumers was established during the decades before and after the turn of the century.

By molding and perpetuating the perception of women as consumers of foods, cooking experts helped lay an ideological groundwork upon which food advertisements thrived in the twentieth century. As some scholars argue, food advertising reinforced the idea that women were consumers who were responsible to maintain the health of their family.[101] The fusion between women's domesticity and consumption—or women's role as consumers as part of their domesticity—was illustrated by Jell-O's recipes booklets. In addition to its 1913 edition, which emphasized women's role to feed their husbands (See chapter VI), its 1916 version, under the title, "The Bride and Her Task," claimed,

---

[100] "Cooking 'Pioneer' Lauds Modern Man," *New York Times*, April 22, 1925, http://select.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=F00F15F6385B12738DDDAB0A94DC405B858EF1D3.

[101] Lears, 187-88 ; Katherine J. Parkin, *Food Is Love: Food Advertising and Gender Roles in Modern America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 9, 159.

"Children are especially subject to stomach troubles that come from over-eating. . . . Jell-O is so easily digested and is so wholesome every way that 'a little more' is never likely to do harm."[102] These messages suggested that women were responsible for taking care of their husbands and children and Jell-O was willing to help these women. Again, the Jell-O recipe booklets took the typical advertising strategy of posing a problem and offering a solution simultaneously. Food advertisers like Jell-O thrived on the view of women's domesticity, which included shopping.

Through this process of incorporating cooking into women's domesticity, cooking teachers had to address the tension between the Protestant ethic and the genteel culture. To solve this conflict, they often incorporated one culture into another. The genteel culture denigrated kitchen labor; cooking experts infused gentility into food-related tasks and promoted dainty dishes. Because dainty dishes were at risk of violating the traditional value of thrift, cooking teachers were quick to emphasize striking a balance between thrift and daintiness or luxury. This effort to blend the two cultural strains in cooking provided cooking teachers with the opportunity to show off their knowledge and skills. Dainty dishes also stimulated the purchase of not only foodstuffs but also table wares, thus bolstering women's role in developing consumer capitalism. The cooking reformers' efforts to bring women into the kitchen accelerated the perception of women as consumers. In addition to women's role in the purchasing and cooking of food, culinary reformers helped women to consume foods in another way: by eating.

---

[102] The Genesee Pure Food Co., *What Six Famous Cooks Say of America's Most Famous Dessert* (Le Roy, N.Y.: The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1913), 1.

CHAPTER VIII

EATING: REFINING WOMEN'S APPETITE

In addition to buying and using, "consuming" means eating and drinking. This primitive act posed a conflict with gentility, as John Kasson writes, "The process of eating might reduce all involved to an animal level of appetite and competition."[1] This negative perception of eating lay the groundwork for the elaborate table manners which developed among the upper and middle classes during the nineteenth century to mitigate or "civilize" the animalistic act of eating. Women had a higher stake in the food culture of the nineteenth century. As Richard Bushman notes, "They were thought to be the exemplars of refinement's highest virtues—taste, sensibility, and delicacy—models for men to conform to."[2] Consequently, many genteel women faced the dilemma of choosing between the physical need of nutrition to survive and the general perception of eating as unfeminine. However, this nineteenth-century genteel culture had, by the early twentieth century, yielded to a modern culture, where women eating, even in public, became socially and culturally acceptable. The changing attitude toward eating at the turn of the century roughly corresponded to the rise and prosperity of scientific cookery as well as of a culture of consumption. A set of questions arise here: Did cooking reformers play a role in causing this transformation? If so, how did they contribute? What was the relationship between scientific cookery, consumer culture, and women's appetite?

---

[1]John F. Kasson, *Rudeness & Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1990), 211.

[2] Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 440.

Considering *consuming* to mean eating and drinking, this chapter explores the role of cooking experts in shaping one aspect of modernity, where women had few qualms about displaying their appetite and eating. Although culinary authorities emphasized the control of appetite, they saw sluggish and capricious appetites as health problems. Advocates of scientific cooking presupposed that all humans, regardless of sex, needed to develop healthy eating habits, thus dismissing the genteel culture's denial of appetite. In addition, cooking reformers devised many recipes for dainty dishes for women to eat as well as to make. By asserting that the aesthetics of foods corresponded to their wholesomeness, culinary authorities combined scientific cookery with the ethos of consumer culture to prompt genteel women to consume these dainty foods. Thus, culinary teachers not only encouraged genteel women to consume foods by going out to buy foodstuffs and cooking them, but by eating the foods as well, even though these dishes were expected to conform to gender norms.

The genteel culture of the nineteenth century stigmatized appetite. Antebellum health reformers like Sylvester Graham believed the temptations of food and sex marked moral weakness and urged Americans to restrict their bodily and sensual appetites.[3] This call for controlling appetite was directed especially to women, who were expected to possess high moral standards. Eating also exposed the physical indelicacies of digestion and defecation, so much so that constipation represented femininity during the nineteenth

[3] Ronald G. Walters, Ronald G. Walters, *American Reformers, 1815-1860*, rev. ed (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997), 151.

century.[4] In this cultural milieu, the Committee on Industrial Education, an organ of the Woman's Education Association of Boston and in charge of opening the Boston Cooking School in 1879, faced a problem of dealing with cooked food, the inevitable product of cooking lessons; the idea that cooking students would enjoy the product of their labor after class was not an option for the committee.[5] Consuming food for enjoyment, which marked a lack of self-control, was in conflict with the genteel ideals, especially femininity, of the nineteenth century.

Cooking reformers challenged the culture's negative perceptions of appetite. As their contemporaries, cooking experts viewed appetite as a reflection of self-control, yet they called for the development of appetite in a healthy way, rather than denigrating it. Although, as Laura Shapiro observes, "Domestic scientists had taken for granted that eating food was a great deal less feminine than preparing it,"[6] they still accepted women's appetite. To Juliet Corson and her colleagues in scientific cooking, appetite should occupy the middle ground between gluttony on one hand and fasting on the other. "Good cooking should not be regarded as an incentive to gluttony, or used as the means of tempting the luxurious to undue indulgence of appetite,"[7] wrote Corson, thus castigating uncontrolled appetite. On the other hand, in explaining "The Use of

---

[4] Joan Jacobs Brumberg, *Fasting Girls: The History of Anorexia Nervosa* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 175.

[5] Laura Shapiro, *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1986), 51-2.

[6] Ibid., 100.

[7] Juliet Corson, *Cooking School Text Book: And Housekeepers' Guide to Cookery and Kitchen* (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1883), v.

Appetite," she asserted, "It is a pernicious habit of thought which leads persons to disregard the claims of appetite. Those vain reasoners who seek to cast discredit upon this wonderful human mechanism, which is the greatest work in nature, by decrying our physical attributes and disregarding our daily necessities in ostensible care for our spiritual or intellectual parts, are quite sure to pay the penalty of their indifference or neglect."[8] Corson viewed appetite as a natural attribute in humans and called for learning how to use it or else suffer a deterioration of health. Fannie Farmer took appetite a step further than Corson, writing in her *Boston Cooking-School Cookbook*, "The salad plants, lettuce, watercress, chiccory [sic], cucumbers, etc., contain but little nutriment, but are cooling, refreshing, and assist in stimulating the appetite."[9] Far from subduing appetite, Farmer viewed "stimulating the appetite" positively. In the same vein, in the October 1900 issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, Janet McKenzie Hill presented eight illustrated recipes in an article entitled "Making Breakfast Appetizing,"[10] thus assuming that dishes must be attractive enough to stimulate appetite. Cooking experts believed that a steady and healthy appetite was desirable.

In the same fashion, cooking experts helped assuage the shame of eating in public. Etiquette manuals warned against eating in public, whether on the street or train, or at the site of amusement. As one writer complained, "The pleasure of traveling is often

---

[8] Ibid., 213.

[9] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *The Boston Cooking-School Cook Book*, rev. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1911), 322.

[10] Janet McKenzie Hill, "Making a Breakfast Appetizing," *Ladies' Home Journal* 17 (October 1900): 31.

greatly marred by the needless spectacle of others eating."[11] Eating in public, which marked a lack of refinement to genteel Americans, was problematic particularly to women. According to Joan Jacobs Brumberg, a woman who was "never to be seen eating" represented "the ultimate embodiment of Victorian imperatives about food and gender."[12] Tacitly defying these negative views of public eating, Sarah Tyson Rorer offered her advice on diet while traveling, writing, "Persons traveling . . . are exceedingly unwise to take large meals. They should eat just enough to satisfy hunger,"[13] perhaps because tourists, sitting for a long time in trains or ships must limit their physical exercise. She also groaned, "The diarrhæa which so often comes to people while traveling is . . . caused . . . from the unaccustomed diet and overeating. They have nothing else to think about, and it is eat, eat, from morning until night."[14] Rorer did castigate uncontrolled appetite but, unlike etiquette manual writers, revealed no objection to eating itself. Eating in public did not pose a problem to cooking teachers like Rorer, who exhorted Americans to develop a controlled but healthy appetite.

In sum, if cooking authorities claimed that they based their argument for cultivating healthy eating habits on scientific laws, these women used science in a way that liberated appetite and eating from the genteel culture of the nineteenth century. The term *scientific cookery* might have connoted nothing but science, management, and

---

[11] Kasson, 199.

[12] Brumberg, 178.

[13] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "The Right Food for Different Men," *Ladies' Home Journal* 15 (October 1898): 22.

[14] Ibid.

control at the cost of taste, flavor, and appearance, yet a scientific approach to foodways seems to have helped shed a positive light on appetite itself. Culinary reformers helped modernize American cooking and eating habits in two primary ways: emphasizing calories and the laws of nutrition for a healthy diet and accepting appetite as basically a good thing in middle-class America.

In prescribing diet, cooking experts regarded occupation, among other things, as a variable, thus reinforcing class differences by food consumption. Cooking authorities usually assigned heavy and stuffy foods to laborers and light and digestible foods to sedentary people such as office workers and professionals. According to Juliet Corson, "carbonaceous, or heat-giving foods," such as "fat meat," "milk," "liver," "beans," and "potatoes," were best suited to "hard steady workers" while, she wrote, "brain workers should subsist chiefly on light and digestible articles," such as "fruits" and "vegetables," as well as "fish," "oysters," and "game."[15] Using occupation as a criterion of food choice, Corson reinforced the perception of vegetables and fruits as high class. As the definition of nutrition pointed mostly to calories and protein before the discovery of vitamins,[16] cooking experts had not yet recognized the nutritive values of vegetables and fruits and regarded them primarily as luxuries. The author of the *New England Cook Book* (1905) wrote, "Fruits do not take an important place as nutrients. They belong rather among the

---

[15] Juliet Corson, *The Cooking Manual of Practical Directions for Economical Every-Day Cookery* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1879), 15.

[16] Nancy Duran, "Farmers' Bulletins Advice to Women on Diet, Food, and Cooking," *Journal of Agriculture & Food Information* 6 (2005): 62.

luxuries, and yet, as an agreeable stimulant to digestion, they occupy a front rank."[17] The writer implied that only those who could afford to buy nutritiously frivolous foods would buy fruits, although some fruits like bananas had become widely available after the turn of the century.

Like fruits, vegetables were also associated with the upper-middle class. In providing the bills of fare, an author of *Progressive Housekeeping* (1889) wrote, "I have given such food as suits the winter months, for which reason I have put salad for up stairs only, as it is in winter costly."[18] Implying that a family dining room was placed "up stairs," while "down stairs" referred to the kitchen, where servants took their meals, the author assigned salads—assuming that they referred to standard green vegetable salads—only to the middle- and upper-middle-class family. Sarah Tyson Rorer also fostered this link between salads and higher classes, writing, "They (succulent or green vegetables and fruits) satisfy hunger without overfeeding, and so form excellent foods for the active brain-worker because, even when one takes little exercise, they tend to keep the blood in good condition" [19] (parentheses mine). Perhaps inadvertently, Rorer diluted the class implication of plant foods by emphasizing the sedentary life of "brain workers," of office clerks, corporate managers, and professionals. Still, by employing occupation as one factor for food modification, cooking experts helped reinforce the perception of vegetables and fruits as upper-middle class foods.

---

[17] Alice M. Turner, The *New England Cook Book* (Boston: Chas. E. Brown Publishing Co, 1905), 30.

[18] Catherine Owen, *Progressive Housekeeping* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1889), 130.

[19] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Our Succulent Vegetables," *Good Housekeeping* 58 (May 1914): 711.

In addition to class connotations, culinary teachers reinforced the femininity of these plant foods, especially fruits, for their light and delicate qualities. Culinary authorities prescribed fruits to "ladies" luncheons partly because of the feminine association of fruits and partly because of the sedentary life of women. In discussing fruit salads, Sarah Tyson Rorer wrote, "Those agreeable to each other in flavor may be blended, such as banana and orange, white grape and orange, apple and celery. These fruit salads are largely used at ladies' luncheons."[20] In the same vein, Fannie Farmer wrote of "using grape juice, fresh raspberry juice, fresh strawberry juice or fresh pineapple juice" to "serve as a first course at a ladies' luncheon."[21] Without explaining why fruit was suitable for women's luncheons, Farmer and Rorer took the association between fruits and women for granted. If they had operated strictly by physiological laws and nutrition science, the cooking authorities could have seen fruits as gender neutral; fruits, for their lightness and digestibility, should also have suited men who engaged in sedentary occupations. Although cooking experts claimed that they had formulated their cooking and diet theories based on science, they let their gender bias influence their idea of food adaptation.

Perhaps unintentionally, cooking experts fostered the femininity of fruits by using them in desserts, which were also strongly associated with women. For instance, many of the twenty dishes Sarah Tyson Rorer listed in her *Dainties* (1894) comprised fruit desserts, such as "Pineapple Hulnah," "Cream Cherries," "Cream Strawberries,"

---

[20] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Good Cooking* (Philadelphia: Curtis Publishing Company, 1896), 140.

[21] Fannie Merritt Farmer, *A New Book of Cookery* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1912), 8.

"Cherries in Jelly," and "Compote of Pineapple."[22] In addition to these fruit desserts, Rorer presented the main dish of "Curried Rice" and a few recipes that used eggs and cheese, but she provided no dishes that employed meat and fish, except some vegetable sauces, such as "Cucumber Sauce," which, according to the author, "is exceedingly nice served with either broiled, boiled or creamed fish," and "Ceylon Tomato Sauce," "a delicious sauce to serve with thin, cold roasted beef or mutton." In addition to using many "exotic" foodstuffs and names, which indicated Rorer's embracement of the "consumers' imperium" (See chapter VI), Rorer's definition of dainty dishes mostly pointed to plant-based foods, particularly fruit desserts.

By formulating these recipes of dainty dishes, cooking authorities presented foods that were designed for genteel women to eat. Here, dainty foods spawned a paradox: consuming delicate and aesthetic foods may have liberated women from the restricted culture of gentility and provided them with the opportunity to underscore their femininity, as well as their class status, by performing the act of eating. "Perhaps inadvertently, the desire to show things off helped to loosen the resistance to personal sexual display and performance in public that had hitherto distinguished American social behavior,"[23] notes William Leach in his study of the relationships between women and department stores at the turn of the twentieth century. In other words, "conspicuous consumption" might have played a large role in unleashing women's appetite. By providing many recipes for dainty dishes, cooking experts helped transform the culture of

---

[22] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Dainties* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1894), 5.

[23] William R. Leach, "Transformations in a Culture of Consumption: Women and Department Stores, 1890-1925," *Journal of American History* 71 (September 1984): 325.

the nineteenth century, where any sign of women's desire for food was frowned upon, into the modern period, where women were able to display their femininity and class status through their appetite. To be sure, many dainty foods lost their initial class connotations, as foodstuffs became democratized after the turn of the twentieth century (See chapter VI), yet they still evoke femininity today.

Although dainty dishes primarily referred to the feminine images of desserts and salads, which used plenty of vegetables, fruits, and sugar, some dishes did use animal foods. Probably culinary teachers did not believe the genteel idea that meat, a heat-giving food, was sexually stimulating and, therefore, not culturally appropriate for proper women.[24] Although cooking experts agreed that meat was heat-producing, they used this quality of meat to assign the food to winter consumption, thus employing seasons, rather than gender, as a criterion of food choice. As one cookbook author wrote, "In winter more meat . . . is required. . . . In summer, on the contrary, less meat and heat-giving foods are needed."[25] Generally, advocates of scientific cookery believed that meat consumption was desirable for laborers rather than for sedentary workers, or in winter rather than in summer. Among animal meats, many cooking teachers reasoned that beef, mutton, and pork, all of which were relatively heavy and indigestible, were desirable for laborers and winter consumption, while poultry, relatively light and digestible, was appropriate for the sedentary. No matter how cooking teachers approached the choice of meat, they rarely used gender as a criterion. After all, except for the advocates of plant-

[24] Brumberg, 173.

[25] Ella A. Pierce, *Hartley House Cook Book and Household Economist*, (New York: Lentilhon & Co., 1901), 163.

based diets, such as Ella Eaton Kellogg, cooking teachers basically called for the intake of all kinds of foodstuffs in balance.

In fact, cooking teachers presented meat-dish recipes, which evoked masculinity, and called them "dainty." In the "Dainty Meals for Small Families" article in the 1899 *Ladies' Home Journal*, Sarah Tyson Rorer presented one sample dinner, whose menu comprised "Broiled Tenderloin" and "Baked Potatoes,"[26] both of which were strongly associated with men. Although the meal was somewhat feminized by other dishes, such as "Giblet Soup," "Lettuce Salad," and "Rice Pudding," Rorer did call the meal that included meat and potato "dainty." In the same fashion, in an article entitled "Dainty Dishes for Mid-Winter" in the February 1900 issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, Janet McKenzie Hill listed not only such stereotypical dainty dishes as "Apple and Cress Salad," "Orange Jelly with Orange Sections," "Banana Cream Cake," "Apple, Duchess Style," and "Hamburg Sponge with Whipped Cream," she also presented some pork and poultry dishes, such as "Baked Ham with Olives," "Chicken Cutlets, Parker House Style," "Pigeons Served with Broth," and "Baked Haddock with Fried Oysters." Hill even showed "Boiled Ham" in the "Appetizing Dishes for Summer-Time" article,[27] of which other cooking experts might have complained, given that they advised the consumption of pork in winter, if people desired. No matter what they thought of offering ham in summer, cookbook authors included foods that were identified with men among their dainty meals.

---

[26] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Dainty Meals for Small Families," *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (September 1899): 24.

[27] Janet McKenzie Hill, "Appetizing Dishes for Summer-Time," *Ladies' Home Journal* 17 (July 1900): 20.

Although cooking experts employed meat and poultry in what they called "dainty" dishes, they still retained the gender association of meat and animal products to some degree. In *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book* (1883), the author revealed this ambiguous perception of meat, "There have been many cases known where people lived to an extreme age who used exclusively a vegetable diet, and others who lived equally as long upon animal food. But the general rule is, that we find the highest degree of bodily and mental vigor only among those who make use of a mixed diet."[28] Lincoln concluded that a mixed diet was the best for "people," both men and women. However, in the same cookbook, Lincoln assured her readers in her directions for "Fish Chowder"; "In this chowder you have nothing but what the most dainty person may relish. There are no bones, skin, or scraps of boiled pork."[29] If a "dainty person" referred to a woman, Lincoln implied that the residues of an animal body were not suitable for a genteel woman to eat. Lincoln, who otherwise approached nutrition in a gender-neutral way, endorsed cultural imperatives: meat or animal bodies were not appropriate for genteel women. Culinary authorities fostered a widespread disassociation between women and meat, which helped cause iron-deficiency anemia among young women at the turn of the twentieth century.[30]

Perhaps more than their ingredients, dainty dishes depended on their appearances and presentations. After all, gelatin, for instance, was an animal product extracted from tissues, bones, or organs of cattle or horses, but took on strong feminine connotations for

---

[28] Mary J. Lincoln, *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book: What To Do and What Not To Do in Cooking* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1916), 467.

[29] Ibid., 156.

[30] Shapiro, 101.

its usefulness in decorating salads and desserts. As Sherrie Inness notes, "The more ornate and decorative the food, the better it demonstrated the distinction between women and men. . . ."[31] Thus, dainty foods often featured their artistry, as Sarah Tyson Rorer wrote of desserts, "Desserts should be attractive, but most simple in material and construction. . . . : a dainty and delicate omelet soufflé, a little dish of whipped cream, or a parfait. A dessert, like the trimming of a gown, should be dainty. . . ."[32] Although "most simple in material" might have attested to Rorer's concern with nutrition, she definitely saw daintiness as beautiful appearance. To Rorer and her colleagues in scientific cookery, the appearance of dainty dishes was no less important than their ingredients and wholesomeness.

Regarding appearance, cooking teachers often suggested making portions thinner and smaller and decorating the dishes with flowers, so that they would look delicate and feminine. In the *Ladies' Home Journal*, Sarah Tyson Rorer advised to offer "thin slices of cold beef with cream horseradish sauce. The meat may be neatly garnished with aspic jelly, and served with mayonnaise of tomatoes and brown bread and butter. Follow this by caramel custards, wafers and coffee. This menu is exceedingly dainty."[33] By cutting meat into thin slices as well as decorating it with aspic jelly, Rorer called the menu that included beef, often viewed as an epitome of masculinity, "dainty." Like Rorer, Janet McKenzie Hill directed in her "Boiled Ham" recipe to "Remove the skin. Cut in very thin

---

[31] Inness, 56.

[32] Rorer, *Good Cooking*, 87.

[33] Rorer, "Dainty Meals for Small Families."

slices. Garnish with nasturtiums. . . ,"[34] thus feminizing the pork dish by slicing it thin and decorating it with flowers. Cooking experts employed these tactics to turn "masculine" dishes dainty.

With their emphasis on aesthetics, dainty dishes served as an intersection between the consumer culture, scientific cookery, and women's appetite. Cooking experts justified eye-appealing foods and dishes by claiming that an attractive appearance would aid digestion. As Laura Shapiro writes, cooking-school teachers explained to their students, most of whom attended classes with an expectation to see highly ornamental dishes, that such foods would activate the salivary glands, which would then help digestion.[35] The author of *Scientific Cooking with Scientific Methods* (1911) agreed with this effect of aesthetics on digestion, writing, "In the scientific blending of proteids, carbohydrates and fats, the careful and dainty preparation must not be overlooked—our food must appeal to the eye as well as to the palate, as a direct aid to digestion."[36] Here, scientific cookery ("scientific blending") joined forces with the ethos of the consumer culture ("appeal to the eye") to satisfy the appetite ("the palate") of women (dainty). Agreeing with this cookbook author, a contributor to *Good Housekeeping* wrote in 1913, "We garnish food for two reasons: (1) To make the appearance attractive, appealing to the appetite. (2) To add food value to the food, as in the addition of Spanish sauce to a plain omelet, a rice

---

[34] Hill, "Appetizing Dishes for Summer-Time."

[35] Shapiro, 83.

[36] Sarah E. Woodworth Craig, *Scientific Cooking with Scientific Methods* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Ellis Publishing Company, 1911), ix.

border around a lamb stew, vegetables garnishing a planked steak."[37] Assuming that women readers would eat such garnished dishes, if they put the suggestions into practice, this writer also intertwined science ("food value"), consumerist orientation ("to make the appearance attractive"), and women's appetite.

In the same vein, Sarah Tyson Rorer endorsed artistic dishes by intertwining scientific laws, consumerist values, and genteel women's appetite. The Philadelphian revealed her approach to cooking and diet during the local food exposition in 1896. To Rorer, "There is nothing more destructive to digestion than the plain meal, which is invariably prepared in the frying-pan, and nothing more conducive to health than the ideal fancy dish. Fried meat and fried potatoes, with a supplement of white bread and apple sauce, are not a plain meal, but a most disturbing one to the digestive apparatus."[38] Hence, she continued: "Artistic cookery is one of the most grievously misunderstood phases of culinary effort. . . . Any dish that charms the eye and worries the stomach is dubbed 'fancy' by the average chef," lamented Rorer. To her, "Artistic cooking worthy the name should be made from such materials only as will blend in chemical composition, and are rich in nourishment."[39] Rorer proclaimed that artistic cookery, which featured appearance, should correspond to the tenets of scientific cookery, which put an emphasis on nutrition and health. She called such cookery dainty, thus reinforcing the feminine and high-class nature of artistic cooking. Perhaps Rorer's definition of

---

[37] Jessamine Chapman, "When to Garnish," *Good Housekeeping* 57 (October 1913): 552.

[38] "Art As Displayed In the Kitchen," *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, November 30, 1896, 3.

[39] Ibid.

dainty dishes was best reflected in her direction for salads: "The beauty and wholesomeness of the salad should commend it to every American housekeeper. I . . . refer . . . to dainty dinner or luncheon salads. . . . [A] simple salad composed of any green vegetable and a French dressing should be seen on every well-regulated table three hundred and sixty-five times a year."[40] To Rorer, salads represented the intersection of consumer orientation ("beauty"), scientific cooking ("wholesomeness"), and women ("dainty"). Rorer then claimed in her column of the *Ladies' Home Journal* in 1899, "Strange as it may seem, those which please the eye in nine cases out of ten please also the stomach."[41] Given that the opposite page of this column featured the debut of Janet McKenzie Hill in the magazine with her ten photographed dishes, Rorer might have cooperated with Hill (and probably the magazine's editor, Edward Bok) in fostering the periodical's approach to cookery: appearance and wholesomeness of dishes would correspond with each other.

Although cooking teachers generally believed that nutrition and artistry would go hand in hand, white bread challenged this congeniality. Cooking reformers knew that whole wheat bread was more nutritious than white bread, even if the latter was more aesthetically approving. Whiteness meant power in many ways at the turn of the twentieth century. Perhaps Anglo-Saxon physicians in a white coat symbolized the power of whiteness: "white" medical authorities with a hygienic appearance. Hygiene suggested cleanliness and purity, the latter of which then symbolized women's moral purity. In this

---

[40] Rorer, *Good Cooking*, 128.

[41] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Which Vegetables with Meats," *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (October 1899): 22.

cultural milieu, white bread—or any white foods, meals, and coordinated meals, for that matter—signified femininity. As Laura Shapiro notes, scientific cookery reinforced the trend of whitening food, which had already been an American tradition.[42] However, brown bread posed a challenge to cooking experts, who were aware that whole wheat bread possessed more nutrition than white bread. Thus, although Sarah Tyson Rorer extolled white-coordinated meals, such as "Lily Lunch" and "White Rose Dinner,"[43] the cooking teacher often chose brown over white bread. In the bread section of *Good Cooking* (1898), Rorer told her readers, "In selecting flour choose that which is dark in color. . . ."[44] She even included brown bread in her "exceedingly dainty"[45] menu and did not hesitate to declare bluntly at the 1893 Philadelphia Food Exposition, "Whole wheat bread is the staff of life. White bread is the staff of death."[46] However, Rorer still seemed aware that her audience desired white bread: "The best bread flours in the market are of a yellowish-white tinge. . . . Though not whole wheat flours they are decidedly the best of the white brands."[47] Rorer thus admitted that whole wheat flours were more nutritious than white ones, yet, perhaps, she compromised with readers who demanded white bread.

Like Rorer, other cooking teachers seemed ambivalent about the choice of bread. In *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book*, the author, although recognizing the appeal of "a

---

[42] Shapiro, 93-94.

[43] Ibid., 84.

[44] Rorer, *Good Cooking*, 73.

[45] Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Dainty Meals for Small Families."

[46] "A Cook in Silk Attire," *Philadelphia Times*, November 15, 1893, 2.

[47] Rorer, *Good Cooking*, 73.

whiter, nicer-looking bread,"[48] wrote, "Until the popular taste is educated to demand the amount of nutriment contained in bread rather than the whiteness of it, as a test of its quality, it is well to make our fine, white bread . . . ."[49] Admitting that brown bread was more nutritious than white, Lincoln seemed to acquiesce to the contemporary American culture, which valued whiteness. Like Lincoln, Janet McKenzie Hill revealed her ambiguity. She presented "Brown Bread with Raisins" in her debut in the *Ladies' Home Journal* in October 1899,[50] yet, in *Salads, Sandwiches and Chafing-Dish Dainties* (1899), Hill wrote, "The bread may be yeast or peptic bread. It may be white or brown." in her discussion of "Bread for Sandwiches." [51] This "may" might have reflected Hill's dilemma between endorsing brown bread for its nutrition and extolling white bread for its purity in her cookbook on dainty dishes. Cooking experts vacillated between endorsing innate nutrients and extolling outer appearances, the latter of which, they believed, would aid digestion.

Curiously, on this issue of refining foodstuffs, cooking experts focused almost exclusively on bread. A contributor to the *American Kitchen Magazine* wrote in 1897, "Foods that are highly refined lose much of their nutritive value and do not furnish enough bulk,"[52] but cooking experts paid little attention to other foodstuffs, such as sugar

---

[48] Lincoln, 41.

[49] Ibid., 41.

[50] Janet McKenzie Hill, "Fifty Delicious Dishes," *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (October 1899): 23.

[51] Janet McKenzie Hill, *Salads, Sandwiches and Chafing-Dish Dainties* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1899), 134.

[52] Etta Morse Hudders, "Diet in Health," *American Kitchen Magazine* 6 (January 1897): 156.

and rice, which were subjected to refining. In *Philadelphia Cook Book* (1886), Sarah Tyson Rorer wrote of bread, "Our fine white bread contains little but starch. We cannot say that such bread is the 'staff of life,' but the brown (not bran), whole wheat bread constitutes, in itself, a complete life-sustainer,"[53] thus making her point clear that brown bread commanded more nutrition than the white one. However, in the same cookbook, Rorer employed both white and brown sugars, without explaining the difference between the two. As for rice, the author simply used the term "rice" never distinguishing the grain between white and brown. The identity of rice became clear in *Dainties* (1894), in which Rorer wrote, "The rice is perfectly dry and white." In *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book* (1902), Rorer viewed the color of rice positively: "Rice is well cooked when each grain has swollen four times its original size, no two are sticking together, and is as white as snow."[54] These descriptions make today's readers wonder why Rorer, who affirmatively adhered to brown (whole wheat) bread for its nutritive benefits, extolled white rice. Perhaps Rorer paid less attention to sugar and rice than bread, because she did not recommend the consumption of sugar and knew that most Americans did not eat rice regularly. In contrast to rice, Rorer noted in the bread section of *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book* (1902), "The use of bread, in every family in this country, three times a day, makes this one of the most important departments. Wheat occupying the most prominent place

---

[53] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's Philadelphia Cook Book* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1886), 311.

[54] Sarah Tyson Rorer, *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book: A Manual of Housekeeping* (Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1902), 294.

in bread-making, will have our first consideration."[55] After all, bread formed a critical part of the regular American table as well as special occasions, such as tea parties and women's luncheons, often in the form of sandwiches.

Perhaps, tea parties and women's luncheons best represented the intersection between scientific cookery, consumer culture, and genteel women's appetite. Tea parties referred to women's social events that took place in mid-afternoon, featuring freshly brewed green or black tea, as well as pastries such as cakes and cookies.[56] The tea party had established its place among women by the early twentieth century, as Fannie Farmer observed in her 1911 article in the *Woman's Home Companion*, "The afternoon tea, either informally among a few friends or as a formal occasion with a company of guests, is not only growing in popularity, but has, I believe, come to stay."[57] She then presented a recipe called "Dainty Sandwiches," whose breads were "cut in rounds, the upper one cut dough nut shape to show the fillings" like "orange-honey and deviled filling."[58] As mentioned above, Farmer also promoted fruit juice, while Sarah Tyson Rorer recommended fruit salads for women's luncheons, probably because fruits, which were light and digestible, would suit genteel women, who led a sedentary lifestyle. By providing recipes for tea parties and women's luncheons, advocates of scientific cookery

---

[55] Ibid., 487.

[56] Susan Williams, *Food in the United States, 1820s-1890* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006), 161-62.

[57] Fannie Merritt Farmer, "The Afternoon Tea," *Woman's Home Companion* 38 (March 1911): 60.

[58] Ibid.

like Farmer and Rorer provided genteel women with an opportunity to heighten their femininity while satiating their appetite.

Tea parties attested to genteel women's needs not only for refined dishes but also for a polished environment in which to satiate their appetite.[59] As discussed in chapter VII, the refined eating surroundings then stimulated the purchase of aesthetic objects. Tea parties surely prompted women to purchase dining ware, such as elegant teacups, silver spoons, table linens, and vases. Surrounded with these beautiful materials, genteel women were able to elevate the otherwise animalistic act of eating into a refined act of dining. Far from stigmatizing women's consumption of food and drink, tea parties, which featured artistic dishes and objects, enhanced the participants' femininity, as well as their social status.

If tea parties and women's luncheons provided women with a safe social environment in which to satiate their appetite, food expositions served as an ostentatiously commercial space where women were able to display their appetite for food with few qualms. News accounts on the expositions throughout the 1890s presupposed women's desire for food, perhaps, in order to underscore the popularity of the show. In contrast to the Woman's Education Association of Boston's reluctance to associate women with eating in the late 1870s, these news reports assumed the female audience would desire to taste the samples distributed by food companies and the dishes cooked at demonstration lectures. A Philadelphia newspaper reported on the 1892 food fair: "The crowds surge about both over the auditorium and galleries, and many partake

[59] Inness, 56.

of samples of buns, hot cakes, cocoa, coffee, and other toothsome things."[60] This article approved of "the crowds"—assuming that most of them were middle- and upper-middle class women—to sample foods and beverages in public. Two years later, a St. Louis newspaper reported that a local pure food exposition "is drawing the society women. . .and attendance upon the cooking lectures of Mrs. Mary J. Lincoln has become the fashionable fad" and that Mary J. Lincoln concocted "delicious dishes . . . which are . . . passed around for the audience to sample."[61] Again, the newspaper showed no hint of questioning the appropriateness of "society women" sampling food in public. Far from criticizing women for succumbing to the temptation of food, the media highlighted—or even exaggerated—the appeal of the foods and dishes concocted by cooking experts to women.

Some food fairs also encouraged visitors to dine at restaurants set up at the expositions. The official catalogue of the United States Food Exposition of 1892 held at the Madison Square Garden boasted of its restaurants: "Visitors to the Exposition should not fail to visit the restaurant, which is in charge of the famous caterers, Mathieu & Journet."[62] The former "acquired an International reputation as chef"[63] of the famous restaurants in Paris and the latter catered to "the Vanderbilts, Sloans and Goelets"[64] in

---

[60] "At the Food Display," *Philadelphia Press*, November 22, 1892, 2.

[61] *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 145.

[62] Food Manufacturers' Association, *Official Catalogue: United States Food Exposition in Commemoration of the Discovery of America, at Madison Square Garden, New York, October 1st to 27th, 1892*, microfiche, 15, New York Public Library.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

New York. In addition to these fancy restaurants, the exposition also featured "a café, or gentlemen's grill-room," which "is the only place in the building where smoking will be allowed" and "the Ladies' Restaurant," which was adjacent to the Concert Hall, where Maria Parloa conducted demonstration lectures. The pamphlet suggested that the restaurants offered menus stereotypical to each sex. The catalogue's tone in discussing restaurants was enthusiastic, never showing any qualms about public eating. Food expositions like this New York show provided genteel women with the opportunity to display their desire for food and to consume it in public, even in the form of samples. By participating in food expositions as demonstration lecturers and managers of booths, cooking experts tacitly endorsed this commercial culture that encouraged women's appetite for food.

While a food exposition was a temporary event, open only several weeks a year, the department store might have played a larger role in liberating genteel Americans, especially women, from the nineteenth-century denigration of eating. The dining facilities at department stores originated in the 1880s, reflecting the managers' efforts to keep customers (mostly women) in the stores, but increased in size and number in the early twentieth century, when women flocked to restaurants in department stores, for example in Philadelphia.[65] The Gimbel Brothers had four different dining facilities by 1902. The Wanamaker, the Gimbel's rival, added a gigantic restaurant in 1911, which boasted of 1,400 seats. Whether these expansions of restaurants in department stores responded to

[65] John Henry Hepp, IV, *The Middle-Class City: Transforming Space and Time in Philadelphia, 1876-1926* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 152-55.

their customer's demand or reflected the managers' effort to attract shoppers, the installment of dining facilities surely helped to usher in a modern culture, where women dining in public became acceptable. As John Henry Hepp, IV writes, women frequented these restaurants more than men, and when the latter did so, they often accompanied women.[66] If department stores themselves attracted women shoppers, the restaurants inside the stores naturally did the same. Women thus went to department stores to consume, that is, both to shop and to eat.

Just as department stores challenged the genteel perception of consuming food, so did the increasing leisure and travel opportunities at the turn of the twentieth century. The more Americans traveled, the more they inevitably ate in public. Perhaps, "walking foods" like hamburgers, which reportedly debuted at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition,[67] reflected a changing social environment, where eating in public became acceptable. In the meantime, many genteel women, who gathered at the Chautauqua assembly in New York, mixing education and summer vacation, also experienced a changing relationship to eating; Chautauqua's limited physical space forced its participants to consume food in a public space. As Jeanne Halgren Kilde writes, in her study of the relationship between gender and space at Chautauqua, "Activities conventionally relegated to the private interiors of houses were performed on verandas

---

[66] Ibid.

[67] Warren Belasco, *Meals to Come: A History of the Future of Food* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 161.

and under canopies: people cooked food, ate meals . . . in these spaces. . . ."[68] and "Many families and most singles took their meals in dining halls, hotels, or boarding houses. . . ."[69] At Chautauqua, these middle- and upper-middle class women consumed food in public, while in their own homes, they most likely did so in private dining rooms. If, as John Kasson writes, "the act of dining . . . needed to be performed in protected circumstances"[70] for its ritual significance, the physical environment of Chautauqua challenged such premises on eating. Coupled with the cooking lessons offered at Chautauqua, where culinary teachers, especially Emma P. Ewing, made sputtering attempts to change genteel women's attitudes toward kitchen work, the dining environment at the Chautauqua Assembly of New York might have prompted women visitors to redefine their relationships to food, both cooking and eating.

Whatever culinary authorities taught at Chautauqua and elsewhere, they dismissed the genteel ideal of appetite and called for the cultivation of controlled, but healthy eating habits. Although claiming that they based their theories of cooking and diet on physiology and nutrition, which were basically gender-neutral, their teachings often revealed signs of gender bias. Perhaps their prejudice was best reflected in what culinary teachers called dainty dishes. Often citing the effect of aesthetics on physical health, cooking experts devised many delicate and artistic dishes for women to consume. Thus, cooking experts merged scientific cookery into an ethos of the consumer culture to

---

[68] Jeanne Halgren Kilde, "The 'Predominance of the Feminine' at Chautauqua: Rethinking the Gender-Space Relationship in Victorian America," *Signs* 24 (Winter 1999): 471.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Kasson, 199.

prompt women to consume dainty dishes. Tea parties and women's luncheons epitomized this relationship between science, a culture of consumption, and genteel women. Cooking experts also participated in food expositions, where displaying appetite was, more or less, acceptable, and in the Chautauqua assembly in New York, which forced its participants to consume food in public, an activity antithetical to the concept of gentility. Through these activities, culinary authorities at the turn of the twentieth century helped reinforce the perception of women as consumers by exhorting women not only to shop for foods and cook for families, but also to eat foods, even if the dishes were relegated to the gender assignations of the time.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

This study of culinary reformers, which begins with 1876, ends forty years later for several reasons. First, most cooking authorities who were born in the mid-nineteenth century had died or slowed down their career by World War I. Second, scientific cookery had ceased its dominance by around this time. Related to this trend, the United States Department of Agriculture issued its first set of overall dietary recommendations, *How to Select Foods*, in 1917, emphasizing newly discovered vitamins and minerals. The arrival of these recommendations in American society then spawned new business opportunities. Just as culinary authorities had resorted to science, food and vitamin manufacturers maximized the scientific appeal of vitamins in advertising their products, often directing the public's attention to how home cooking could strip away vitamins.[1] Third, dieticians, including Ella Eaton Kellogg, formed the American Dietetic Association in 1917, which marked another stage of professionalism in the realm of home economics as well as the beginning of a new era for cooking and nutrition experts. Finally, the entry of the United States into the First World War in 1917 provided some nutrition and cooking experts, including Mary Hinman Abel, with an opportunity to engage in a governmental effort to manage food resources for US troops and its allies. Led by Herbert Hoover's Food Administration, the massive campaign called for Americans to economize their everyday

[1] Rima D. Apple, *Vitamania: Vitamins in American Culture* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1996), 2; Katherine J. Parkin, *Food Is Love: Food Advertising and Gender Roles in Modern America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 162.

diet,[2] an agenda that many culinary authorities had cherished. These four major developments marked 1917 as the new era of American diet and nutrition.

During the forty years up to 1916, advocates of scientific cooking contributed to modernizing not only American cooking and eating habits, but American society at large as well. They helped secularize the notion of health, which predisposed American society to embrace a consumer orientation that appreciated physical vitality and emotional exuberance. When genteel Americans were ill at ease with appetite and the act of eating, cooking experts assured them that physical desire for food was normal, although they must control it to maximize health benefits. This liberation of appetite from the confined genteel culture occurred in tandem with mass marketing and consumption, which democratized many once-expensive food items. Culinary experts also insisted on women's roles as family cooks and "consumers," including their role of purchasing household goods, including foodstuffs. Although one may challenge those roles, many characteristics of American foodways we take for granted today can be traced back to the Progressive-era cooking reformers.

Culinary authorities' promotion of dainty foods played a large role in this modernizing process. In terms of political economy, utilizing tropical produce and processed foods like gelatin, many dainty dishes marked modernity that derived from the interrelated projects of industrialization, technological development, and American overseas expansion. In socio-cultural terms, dainty foods were initially designed for

---

[2] The Historical American Cookbook Project, "Mary Himan Abel," The Historical American Cookbook Project, http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks/html/authors/author_abel.html.

upper- and middle-class women to cook and eat, thus helping them to connect themselves with food. As mass consumption developed in the early twentieth century, dainty dishes filtered down into the lower class, thus becoming democratized. Most important to this study, dainty foods reinforced eye values, an ethos of consumer culture. Thus dainty dishes helped modernize many facets of America society.

Dainty dishes might pose a challenge to the general view of scientific cookery. In *Defense of Food* (2008), environmental journalist Michael Pollan points out Progressive-era cooking authorities as one group of professionals for reinforcing the Puritan tradition of denying pleasure in eating[3] and for advancing the cause of nutritionism, an ideology that reduced whole foods into chemical units of disparate nutrients.[4] The term *scientific cookery* might evoke nothing but control, management, and nutrition, yet many cooking teachers did pay attention to the sensory aspects of cooking and eating (at least they claimed so). Rather than denying sensual pleasure outright, some culinary experts attempted to incorporate such elements, especially eye appeal, into their recipes. Modernization in cooking and eating pointed to the embracement of nutrition science *and* sensory and emotional pleasures.

Modernization did not mark a clear break from the past, but turned out to be an uneven and muddled process. Culinary reformers had to tackle a range of cultural and social conflicts, contradictions, and ironies in promoting scientific cookery. First, cooking experts expanded their activities into the public sphere, while preaching women's

---

[3] Michael Pollan, *In Defense of Food: An Eater's Manifesto* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2008), 54-55.

[4] Ibid., 27-32.

domesticity. Second, food abundance, which marked progress to the American public, challenged the values of self-control and management that cooking experts also preached. Third, cooking experts, who embraced science, inevitably faced the issue of dealing with old wisdoms and tradition. Fourth, the cooking experts' endorsement of high culture became dominated by a new culture of mass amusement. Fifth, cooking experts had to address the conflicts between their ideas of healthy foods and eating habits and those of business and the public. Sixth, in their attempt to bring upper- and middle-class women into kitchens and to infuse the cultural value of thrift into the aesthetic appeal of foods, cooking reformers faced contradictions between the Protestant ethic and the genteel culture. Finally, both science and art (or daintiness)—two catchwords that appealed to middle-class women—paradoxically liberated and confined them. Thus advocates of scientific cookery navigated through a range of social and cultural paradoxes, frictions, and ironies in their promotion of scientific cookery. Modernity was a product of these complex social and cultural tides.

The consumerist approach to cookery, for which Progressive-era cooking experts laid the groundwork, advanced in the 1920s and 1930s. As Jessamyn Neuhaus writes, cookbook authors of the 1920s began to put less emphasis on scientific principles and more on portraying cooking as fun than the Progressive-era cookbook writers.[5] In 1933 a contributor to *Collier's* magazine summed up the climate of modern culinary culture with

[5] Jessamyn Neuhaus, *Manly Meals and Mom's Home Cooking: Cookbooks and Gender in Modern America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 25, 54-56, Chapter 3.

gusto: "Cooking is fun!"[6] The fact that the author seemed to express this emotional exuberance without scruples signified the maturity of the American consumer culture.

Perhaps the consumerist approach to cookery was best reflected in the titles of two of the most popular cookbooks published in the twentieth century: *The Joy of Cooking*, originally published in 1931, and *The I Hate to Cook Book* (1960). They showed contrasting attitudes toward cooking, as Neuhaus explains: the former representing the message that cookbook authors of the 1920s and 1930s wished to convey, while, in contrast, the latter signifying the "discourse of discontent" about cooking that women felt in postwar America.[7] This difference notwithstanding, both books expressed the release of emotion—either "joy" or "hate"—that characterized modern consumer culture. These highly emotional titles made a sharp departure from the name of the bestselling cookbook before *The Joy of Cooking*: Fannie Farmer's *The Boston Cooking-School Cook Book.*

The titles of modern cookbooks were also indicative of the full-fledged culture of mass consumption and amusement. In contrast to *The Boston Cooking-School Cook Book*'s authoritative tone of the title as well as the content, *The Joy of Cooking* and *The I Hate to Cook Book* sounded fairly casual and, in the case of the latter, even humorous.[8] This "woman next door" approach also manifested itself in Betty Crocker, a fictional culinary authority invented in 1921 by Washburn Crosby, a Minneapolis flour

---

[6] Ibid., 54-56.

[7] Ibid., 55-56, 249-50.

[8] Mary Drake McFeeley, *Can She Bake a Cherry Pie?: American Women and the Kitchen in the Twentieth Century* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000), 50.

manufacturer merging with other flour mills to create General Mills seven years later. The Minneapolis company unified its several home economists into one voice as a company representative to respond to letters from consumers. A radio program entitled "The Betty Crocker Cooking School of the Air" began broadcasting in 1931 and ran for nearly three decades.[9] The fact that a fictional character gained such popularity in the mid-twentieth century, along with the highly emotional and casual-toned cookbooks, indicated a culture of consumption and amusement, which often emphasized fame over substance and approachability over authoritativeness.

Betty Crocker, *The Joy of Cooking*, and *The I Hate to Cook Book* also represented the intersection between commercial capitalism and women's domesticity. Betty Crocker represented the General Mills food conglomerate, while the two cookbooks, which featured simple, everyday recipes for middle-class women, relied heavily on processed foods to simplify cookery.[10] In addition, the two cookbooks and the fictional figure assumed women's role as family cooks, which then implied that women also shopped for the food. Whether women enjoyed or hated it, cooking and shopping belonged to women's responsibilities.[11]

---

[9] For information on Betty Crocker, see Susan Marks, *Finding Betty Crocker: The Secret Life of America's First Lady of Food* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Laura Shapiro, "'I Guarantee': Betty Crocker and the Woman in the Kitchen," in *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food*, ed. Avakian, Arlene Voski and Barbara Haber (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), 29-40.

[10] Neuhaus, 49, 251.

[11] Ibid., 250.

These traits of modern cookery— cooking for families as women's job, reliance on processed foods, and heavy emotional attachment—had already emerged at the time of scientific cookery, at least to some extent. The Progressive-era cookbook authors did not equate home-made cookery with cooking from scratch. Nor did they flatly deny or dismiss sensory aspects of foodways simply because they extolled the rationality of cooking and eating. Even if culinary authorities put a primary importance on nutrition and health, many of them acknowledged the necessity of incorporating artistic and sensual elements of cooking and eating into scientific approach. This precarious balance between science, nutrition, and duty on the one hand, and art, taste, and joy on the other might have tilted toward the latter from the 1920s onward, in parallel with the maturity of consumer culture. But sensual pleasures have not entirely subverted the emphasis on health and nutrition. If we embrace cooking as an emotional undertaking and eating as a sensory activity, perceive cooking primarily as a woman's job, and believe that the quality of food matters more than quantity and that eating habits affect physical and psychological health, we are living in the legacy of the culinary reformers of the Progressive era.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Carol J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum, 1990.

"Amusements." *Philadelphia Press*, November 6, 1894, 12.

Anti-Adulteration Journal 2 (June 1886).

Apple, Rima D. *Vitamania: Vitamins in American Culture*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

"Art As Displayed In the Kitchen." *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, November 30, 1896, 3.

"At the Food Display." *Philadelphia Press*, November 22, 1892, 2.

"At the Food Show." *Public Ledger*, November 22, 1892, 2.

Avakian, Arlene Voski and Barbara Haber, eds. *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.

Axelrod Alan, ed. *The Colonial Revival in America*. New York: Norton & Company, 1985.

Barrows, Anna. "Labor That Satisfieth Not." *Congregationalist and Christian World*, March 11, 1905, 327.

_____. "Fashion in Foods—Vegetarianism." *Congregationalist*, August 22, 1895, 271.

_____. "New Professions for Women Centering in the Home," NAWSA Convention, Washington, D.C., February 8-14, 1900 in *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper*, edited by Mari Jo and Paul Buhle, 369-70. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978).

_____. *Principles of Cookery*, vol. 5, *The Library of Home Economics: A Complete Home-Study Course on the New Profession of Home-Making and Art of Right Living: The Practical Application of the Most Recent Advances in the Arts and Sciences to Home and Health*. Chicago: American School of Home Economics, 1911.

_____. "Ready to Act." *Christian Union*, March 10, 1887, 15.

_____. "Talks with Girls about Cooking." *Christian Union*, September 27, 1888, 326.

Belasco, Warren. *Meals to Come: A History of the Future of Food*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Belasco, Warren and Philip Scranton, ed. *Food Nation*: Selling Taste in Consumer Societies. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Belden, Imogene. "Table Decorations at Philadelphia Food Exposition." *Table Talk* 7 (February 1892): 44-45.

Benson, Susan Porter. *Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers, and Customers in American Department Stores, 1890-1940*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986.

Bentley, Amy. *Eating for Victory: Food Rationing and the Politics of Domesticity*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

Biddle, Gertrude Bosler and Sarah Dickinson Lowrie, ed. *Notable Women of Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942.

Biesel, Elise. "The First Cook in the Land." *Good Housekeeping* 58 (March 1914): 421.

Blair, Karen J. *The Clubwomen as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined, 1868-1914*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: N.W. Norton, 1976.

Bolton, Sarah Knowles. *Successful Women* . . . . Boston: D. Lothrop Co., 1888. Microfiche.

"The Boston Food Fair." *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (December 1897): 116-17.

Bower, Anne L. ed. *Recipes for Reading: Community Cookbooks, Stories, Histories*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1997.

Braden, Donna R. *Leisure and Entertainment in America*. Dearborn, Mich.: Henry Ford Museum & Greenfield Village, 1988.

Bronner, Simon J., ed. *Consuming Visions: Accumulation and Display of Goods in America, 1880-1920*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989.

Brown, Elspeth H. *The Corporate Eye: Photography and the Rationalization of American Commercial Culture, 1884-1929*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Brumberg, Joan Jacobs. *Fasting Girls: The History of Anorexia Nervosa*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Burbick, Joan. *Healing the Republic: The Language of Health and the Culture of Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Calhoun, Charles W, ed. *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, 1996.

Chapman, Jessamine. "When to Garnish." *Good Housekeeping* 57 (October 1913): 552.

Charles B. Knox, Co. *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People: Knox Gelatine*. Johnstown, N.Y.: Charles B. Knox, Co., 1915.

Cincinnati Retail Grocers' Association. *Souvenir Program: The Pure Food Exposition, Music Hall, November 7th to 27th, 1898*. Cincinnati, 1898. Cincinnati Historical Society Library.

Cleveland's Baking Powder Co. *Cleveland's Superior Recipes*. New York: Cleveland's Baking Powder Co., 1894.

Collins, Nina. "Domestic Sciences at Bradley Polytechnic Institute and the University of Chicago." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (Autumn 2002), http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3945/is_200210/ai_n9117213.

"Concerning Teas." *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (December 1897): 114-15.

"Cookery in a Turkish Tent." *Philadelphia Times*, November 17, 1893, 4.

"Cooking 'Pioneer' Lauds Modern Man." *New York Times*, April 22, 1925, http://select.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=F00F15F6385B12738DDDAB0A94DC405B858EF1D3.

"A Cook in Silk Attire." *Philadelphia Times*, November 15, 1893, 2.

"Corn Festivals." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 18-19.

Corson, Juliet. *Cooking School Text Book*. New York: Orange Judd Company, 1878.

_____. *Family Living on $500 a Year*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1887.

_____. *Fifteen Cent Dinners for Families of Six*. New York: The Author, 1877.

_____. "Kitchen Economy of the New Year," *Table Talk* 2 (January 1887): 1-3.

_____. *Miss Corson's Practical American Cookery and Household Management*. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1886.

_____. *600 Selected Recipes*. Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1893.

_____. *Twenty-Five Cent Dinners for Families of Six*, 13th ed., rev. and enl. New York: Orange Judd Company, 1879.

Craig, Sarah E. Woodworth. *Scientific Cooking with Scientific Methods*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Ellis Publishing Company, 1911.

"Creditors and Mrs. Rorer." *New York Times*, September 27, 1907, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9D07E0DA1F30E233A25754C2A96F9C946697D6CF.

"Dainty Desserts." *The Chautauquan* 32 (February 1901): 553.

Davidson, Alan. *The Oxford Companion to Food*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dearborn, Carrie M. "The Therapeutics of Diet." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July 1894):153-56.

"Death of Juliet Corson." *New York Times*, June 20, 1897, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9F0DE7D81230E333A25753C2A9609C94669ED7CF.

"'Desserts Are Deadly,' Says Mrs. Rorer." *Philadelphia Press*, November 16, 1900, 6.

"Doctors' Day at the Food Show." *Philadelphia Record*, November 15, 1894, 5.

"A Domestic Woman Abroad." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 41.

Downey, Dennis. *A Season of Renewal: The Columbian Exposition and Victorian America.* Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2002.

Dudden, Faye E. *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Davidson, Alan. *The Oxford Companion to Food.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Davis, Ethel Davis. "Dishonesty and Caste: In Domestic Service." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 113-17.

DuPuis, E. Melanie. *Nature's Perfect Foods: How Milk Became America's Drink.* New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Duran, Nancy. "Farmers' Bulletins Advice to Women on Diet, Food, and Cooking." *Journal of Agriculture & Food Information* 6 (2005): 49-75.

DuSablon, Mary Anna. *America's Collectible Cookbooks: The History, the Politics, the Recipes*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1994.

Edwards, Rebecca. *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Elliott, Ellen Coit. "Simplification in the Home." *American Kitchen Magazine* 5 (November 1897): 43-46.

Ewing, Emma P. "Cookery and Christianity." *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, August 8, 1890, 6.

_____. "Cooking and Culture." *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, July 20, 1898, 2-3.

_____. "Culinary Rubbish." *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, August 8, 1897, 5.

_____. "Home-Making." Date unknown (1888 or after), Emma P. Ewing Collection, Iowa State University.

_____. "The Ideal Bill of Fare." *The Chautauquan; A Weekly Newsmagazine* 14 (November 1891): 212.

_____. "The Missing Link in the Food Question." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (August 1894): 216-20.

"An Exhibit in Household Economics." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (April 1894): 19-26.

Farmer, Fannie Merritt. "The Afternoon Tea." *Woman's Home Companion* 38 (March 1911): 60.

_____. *The Boston Cooking-School Cook Book.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1896.

_____. *Chafing Dish Possibilities.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898.

_____. *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1904.

_____. "Good Things for the Christmas Dinner." *Woman's Home Companion* 32 (December 1905): 20.

_____. *A New Book of Cookery.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1912.

Firat, A. Fuat. "Summary of "Gender and Consumption: Transcending the Feminine?" In *The Consumer Society*, edited by Neva R. Goodwin, Frank Ackerman, and David Kiron, 95-97. Washington D.C.: Island Press, 1997.

Fisher, Carol. *The American Cookbook: A History.* Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2006.

Fisher, Mary Wager. "Mrs. Sarah Tyson Rorer." *Table Talk* 2 (February 1887): 50-52.

"Fish, Frying and Economy." *Philadelphia Times*, November 18, 1893, 4.

"The Food Exposition." *Medical and Surgical Reporter* 69, November, 25, 1893: 833.

"Food Fairs." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (October 1894): 42-43.

Food Manufacturers' Association. *Official Catalogue: United States Food Exposition in Commemoration of the Discovery of America, at Madison Square Garden, New York, October 1st to 27th, 1892*, microfiche. New York Public Library.

"The Food Show A Popular Place." *Philadelphia Press*, November 12, 1897, 8

"The Food Show As Artist Walt McDgougall Describes IT." *Philadelphia North American*, November 13, 1900, 2.

Fox, Richard Wightman and T. J. Jackson Lears, eds. *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880-1980.* New York: Pantheon, 1983.

"From Bay View, Michigan." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (August 1894): 246.

Gabaccia, Donna R. *We Are What We Eat: Ethnic Food and the Making of Americans.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

The Genesee Pure Food Co. *Jell-O and the Kewpies: America's Most Famous Dessert.* Le Roy, N.Y.: The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1915.

_____. *What Six Famous Cooks Say of America's Most Famous Dessert.* Le Roy, N.Y.: The Genesee Pure Food Co., 1913.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. *Intimate Practices: Literary and Cultural Work in U.S. Women's Clubs, 1880-1920.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Gevitz, Norman, ed. *Other Healers: Unorthodox Medicine in America. Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Gompers, Samuel. *Some Reasons for Chinese Exclusion. Meat vs. Rice. American Manhood against Asiatic Coolietism. Which Shall Survive?* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Good Health. Battle Creek, Mich.: Good Health Publishing. Co., 1879-1912, New York Academy of Medicine Library, New York.

Goodwin, Larine Swainston. *The Pure Food, Drink, and Drug Crusaders, 1879-1914.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1999.

Green, Harvey. *Fit for America: Health, Fitness, Sport, and American Society*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986.

Grover, Kathryn, ed., *Hard at Play: Leisure in America, 1840-1940*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press; Rochester, N.Y.: Strong Museum, 1992.

Harland, Marion. *Marion Harland's Complete Cook Book: A Practical and Exhaustive Manual of Cookery and Housekeeping*. St. Louis: The Marion Company, 1906.

Hawthorne, Hannah. "Juliet Corson." *Table Talk* 2 (March 1887): 81-83.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1981.

Hepp, John Henry, IV. *The Middle –Class City: Transforming Space and Time in Philadelphia, 1876-1926*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Hill, Daniel Delis. *Advertising to the American Woman, 1900-1999*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2002.

Hill, Janet McKenzie. *The American Cook Book: Recipes for Everyday Use*. Boston: The Boston Cooking-School Magazine Co., 1914.

_____. "Appetizing Dishes for Summer-Time." *Ladies' Home Journal* 17 (July 1900): 20.

_____. "Fifty Delicious Dishes." *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (October 1899): 23.

_____. "Making a Breakfast Appetizing." *Ladies' Home Journal* 17 (October 1900): 31.

_____. *Nyal Cook Book*. Boston: The Boston Cooking-School Magazine, Co, 1916.

_____. *Practical Cooking and Serving*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company,1902.

_____. *Salads, Sandwiches and Chafing-dish Dainties*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1899.

_____. *A Short History of the Banana and a Few Recipes for Its Use*. Boston: United Fruit Co., 1904.

The Historic American Cookbook Project. "Feeding America." The Historic American Cookbook Project. http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/cookbooks (accessed October 1, 2008).

The Historical Society of Battle Creek. "John Harvey Kellogg," The Historical Society of Battle Creek. http://www.geocities.com/Athens/oracle/9840/kellogg.html (accessed October 1, 2008).

Hoganson, Kristin. *Consumers' Imperium: The Global Production of American Domesticity, 1865-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Horowitz, Daniel. *The Morality of Spending: Attitudes toward the Consumer Society in America, 1875-1940*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

"*Household News* and its Progress." *Household News* 4 (July 1896): x.

A Housekeeper. *The American Matron: Or Practical and Scientific Cookery*. Boston and Cambridge, Mass.: James Munroe and Company, 1851.

Howe, Julia Ward, Mary Elvira Elliott, Mary Hannah Graves, Mary A. Stimpson, Martha Seavey Hoyt, comps. *Representative Women of New England*. Boston: New England Histological Publishing Company, 1904.

"How to Feed Our Sick." *Public Ledger*, November 15, 1894, 10.

Hudders, Etta Morse. "Diet in Health." *American Kitchen Magazine* 6 (January 1897): 154-56.

Inness, Sherrie A., ed. *Cooking Lessons: The Politics of Gender and Food*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Little Publishers, 2001.

_____. *Dinner Roles: American Women and Culinary Culture*, Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001.

_____. ed. *Kitchen Culture in America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Jacobs, Meg. *Pocketbook Politics: Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

James, Edward T. ed. *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Presds of Harvard University Press, 1971.

Jenkins, Virginia Scott. *Bananas: The American History*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Jo, Mari and Paul Buhle, ed. *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978.

Kasson, John F. *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1978.

Kasson, John F. *Rudeness & Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1990.

"Keep a House a Year and Be Miserable." *Philadelphia Press*, November. 17, 1900, 6.

Kellogg, Ella Eaton. *Science in the Kitchen*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Modern Medicine Publishing Co., 1892.

Kilde, Jeanne Halgren. "The 'Predominance of the Feminine' at Chautauqua: Rethinking the Gender-Space Relationship in Victorian America," *Signs* 24 (Winter 1999): 449-86.

Laird, Pamela Walker. *Advertising Progress: American Business and the Rise of Consumer Marketing*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics, Proceedings of the First, Second and Third Conferences. New York: Lake Placid, 1901.

Leach, William R. "Transformations in a Culture of Consumption: Women and Department Stores, 1890-1925." *Journal of American History* 71 (September 1984): 319-42.

_____. *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture.* New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

_____. *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.

Levenstein, Harvey. "The New England Kitchen and the Origins of Modern American Eating Habits." *American Quarterly* 32 (Autumn 1980): 369-86.

_____. *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Levine, Susan. *School Lunch Politics: The Surprising History of America's Favorite Welfare Program*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Origin of Table Manners*, Vol. III. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

_____. *The Raw and the Cooked*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Lincoln, Mary J. "Christmas Pies and Pastry." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (December 1894): 131-35.

_____. "Extracts from Cookery, or Art and Science versus Drudgery and Luck." A Celebration of Women Writers, http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/eagle/congrees/lincon.html (accessed October 1, 2008).

_____. *Mrs. Lincoln's Boston Cook Book: What To Do and What Not To Do in Cooking*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1916.

_____. *Home Helps*. Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1910.

_____. "How I was Led to Teach Cookery," *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (May 1894): 67-69.

_____. "The Pioneers of Scientific Cookery," *Good Housekeeping* 51 (October 1910): 470-74.

_____. "A Symposium—The Markets of Some Great Cities." *The Chautauquan* 24 (December 1896): 332.

"Lobsters Are Scavengers," *Philadelphia Press*, November 10, 1900, 6.

Lord, Myra Belle Horne. *History of the New England Woman's Press Association, 1885-1931*. Newton, MA: Graphic Press, 1932.

"Luxurious Economy." *Philadelphia Press*, November 11, 1897, 9.

"Luxurious Economy." *Table Talk* 2 (January 1887): 27.

Marks, Susan. *Finding Betty Crocker: The Secret Life of America's First Lady of Food*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Markward, Rose. *Dainty Desserts for Dainty People*. Johnstown, N.Y.: Charles B. Knox Co., 1896.

McFeeley, Mary Drake. *Can She Bake a Cherri Pie?: American Women and the Kitchen in the Twentieth Century*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.

McIntosh, Wm. Alex and Mary Zey. "Women as Gatekeepers of Food Consumption: A Sociological Critique." In *Food and Gender: Identity and Power*, edited by Carole M. Counihan and Steven L. Kaplan, 125-44. Amsterdam, The Netherland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998.

Merchants' Protective Association of Hudson County, N.J. *Official Souvenir and Catalogue, World's Food Fair and Industrial Exposition, Jersey City, March, 4-23rd, 1895*. Jersey City, N.J.: Datz Print, 1895. New York Public Library.

"A Millionaire's Kitchen." *Boston Cooking-School Cook Book* 6 (October 1901): xx.

Mintz, Sydney. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

"Mission of the Cooking School." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July, 1894): 189.

"Miss Maria Parloa." *Journal of Home Economics* 1 (October 1909): 378-85.

"Mrs. L. T. Rorer Fails in Business Venture." *New York Times*, September 26, 1907. http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9502E3DC103EE033A25755C2A96F9C946697D6CF.

"Mrs. Rorer on Samples." *Printer's Ink*, April 11, 1900, 11.

"Mrs. Rorer Talks of Desserts." *New York Times*, November 1, 1895. http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9407E7DD1139E033A25752C0A9679D94649ED7CF.

"Mrs. Sarah T. Rorer and the New Cult." *Philadelphia Evening Bulleting,* November 9, 1897, 3.

Nasaw, David. *Going Out: the Rise and Fall of Public Amusements*. New York: BasicBooks, 1993.

Neil, Marion Harris. *A "Calendar of Dinners" with 615 Recipes: Including the Story of Crisco*. Cincinnati: Procter & Gamble Co., 1915.

Neuhaus, Jessamyn. *Manly Meals and Mom's Home Cooking: Cookbooks and Gender in Modern America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Neumeyer, Elizabeth. *"Mother" Ella Eaton Kellogg*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Heritage Battle Creek, 2001.

New England Retail Grocers' Associations. *World's Food Fair and Home Congress: Mechanics' Building, Boston, Monday, Oct. 5 to Saturday, Nov. 7, 1896*. Boston: Barta Press, 1896. Hagley Museum and Library. Wilmington, Delaware.

"The New York Cooking School." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 355 (December 1879): 22-29.

N. K. Fairbank Co. *Cottolene*. Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1893.

Ohmann, Richard M. *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century*. New York: Verso, 1996.

Okun, Mitchell. *Fair Play in the Marketplace: The First Battle for Pure Food and Drug*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986.

Owen, Catherine. *Progressive Housekeeping*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1889.

Parkin, Katherine J. *Food Is Love: Advertising and Gender Roles in Modern America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Parloa, Maria. "The Household Market Basket." *Good Housekeeping* 17 (January 1893): 1-3; (July 1893): 1-3.

_____. *Miss Parloa's New Cook Book and Marketing Guide*. Boston: Dana Estes And Company, 1880.

_____. "The Woman with No Servant." *Ladies' Home Journal* 20 (September 1903): 36.

_____. "The Young Couple with a Maid." *Ladies' Home Journal* 22 (September 1905): 36.

Patten, Simon. *The New Basis of Civilization*. New York: The MacMillion Company, 1907.

"Philadelphia Cooking School Commencement Day." *Household News* 4 (June 1896): 242-48.

Pierce, Ella A. *Hartley House Cook Book and Household Economist*. New York: Lentilhon & Co., 1901.

"Pleasant Days at Chautauqua." *Philadelphia Press*, July 11, 1897, 5.

Pollan, Michael Pollan. *In Defense of Food: An Eater's Manifesto*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2008.

Poole, Hester Martha Poole. *Fruits, and How to Use Them.* New York: Fowler & Wells, 1890.

"Proper Diet for the Sick." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 15, 1894, 2.

"Pure Food Display." *Public Ledger*, November 21, 1891, 2.

"Pure Food Exhibit." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 26, 1890, 2.

"Pure Food Show." *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 11, 1898, 7.

Richards, Ellen H.. *The Cost of Food: A Study in Dietaries.* New York: Robert Brummond and Company, 1901.

_____. *The Cost of Living as Modified by Sanitary Science*, 3d ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1915.

_____. "The Place of Science in Woman's Education." *American Kitchen Magazine* 7 (September, 1897): 224-27.

Richards, Ellen H. and Sophronia Maria Elliott. *The Chemistry of Cooking and Cleaning: A Manual of Housekeepers*, 3d ed, rev. and enl. Boston: Whitcomb and Barrows, 1907.

Rieser, Andrew C. *The Chautauqua Moment: Protestants, Progressives, and the Culture of Modern Liberalism.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Rorer, Sarah Tyson. *Dainties.* Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1894.

_____. "Dainty Meals for Small Families." *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (September 1899), 24.

_____. "Domestic Economy for Farmers' Wives." *Household News* 4 (April, 1896): 132-33.

_____. *Good Cooking.* Philadelphia: Curtis Publishing Company, 1896.

_____. *Home Helps.* Chicago: N. K. Fairbank Co., 1900.

_____. "How to Live on a Thousand a Year." *Table Talk* 3 (October 1888): 431-32.

_____. *Made Over Dishes.* Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1898.

_____. *Mrs. Rorer's Diet for the Sick.* Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1914.

_____. *Mrs. Rorer's Key to Simple Cookery*. Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1917.

_____. *Mrs. Rorer's New Cook Book: A Manual of Housekeeping*. Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1902.

_____. "Our Succulent Vegetables." *Good Housekeeping* 58 (May 1914): 711.

_____. *Philadelphia Cook Book: A Manual of Home Economics*. Philadelphia: Arnold and Company, 1886.

_____. "The Right Food for Different Men." *Ladies' Home Journal* 15 (October 1898): 22.

_____. "Which Vegetables with Meats." *Ladies' Home Journal* 16 (October 1899): 22.

Rutherford, Janice Williams. *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick & the Rise of Household Efficiency.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003.

Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Samson, Peter Edward. "The Emergence of a Consumer Interest in America, 1870-1930." PhD. diss., University of Chicago, 1980.

Scanlon, Jennifer. *Inarticulate Longings: The* Ladies' Home Journal*, Gender, and the Promises of Consumer Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Schneirov, Matthew. *The Dream of a New Social Order: Popular Magazines in America, 1893-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Schultz, James R. *The Romance of Small-Town Chautauquas*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.

Scott, Anne Firor. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Shallcross, Julian. "Marion Harland." *Table Talk* 2 (February 1887): 19-20

Shapiro, Laura. "'I Guarantee': Betty Crocker and the Woman in the Kitchen." In *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food*, edited by Avakian, Arlene Voski and Barbara Haber, 29-40. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.

_____. *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the Turn of the Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1986.

Shi, David Shi. *The Simple Life: Plain Living and High Thinking in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

"Simple Way to Fool Man with Left-Over Meat." *Philadelphia North American*, November 15, 1900, 11.

"Simplicity in Living." *Boston Cooking-School Magazine* 8 (January, 1903): 304-5.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1973.

_____. "Two Political Cultures in the Progressive Era: The National Consumers' League and the American Association for Labor Legislation." In *U.S. History as Women's History: New Feminist Essays*, edited by Linda Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar, 36-62. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Spring, Joel H. *Educating the Consumer-Citizen: A History of the Marriage of Schools, Advertising, and Media*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2003.

Stage, Sarah and Virginia B. Vincenti, eds. *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997.

"A Standing Offer." *American Kitchen Magazine* 8 (October, 1897): 37.

Starr, Paul. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine: The Rise of a Sovereign Profession and the Making of a Vast Industry*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Stover, Blanche M. *The History of Home Economics*. Edited by Hazel T. Craig. New York: Practical Home Economics, 1945.

Strasser, Susan. *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

_____. *Satisfaction Guaranteed: The Making of the American Mass Market*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian, 1989.

A Summer at Chautauqua." *Tribune Monthly* 2 (September 1890): 19-20.

"The Summer Schools." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 1 (June & July, 1894): 182-83.

Susman, Warren I. *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

"Substantial Food for Workingmen." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 20, 1894, 7.

Swiencicki, Mark A. "Consuming Brotherhood: Men's Culture, Style and Recreation as Consumer Culture, 1880-1930." In *Consumer Society in American History: A Reader*, edited by Lawrence B. Glickman, 207-40. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Table Talk. Philadelphia, 1885-1920. New York Public Library and the State Library of Pennsylvania.

Tebbel, John, Mary and Ellen Zuckerman. *The Magazine in America, 1741-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Thatcher, H.D., M.D., ed. *How to Test Baking Powder*. Potsdam, N.Y.: H.D. Thatcher & Co., 1894.

"That Christmas Dinner." *Philadelphia Press*, December 10, 1896, 10.

"There Is No New Woman." *New York Times*, October 19, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9D01EED8113DE433A2575AC1A9669D94649ED7CF.

Theophano Janet. *Eat My Words: Reading Women's Lives through the Cookbooks They Wrote*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

"To Improve Our Food." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, February 25, 1889, 2.

"Too Many Meals Are Eaten." *New York Times*, October 29, 1895, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9F0DE5DE1139E033A2575AC2A9669D94649ED7CF.

Trachtenberg, Alan. *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

Turner, Alice M. Turner. The *New England Cook Book*. Boston: Chas. E. Brown Publishing Co., 1905.

"Two Cooking Lessons." *Philadelphia Times*, November 23, 1893, 22.

The United States Bureau of Education. *Industrial Education in the United States: A Special Report*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883.

Vaccaro, Pamela. *Beyond the Ice Cream Cone: The Whole Scoop on Food at the 1904 World's Fair*. St. Louis, Enid Press, 2004.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: The MacMillan Company, 1899.

Vileisis, Ann. *Kitchen Literacy: How We Lost Knowledge of Where Food Comes From and Why We Need to Get It Back*. Washington: Island Press, 2008.

Walters, Ronald G. *American Reformers, 1815-1860*., rev. ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 1997.

Watson, Kate H. "Report of Committee on Food." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (January 1895): 186-87.

"A Week at Chautauqua." *American Kitchen Magazine* 5 (September 1896): 249-57.

Weimann, Jeanne Madeline. *The Fair Women*. Chicago: Academy Chicago, 1981.

Whipple, Wayne. *The Minute Man: A Brief Account of the Battles of Lexington and Concord*. Orange, Mass.: Minute Tapioca Co., 1909.

White, J. E. *The "Home Queen" Cook Book*. Chicago: M. A. Donohue & Company, 1901.

Wholesale Grocers' Association. *The Cincinnati Pure Food Exposition, Season of 1894: Music Hall, February 26th to March 17th 1894*. Cincinnati, 1894. Cincinnati Historical Society Library.

"Who's Who in Home Economics, Sarah Tyson Rorer." *Practical Home Economics* 7 (January 1934): 13

Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Williams, Susan. *Food in the United States, 1820-1890*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006.

_____. *Savory Suppers and Fashionable Feasts: Dining in Victorian America.* Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1996.

Woloson, Wendy A. *Refined Tastes: Sugar, Confectionery, and Consumers in Nineteenth-Century America.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 2002.

"Woman's Affairs." *Boston Cooking- School Magazine* 18 (November 1913): 287.

"World's Food Fair." *New England Kitchen Magazine* 2 (October 1894): 3-10.

Wyman, Carolyn. *Better Than Homemade: Amazing Foods That Changed the Way We Eat.* Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2004.