



## introduction: deleuze and the being of the sensory

It is for good reason that Deleuze and Guattari, when exploring the nature of art, attach great importance to the tenderness of the flesh (*What is Philosophy?* 179). The skeletal structure gives the artwork its frame, its enveloping, its singularity, as art history has often argued. But the flesh, the soft part, the edible part, provides the artwork with its sensuality, with its rhythm, its vibration. Therefore, Deleuze claims that every body (including a body of art) actually has *both* a state of hardness *and* a state of fluidity (*The Fold* 6). Similarly, when examining the nature of the culinary, the creation of a meal is not only about producing a harmonic, polyphonic and contrapuntal combination of tastes, smells and forms, as most cooking books claim. On the contrary, whenever a chef sets himself to work with his pallet of foods it is in the movement away from the skeletal structure that functions as an extension of the plate or of the ground from which food emanates that the creative assembling of elements through which a reproduction of the senses is started.

The territories of the arts and the culinary are close to one another in many ways. Their elasticity, their combined hardness and softness, makes similar use of expression when exerting themselves onto us. Both art and food are capable of *exploring the being of the sensory*. A painting always tries the ability of the eye to touch, to feel the canvas beyond its optical image. The culinary is similarly synaesthetic; the edible plays our senses by more than gustatory and olfactory stimuli. It also involves experiencing structures (the viscosity, the profile), colors and sounds. Both art and the culinary, then, create miniature forms of life, condensed expressions capable of

rick dolphijn

## AN AESTHETICS OF THE MOUTH *creativity between the culinary and the arts*

great disturbance, destabilization and metamorphosis. In the moments of detachment, in their power (*puissance*) to cut us loose, lies their ability to function as portals to the world.

The aim of this text is to propose some thoughts on how the arts and the culinary, in their proximity, make use of one another in order to explore this being of the sensory. Both territories are in constant need of new grounds in order to redefine themselves. They need to be on the move, or at least in a permanent state of vibration. This article explores in what ways the culinary realm has furnished the artist with directions in which to push art to its outside and thus opening it up to the world. Similarly, it pays attention to how art has questioned the definitions of cuisine by accommodating the territory of food with adjoining territory.

I will call the tactic of the flooding of art into food and food into art the *creative*. This tactic is profusely involved with the flesh, as it proliferates, shrinks, rots, is prepared, eaten and is being eaten. The creative is not a transcendental, eternal or universal Idea and there is nothing romantic about it. It has no form or substance and is always singular and immanent. It is an abstract drill capable of prying open the encasing definitions. It creates the peepholes that allowed people either to experience truth or to move away from it. Creativity does not comment on truth. It creates it, *est enim verum index sui et falsi*, as Spinoza would say (320, ll. 8–9).

Creativity has always invited non-food within the territory of food, and non-art within art. One decisive, perhaps irreversible, moment in the coming into being of the creative stands out: *modernity*. Coming with the (Orphic) Cubist ideas about “pure painting” in the early twentieth century, Marshall McLuhan defined this era to be about the discovery *and* the questioning of territorial margins, about a critical *and* a clinical approach towards territoriality, thus enabling the motors of creativity to work like they never worked before. The modernist painter’s focus on what could be done with the two-dimensional square, the paint, the brush, and the overall sensitive expressiveness of the painter were not an attempt to convince us of the limits of painting. It works the other way around: it was their way of getting to know the *dimensions* of painting, and especially its *margins*. These margins accommodated limitless experimentation and exploration, starting with the above-mentioned skeletal components, but creating connections to every possible articulation of sensation.

Similar developments took place in the kitchen. It was again in the early twentieth century that innovative chefs such as Emile Escoffier (1846–1935) and Fernand Point (1897–1955), started their inquiries into what cooking and eating was all about. They demonstrated that the cook’s mission was to move away from everything that coded cuisine. The culinary, they claimed, was about mapping the possibilities between the chef, his tools, the powers of heating and cooling and the edible, in order to search for every possible expression of the

sensory. Here, too, this break which we call modernism (after McLuhan) resulted in a limitless experimentation and exploration of the alimentary and beyond. Modernist painting *and* modernist cuisine were out to clarify our view, to renew our language, to brush our teeth and blow our nose in order to get rid of the clichés and the stereotypes that had controlled and paralyzed our senses before.

### the artist in the kitchen: deterritorializing and reterritorializing art

Within dominant art theory, focused as it is on bony structures rather than on fleshy tactics, generative connections between the arts and the culinary rarely surfaced. Usually, only the representation of comestibles in painting is discussed, where the majority of them extract the alimentary merely to represent abundance. The lusty royal banquets, the always emerging cornucopia; when the alimentary surfaced within art theory (from Van Breughel to the brothers Grimm) it is the core ingredient of the *Land of Cockaigne*, the land where the grilled geese fly through the air, where pancakes grow on trees and the rivers ooze with lemonade. Comestible representations in seventeenth-century Dutch still lifes, in the “portraits” of Guiseppe Arcimboldo (1527–93) and in religious artworks (from the Garden of Eden to the Last Supper) did not go unnoticed either. Food turns up in depictions signifying issues such as Original Sin (obviously the apple) and other socio-cultural phenomena, from infidelity to chastity. Apart from these visual representations, few attempts have been made to study the relation between food and art.

There is much more to be said about how the arts include the edible. The early history of Western art (at the margins of the sixteenth-century Renaissance) already presents us with two important perspectives, in the works of Rabelais (c.1490–1553) and Hieronymus Bosch (c.1450–1516). In exploring the edible, Rabelais reinvented the novella, the satiric, and actually set the tone for a general way in which literature codes life. It was Rabelais who pushed the idea of food as the sign of the abundant to its extreme,

where affluence meets squander, where the phantasmagoric produces the real. Writing with a full mouth, laughing with a full mouth, Rabelais decodes Language in a way only Carroll was able to parry by leaving Alice open-mouthed at her coronation dinner.<sup>1</sup> Together they created a space only Joyce, Beckett and Proust, in the early twentieth century, were able to expand. In particular, Proust's madeleine comes close to Rabelais, as here too alimentary experiments are produced that allow us to feel the nature of decadence and social struggle in their respective times or time span. Proust, like Rabelais, opens up language and shows us the real by traveling the alimentary and making everyone and everything enter the same "dance," as Bakhtin calls it. It is in the mouth – the most important interface between the inside and the outside – that they find the locus for the creation of the world.

With Bosch, food travels in the opposite direction: as now abundance breaks into doom. In stark contrast with the noble and beautiful *Homo sapiens* produced by his leading contemporaries from the Italian Renaissance, food, or rather the edible, provides Bosch with ways of expressing the frailty and wickedness of mankind. Bosch is not so much interested in the mouth. His is a one-way journey to the inside, where art is swallowed up by the darkness of the alimentary canal, where absolute war between all the contestants is accompanied by the smell of death and destruction. Bosch foreshadows the way artists such as Salvador Dalí frame everything in terms of the edible, to the alimentary canal and to the flesh that forms us. For Dalí, more than any other artist, offers everything to the jaw and the gut. He himself already concluded that "my enlightenment is born and propagated through my guts" (10–11). Dalí practices a visceral aesthetics quite similar to Brillat-Savarin (whom he admired), compelling Barthes to comment that:

... food provokes an internal pleasure; inside the body, enclosed in it, not just beneath the skin, but in that deep central zone, all the more primordial because it is soft, tangled, permeable, and called, in a very general sense, the intestines. (Barthes 62)

Not only in the cookbook entitled *Les Dîners de Gala*, which he conceived and illustrated, but in his entire oeuvre, visceral impulses are looming over the horizon. So many bodies figuring in his paintings are without their bones, making them into rubbery plastic slabs of meat. Not only the human body and the human face (see, in this respect, his famous self-portraits), but even time – the clock – is soft, and made edible. Dalí prepares everything – bodies, time, art works themselves – to fit and enter the insistently alimentary body. Everything works in the cycles of consumption, is sacrificed to it, using the culinary – or to use a term closer to him, the gastronomic – in order to *reterritorialize* art into the body. Many more artists used food this way, but carried along by the modernist winds, Dalí effected the most intense incarnation of what a reterritorialization of the arts is all about. All his art works are in search of the viscera, of the gut, in which they desire to disappear. With Dalí, alimentary reterritorialization gets its highest degrees of intensity.

Reterritorialization has been the guiding principle of several art house films as well, most famously *La Grande bouffe* (1973) by Marco Ferreri. But it is especially within the area of art performance, itself already very much an exploration of the human being and its bodily functions, that alimentary fixation has become a major theme. In a wonderful article, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett shows just how much the culinary inspired contemporary performance artists to reterritorialize art into the alimentary canal. She describes about a dozen renowned projects that escape the territory of the arts similar to Dalí. Three of them epitomize the different stages of this journey into the body/out of this world. Take first a performance by Alicia Rios entitled *Organoleptic Deconstruction in Three Movements* (1993). In this installation the chewing of the jaw overcoded the entire body, making the whole body a masticating consumption organ whose only function was to digest everything it was confronted with. Second, a performance by Janine Antoni entitled *Gnaw* (1992) gave her audience a view of a stage in the cycle of consumption presented as "... 600-lb (270-kg) block of gnawed chocolate,

another of gnawed lard, and the candies and lipsticks she had made from the bits of each block that she has spit out” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, “Playing to the Senses” 5). At first glance, as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett notes, the body seemed entirely absent from this performance piece, despite the clearly evident teeth-marks on the massive cubes of chocolate and lard. But this is not the case at all. For Antoni had already taken the public inside her body. By now reterritorialization has taken us to the gut, revealing the pandemonium of the inside. Finally, Jana Sterbak addresses the last stage of reterritorialization with her performance *Vanitas: Flesh Dress for an Albino Anorexic* (1987). Dressed in 50 lb (22.5 kg) of raw flank steak that was neither meant to be eaten nor to look like something you might want to eat, it “...concretized the self-consuming anorexic body, the body that refuses food” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, “Playing to the Senses” 5). In this performance, the concentric circle of consumption has reached its final appearance: the body that consumes nothing but itself. The body/the flesh is cut off from the world, fully thrown upon its own resources of which it will quickly run out.

Contrary to Pied Piper Dalí and his surreal Hamelinian sirens whose alimentary connections were designed to move away from the real, (McLuhan’s) modernity also minutely explored the culinary routes previously traveled in the works of Rabelais. In these tactics, art does not enter the gut but seduces the mouth, the ultimate sensory organ, highly sensitive to touch, taste, smell and sound. It is the softest of the senses, the most fleshy, the most loveable. Here, the Italian Futurists start their exploration of the arts. Or rather, to use the other Deleuzian term, it is according to the mouth that the Futurists *deteritorialize* art. Reading *The Futurist Cookbook* by Fillippo Tommasso Marinetti (1876–1944) (also known as “the caffeine of Europe”) leaves us with no other conclusion. Very outspoken (and funny), he labels the full stomach his enemy, as it sets a limit on the duration and acuteness of culinary attention. Or rather, the full stomach provides us with the illusion that our desires have been fulfilled

whereas they are merely paralyzed, hence removing us from the pleasures of eating. Consequently, the Futurists’ goal was to fully separate the mouth from the alimentary canal, from the growling gut that merely intends to absorb. A first step, then, was to meet daily dietary needs through the supply, free of charge, of scientifically distilled and synthesized pills. Only then the mouth would be liberated from the organs that had always disciplined it as a mere supplier of well-crushed fuel. Consequently, the Futurists’ ideas regarding cuisine meant a staving off of satiety; the goal of eating is not to feel full or to consume protein, carbohydrates and vitamins. On the contrary, eating is about sensing, about the joys of fusion. Futurist cuisine therefore eliminated or delayed swallowing. Also, they promoted light food, banned the knife and the fork, and preferred eating with the hands. The point was to touch the food with the fingers and the mouth, to *feel* the food; and to smell it, pass it around or just use your eyes to see what a good meal can do to you.

The olfactory sensations – the most autonomous, singular and impalpable of the sensations – especially allowed them to explore kinetics. Inspired by the fragile and fleeting nature of scent – which nevertheless seems to be more powerful than anything else because of its immediate and total invocation of experiences<sup>2</sup> – they used propellers in order to accelerate these sensations. These processes, alimentary in nature, compelled them to reflect on the importance of speed, which consequently became their major argument. Therefore, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett concludes:

Virtually all the major themes of Italian Futurism were explored through food, including passims, machines, speed, simultaneity, synaesthesia, words-in-liberty, the art of noise, theatre of objects, fisicofollia (body madness), a totalizing aesthetic program of renewal, and the interpenetration of art and the quotidien [*sic*]. Futurist cuisine was consistent with the more general tendency of Fascist aesthetics to separate objects from their uses, as in Marinetti’s aestheticization of war. (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, “Edible Art” 21)

The differences between the artistic revolutions set in motion by Dalí and Marinetti are perhaps most palpable in their reflections on a concept that had been central to the arts for such a long time: the concept of beauty. Dalí, not surprisingly, redefined beauty in terms of the edible. Claiming that beauty will be edible or will cease to be, he reterritorialized beauty into the gut, requiring it to be eaten. Marinetti, on the other hand, inspired especially by the transience of olfactory sensations, discovered a truth in painting/the plastic arts when declaring that the splendor of the world has been increased by a new beauty: the beauty of speed. Through volatile scent, Marinetti shows us the kinetic dimension of the territory of art (acceleration and deceleration), actually accomplishing this insight by practicing its dynamic dimension (its connections to other territories). Futurism did not show us the body, or its consumptive powers. Through their (alimentary) study of the senses, the Futurists discovered the *action* of the body, and in so doing, maybe even more so than the Cubists, prepared the ground for great revolutions in modern art articulated by the Duchamp brothers, Joseph Stella and Constantin Brancusi. Futurism equals pure plastic rhythm.

One more thing needs to be said. As a consequence of the modern freedom of creativity, the movements of reterritorialization and deterritorialization by means of the alimentary were most intensely practiced by Salvador Dalí and the Italian Futurists. Earlier, though less powerful and acute, Bosch and Rabelais also used cuisine in these ways. Deterritorialization and reterritorialization of the arts through the edible are therefore no temporal phenomena. Neither are they spatial. The Chinese tradition, for instance, has made much use of the edible, in particular during the T'ang and S'ung dynasties when poets produced a great number of fascinating miniatures of life through food.<sup>3</sup> This shows that deterritorialization and reterritorialization are consequential to art itself. They are not intrinsic to modernism or any other spatio-temporal constellation. Though articulated within these blocks enfolding them, it is in the nature of art itself to demand *continuous* creative reterritorialization and deterritorialization.

## the chef in the atelier: becoming-inedible

The first and foremost difference between the territories of the arts and of cuisine concerns their respective relations to the (socio-)cultural. The latter can be found external to the arts whereas it is always already included in the culinary. This difference marks what others have called the high and the low arts. The division has never been a difference in quality. Rather, it refers to the different creative battles that the two territorialities instigate. Earlier, this text showed how creative artists use the culinary *horizontally* to move off the territory of the arts by the kinetic and dynamic questioning of artistic customs and definitions. Now the emphasis is on how creative chefs used the arts to escape the cultural (aristocratic or bourgeois) rules and regulations that *vertically* stretched the territory of cuisine. These rules come not only from etiquette and table manners but also from the way food was used to express abundance and copiousness and actually from any way societal values have been violently inscribed within the edible. In contrast to popular belief, great chefs have therefore never been interested in complicating cuisine. On the contrary, cuisiniers like Grimod (1758–1827), Brillat-Savarin (1755–1826), Escoffier (1846–1935) and Point (1897–1955) were all in search of simplicity, for a (re)turn to a cuisine that was more “pure.” Even for *the* codifier of grand cuisine, Antonin Carême (1783–1833) – famous for his extravagantly costly and ornate methods of preparation and display – cooking was always aimed at exorcizing the cultural noise that polluted, veiled and camouflaged the sensory powers of the edible (see Mennell).<sup>4</sup>

With Grimod, Brillat-Savarin and Carême food was simply coded according to socio-economic position. At the start of the twentieth century, when Escoffier and Point gave form to cuisine, alimentary coding was much more refined. The cause of this growing importance of the political in terms of food was what Foucault (*The Will to Knowledge*) has called the Victorian regime – a misty, utterly romantic, sanctimonious wind that not only blew across the Anglo-Saxon world but also gradually infiltrated the entire Western

world with its cold principles. Victorianism introduced the strictest hierarchy in social life according to these four dualisms: it defined the Man and the woman according to it; it defined the Adult and the child according to it; it defined the White and the colored according to it; it defined Mankind itself and the animal according to it. Striating the everyday according to these paradigms, Victorianism organized life and hence the territory of the culinary according to these four major schisms, or, rather, organized it according to its newly installed four-fold center: the White, Adult, Rational Man. Four qualities strategically attributed to one power bloc, referred to by the particular points through which it passes. It is an axiomatic fortification in which ZERO always functions as an orientation according to which movement takes place.

Joan Jacobs Brumberg discusses particular alimentary points through which Victorianism functioned. Focusing largely on the production of femininity, she shows how heavy and poisonous foods like red meat and alcohol were increasingly considered to be Masculine, or, rather, to be non-feminine. Through food, she concludes, the female had been wrapped up in a romantic beauty-ideal of paleness and sickness by which she discerned herself from the strong and virulent man. There was nothing feminine about consuming large portions, about drinking alcohol, or about eating red meat (in fact, the latter was linked to adolescent insanity and nymphomania (Counihan and Van Esterik, *Food and Culture* 424)). With her appetite and with her body, the female expressed her righteousness, once more contributing to the discourse of the flesh; the virtues that made food the inedible for the female, who, in turn, became anorexic. Brumberg agrees with Foucault when showing that Victorian repression took place only *after* the production of Masculinity and femininity as political categories. Similarly, the child was produced in its relation to the Adult. Strongly correlated with the invention of the nuclear family (which also contributed to the new definition of femininity) came the definition of the child (Secombe, *A Millennium of Family Change*). Then came the invention of the children's menu. Similarly the White was opposed to the colored

(European racism, as Deleuze and Guattari call it, was a Victorian invention) and the Rational (Cultivated Man) to the irrational (uncultivated animal). In both cases food again played an important role: the colored was defined in its relation to the White by producing definitions of national and local cuisines (see Appadurai, "How to Make a National Cuisine"), whereas the schism between Man and animal was, for instance, sedimented with the introduction of pet food.

Within the first decades of the twentieth century, the Victorian virtues that had installed themselves firmly into Western cuisine were being cracked. The anti-regime of McLuhan's modernity started its cross-examination by allowing the territory of the culinary to enter into a process of emancipation first by creating connections to the arts. Indeed, similar processes can be discerned within sexuality and other socio-cultural territories that had been organized according to the principles of Victorianism, as Foucault has shown us (*The Will to Knowledge; The Use of Pleasure*). Here, too, modernism accelerated new thoughts that searched for ways to escape the cultural codes that so strongly defined their territories and suffocated anything that even came close to creativity. By exploring the margins of the culinary and by opening it up to the territory of the arts, the greatest cultural revolutions of the twentieth century were born.

These cultural revolutions might seem to have employed the same tactics as the revolutions that took place within the arts. After all, they too concerned the exploration of their margins and the creation of connections to other territories. However, because of their inclusion of the cultural these revolutions were of an entirely different nature and need to be conceptualized accordingly. I have already stated that following their two-dimensional construction, the arts connected to other territories in two different ways (by reterritorialization and deterritorialization). The culinary, on the other hand, in searching for ways to compose an entirely different idea of the comestible, necessarily emancipates from the One power center, and thus always performs a *becoming-inedible*. The creative chef, in the de-constituting of the Culinary Standard, has to compose intense relations with the unknown, with

the dark nebulas to be found at the margins of its territory. Doing so, the chef has to prevent the major inscriptions from taking place, to ward off Victorian normality that, in a moment of non-watchfulness, would penetrate into the culinary creation again, using the bones to outline its form and the flesh to lay out its landscape of virtues, dualisms and repressions. The chef has to experiment by reaching for the inedible, thus revolutionizing cuisine by the four traits that constitute it. A becoming-inedible thus necessarily comes with a four-fold decoding in which cuisine ceases to be a definable aggregate. Four movements that practice a deterritorialization, but always according to its dominant point: making becoming a deterritorialization, but deterritorialization not a becoming. A quadruple movement pushes us at the same time towards a search for a different cuisine (through the woman, the colored) and for a non-cuisine (through the animal, the child): a horizontal move away from the white phallogocentric discourse, *and* a vertical move back into the *terroir* to the earth where all food comes from.

Auguste Escoffier was the first to undo food of its Masculinity and its ratio, especially by getting rid of the traditional fat sauces (*allemands*, *espagnoles*), which he believed suffocated each meal (Escoffier, *Ma cuisine*). However, it was actually his younger contemporary Fernand Point who radically overcame the Victorian codes that had been the center of cuisine for so long. Like Escoffier, Point reduced the amount of fat and the amount of meat: cuisine meant no more three hours of cooking in cognac, no large chunk of meat drowning in its sauce. By serving smaller portions and much lighter meals, Point emancipated cuisine in evading the Masculine position that had overcoded cuisine previously. But more routes of escape were taken. Preferring natural taste, only the freshest ingredients (straight from the earth and the butchery) and using a minimum of sauces and dressings, Point warded off the culinary rationality, moving towards the animal, the uncultured. Finally, the use of exotic ingredients (especially from Asian cuisine, but also from a long-forgotten past) and his preference for fewer ingredients and simple pure tastes also show that his experiments moved

towards the colored and the child. This is the true becoming-inedible, a quadruple emancipation, resulting in creating “the plate as a painting,” as Point summarized it (Point, *Ma gastronomie*)

Point’s idea of creating the plate as a painting can be misread in two ways. First, one might think that Point complicates cuisine by introducing the visual into its sensory stimulations; secondly, that the territory of arts was merely used by the culinary in a pictorial sense. But Point’s goal was never “to complicate” the way food is visually arranged on a plate. Sure, the discovery of the photogenic side of food has been a great reformer in twentieth-century cuisine. But the culinary was never active in the arts merely by the depiction of comestibles, and likewise the artistic was never merely active within cuisine through the resemblance of a meal to a painting. Rather, Point can be considered a true (McLuhanesque) modernist as he saw that the chef *necessarily* had to extend his experiments into the visible, not by using cornucopian methods or any other pictorial ideal but by composing visual rhythm in accordance with other sensory stimuli.

It is no coincidence that Point’s innovations coincided with the first emancipatory movements in Europe (the First Feminist Wave), and that they truly changed cuisine with the Great Fall of the Rational-Adult-White-Man in the late 1960s/early 1970s, when any suppressed group was involved in great streams of emancipation (the Second Feminist Wave, Paris 1968, the Civil Rights Movement and racial segregation in the USA). This was the time, really, to allow Point’s revolutions to explore cuisine without any reticence. And thus, parallel to this summit of political (emancipatory) revolutions, Point’s followers (Paul Bocuse, Michel Guérard, Louis Outhier and Alain Senderens) led the creative battles in the kitchen and were recognized as the great revolutionaries of contemporary cuisine by the culinary critics Gault and Millau. These chefs became internationally renowned in 1972, when Henri Gault summarized their activities as *nouvelle cuisine*. In 1973, Gault wrote a “veritable manifesto” for the nouvelle cuisine movement in which he summed up ten arguments to show how these new chefs

continued the routes away from “the edible” (Gault, *Cooks and Other People*), from normalized cuisine, as first questioned by Escoffier and especially Point. Gault noted that nouvelle cuisine should avoid the “terrible brown and white sauces”; nouvelle cuisine should be interested in dietetics, light dishes, salads; nouvelle cuisine should be about the diminishing of portions; nouvelle cuisine makes use of every technological novelty, as long as it does not interfere with the nature of the product (for instance, it should be cautious in relation to the use of the refrigerator); and, most of all, nouvelle cuisine should be about combining anything with anything,<sup>5</sup> about breaking the culinary codes in any way.

### conclusion: creativity from the gut to the mouth

Nevertheless, it could be said that Point’s revolutions actually found their reterritorialization with Gault’s manifesto for nouvelle cuisine. Naming and defining what their novelties were all about, a new central point was created, a new center that any new emancipation was bound to turn against.<sup>6</sup> But that is not entirely what happened. For apart from caricaturizing and ridiculing the new way of cooking (in particular, its diminishing of portions was believed to be ludicrous), which led to the swift demise of the name *nouvelle cuisine*, its spirit is still very much present. Beyond its name or the qualities as Gault defined them, it permanently liberated the culinary from several of its political burdens, and keeps the creative machines spinning, blowing its revolutionary culinary wind around the world up to today. As a movement, nouvelle cuisine is dead, but its radical ideas on cooking have permanently changed the territory of the culinary. It set an obsessive search for newness and invention into motion, infecting every serious chef in the (Western) world with a sense of the unexpected, the unexplored. It convinced us once and for all that food is not a means of filling the stomach but of challenging the senses creatively. But it not only affected high-class restaurants; nouvelle cuisine changed

the way we eat in every respect. It made cuisine enter a permanent becoming-inedible, as it set out creative lines to all the territories that somehow come close to it. By traveling the arts, nouvelle cuisine has punctured the culinary, allowing the surrounding fogs to enter, in its desire to be connected to any possible territory according to the quadruple emancipatory articulations of becoming-inedible. The culinary remains a territory that is also structured according to the political, since it necessarily includes the socio-cultural. It searches for ways to ward it off, but the culinary knows of hierarchy, making this territory perhaps not quite a volume yet still more than simply a surface.

With the territory of the arts, it is precisely the other way around. Art does not include the socio-cultural, yet it is sometimes harassed by it (predominantly by its judges). Art is a two-dimensional plane, yet when times are not right it sees itself stretched out into something more than the surface it should be (its elasticity is very much being tested). Art longs to be in a constant state of deterritorialization, whereas the culinary wants to be on the run through a permanent becoming-inedible.

Both movements are, however, away from the gut, which equals the Rational Adult White Man, and swirl through its margins, its outskirts, just underneath the skin, the surface, the membrane. Sometimes piercing it. Always effecting its highest sensitivity. Converging in the tongue, the lips, the inner mouth with its holes covered with liquids – pure softness and sensuality – intending not to get to the outside but rather to amalgamate, to enlarge its territory. Yet still using different connections. For, whereas the culinary revolutions instigated by Point might resonate with the artistic innovations proposed by Marinetti in his *Futurist Cookbook*, the battles being fought are of a different nature. They are very close to one another, as opposites. Two reciprocal skeletal structures using different tactics, enfolded into one another, tied together by meat, they form the mouth. According to their different hardness and different softness, they form a different

stretch, thus setting out their creative search for the new *within* one another. Towards the being of the sensory. Towards life.



## notes

The author wishes to thank Amis Boersma, Marcel Cobussen and Bregje van Eekelen for their comments.

1 Sara Guyer critiques Deleuze (*The Logic of Sense*) for having misread what happened at Alice's coronation dinner (Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*); this event was not about eating or about being eaten, she claims. On the contrary, Alice remains hungry and speechless throughout this dream. And it is accordingly – through her non-eating, in the *removal* of the mouth – that she questions language, logic, or, rather, the definitions of writing.

2 Once again an argument that reminds us of Proust's famous excerpt on the madeleine, where he also, unarguably, shows us the power of comestibles:

But when from a long-distant past nothing subsists, after the people are dead, after the things are broken and scattered, taste and smell alone, more fragile but more enduring, more unsubstantial, more persistent, more faithful, remain poised a long time, like souls, remembering, waiting, hoping, amid the ruins of all the rest; and bear unflinchingly, in the tiny and most impalpable drop of their essence, the vast structure of recollection. (Proust 50–51)

3 It was not only China's most famous poet Li Bai (or Li Po or Li Tai-pé) (701–62) who eagerly explored the realm of food but also less famous artists such as Zhou Bang-Yan (1056–1121), who devoted much of his poetry to the edible. Their use of the alimentary is quite similar to the directions pointed out by Dalí/Bosch and Rabelais/Marinetti. Li Bai uses food, and especially wine, in order to reach for the world of Taoist truths. Even in style and in wit his work comes very close to Rabelais/Marinetti. Zhou Bang-Yan, on the other hand, practicing the conventional *wanyue pai* style (the “graceful-suggestive” style), prefigured, in a way, what Bosch/Dalí did

## dolphijn

centuries later; in his work, everything refers to the alimentary territory in order to verbalize heartache, sadness and transitoriness.

4 The influence of Antonin Carême on European Cuisine cannot be underestimated because he wrote many timeless books on cuisine and (notably) because he was most popular with the new French post-Revolution elite, Napoleon himself and the other great names of the then European royal houses and nobility (such as King George IV from England, Tsar Alexander I, Lord Steward and Baron Rothschild) and thus also practically inspired an entire new generation of chefs.

5 A search for the exotic was established mainly by experimenting with new vegetables from China, Japan, India, and North Africa. Later, the concept of *fusion cooking* was derived from this practice.

6 The first person to ridicule the advancements of nouvelle cuisine was, strangely enough, Paul Bocuse himself. In an attempt not to become the victim of the growing antipathy against the new cuisiniers, Bocuse quickly distanced himself from nouvelle cuisine.

## bibliography

Adams, Carole. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum, 1990.

Appadurai, Arjun. “How to Make a National Cuisine: Cookbooks in Contemporary India.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30 (1988): 3–24.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1968.

Barthes, Roland. “Reading Brillat-Savarin.” *On Signs*. Ed. Marshall Blonsky. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP. 61–75.

Brumberg, Joan Jacobs. “The Appetite as Voice.” Ed. Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik. *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice in Wonderland. 1865*. Ed. Donald J. Gray. New York: Norton, 1971.

Counihan, Carole and Penny Van Esterik (eds.). *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

## aesthetics of the mouth

- Dalí, Salvador. *Les Dîners de Gala*. Paris: Draeger, 1973.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*. Trans. Mark Lester with Charles Stivale. Ed. Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia UP, 1990.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.
- Escoffier, Auguste. *Ma cuisine*. Paris: Flammarion, 1972.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality Part 2*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1988.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality Part 1*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Gault, Henri. "Nouvelle Cuisine." *Cooks and Other People: Oxford Symposium on Food History 1995*. Oxford: Prospect, 1996.
- La Grande bouffe*. Dir. Marco Ferreri. Image Entertainment, 1973.
- Guyer, Sara. "The Girl with the Open Mouth: Through the Looking Glass." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 9.1 (2004): 159–63
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. "Edible Art." *Artforum* (Nov. 1989): 20–23.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. "Playing to the Senses: Food as a Performance Medium." *Performance Research* 4.1 (1999): 1–30.
- Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso. *The Futurist Cookbook*. Trans. Suzanne Brill. London: Trefoil, 1989.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. 1964. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Mennell, Stephen. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1996.
- Point, Fernand. *Ma gastronomie*. Wilton: Lyceum, 1974.
- Proust, Marcel. *Swann's Way. Within a Budding Grove*. Vol. I. Trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin. *Remembrance of Things Past*. London: Chatto, 1981.
- Seccombe, Wally. *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Northwestern Europe*. London and New York: Verso, 1992.
- Spinoza. *Opera*. Ed. Carl Gebhardt. Heidelberg: Winter, Part 4, 1925.

Rick Dolphijn  
Room L2-011  
Faculty of Cultural Studies  
Erasmus University Rotterdam  
PO Box 1738  
3000 DR Rotterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [dolphijn@fhk.eur.nl](mailto:dolphijn@fhk.eur.nl)

Copyright of *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.