

## **The Many Rooms in the House: Research on Past Foodways in Modern Europe**

*Peter Scholliers*

In 2007 I published a survey dealing with research about Europe's foodways in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>1</sup> Rather than being interested in the conclusions of this research, I wished to examine *how* scholars study food history, which offered an opportunity for testing the application and relevance of interdisciplinarity. Luckily, not only historians but also scholars who were not trained as historians investigate foodways of the past. Studying food in the modern era has indeed attracted a large number of disciplines, ranging from anthropology and sociology to communication sciences and geography. I wished to learn whether and how these approaches, methods, and insights inspired historians. My conclusions confirmed the extraordinarily thriving interest in Europe's past foodways by an ever-growing number of disciplines, the total lack of common ground of these studies, and their hesitant interest in interdisciplinary approaches.

In this chapter I want to expand this inquiry by using recent literature and asking additional questions. I am, first and foremost, interested in the way historians have dealt with the overwhelming attention from other disciplines since the early 2000s. Would they welcome it and explore new themes, methods, and insights, or resist and ignore the loud knock on their door? Also, I consider the question of how amateur historians (i.e., nontrained historians as well as nonacademics) set off with historical questions and debates, apply historical concepts, search for historical sources, and refer to adequate historical literature. This chapter has three sections: the first two form a chronological survey with the year 2005 as a caesura (in order not to replicate my 2007 survey and to emphasize recent developments), while the third section is a lengthy conclusion.

### **Separate Rooms in a Cozy Hut (1960s–1980s) and Accessible Rooms in a Welcoming House (1990s–2005)**

Broadly speaking, two intellectual loci in food studies existed between 1900 and 1960: that of economic history and that of folklore.<sup>2</sup> The two neglected each other. Economic historians dealt with the food supply, hunger, and prices, while folklorists studied

regional variations, table manners, and cooking utensils. Next to these, there was popular literature that provided entertaining food stories. In the late 1950s, historians discovered the study of everyday life. This turn came along with the popularity of *Annales* and *Alltagsgeschichte*.<sup>3</sup> The latter paid attention to anthropological approaches, that is, the daily (or “lived”) experience of ordinary men and women, where the cultural dimension of food and drinks played a role.<sup>4</sup> The *Annales* methodology encompassed the study of long-term developments and structures of daily life, searching for inspiration with economists, sociologists, ethnologists, linguists, and natural scientists. Soon, the quantitative approach dominated the interest of *Annales* historians, while the ethnological sway, or the attention to material culture, vanished. This upsurge of social food historiography, with its quantitative considerations, had such a strong impact that other approaches could not ignore social history’s prevailing position.<sup>5</sup> Most historians were rather pleased with this situation, which mirrored the more general position of social history in those days as new, critical, emancipating, and challenging. As French historian Jean-Louis Flandrin later put it, historians then viewed ethnology as “too anecdotal” and anthropology as providing general patterns with arbitrary, subjective, and ethnocentric starting points that “reach only very poor ideas.”<sup>6</sup>

Yet socioeconomic history’s supremacy was challenged discreetly when a few authors took a distinctly innovative look at food history. None of them were historians by training. Ethnologist Günter Wiegelmann published a general food history of Germany in 1967, paying attention to regional cooking and daily as well as festive food.<sup>7</sup> Philosopher and psychologist Jean-Paul Aron, *Annaliste* in the margins, published a book in 1973 that put the nineteenth-century Parisian diner at the center of attention, considering restaurants, menus, taste, and fancy cuisine.<sup>8</sup> In 1977, philosopher-historian-sociologist Theodore Zeldin devoted forty pages of a book on French nineteenth-century social history to food, considering taste, regional cuisine, cooks, and culinary writers. In 1982, anthropologist Jack Goody wrote a book with historical and comparative perspectives, asking about the lack of haute cuisine in African societies (and, contrariwise, its significance in Europe). In 1985, sociologist Stephen Mennell published a book in which he compared England’s and France’s long-term culinary traditions, considering networks of people with their preferences and appetites. Also in 1985, anthropologist Sidney Mintz published a study on the economic, political, and cultural history of sugar. These authors had several inspirational sources but especially important was Claude Lévi-Strauss’s decoding of foodways in order to reveal the underlying meanings and structures of society.

Sociologist Jean-Pierre Poulain admitted in 2002 that French food scholars had for years neglected the richness of the aforementioned anthropological, sociological, and ethnological research.<sup>9</sup> Jean-Louis Flandrin and Massimo Montanari emphasized the fact that initially (i.e., in the 1970s) only a few historians of antiquity were interested in cultural aspects of food.<sup>10</sup> Yet there were traces of changes in the late 1980s. The journal *Food and Foodways* organized roundtable discussions about Goody’s and Mintz’s books.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, some historians did see the benefits of looking over

the sky-high fence. Hans-Jürgen Teuteberg, the German historian dealing with the history of housing, enterprises, and consumption, collaborated with the ethnologist Wiegelmann. They developed a partnership with a clear division of labor: Teuteberg focused on socioeconomic issues and Wiegelmann on ethnological ones.<sup>12</sup> In France, Flandrin, an *Annaliste* and historian of the family and mentality in the eighteenth century, was more sweeping in his view of food history. Around 1980, he pleaded for genuine integration of ethnology into the social historians' approach. He explored *new* sources (menu cards, recipe books, and culinary writing in general), used *new* methods (a form of close reading of texts), and, especially, addressed *new* topics (such as pleasure, taste, emotion, haute cuisine, and the organization of a meal).<sup>13</sup> He fiercely opposed the prevailing socioeconomic food historiography of the day<sup>14</sup> and criticized some sociologists' approach to history as too readily accepting of stereotypes.<sup>15</sup> In Italy, Massimo Montanari, at the outset an agricultural historian of the Renaissance, started writing about food history in the 1980s and gained a reputation with his *La fame e l'abbondanza*, published in 1993. Montanari paid great attention to careful reading of texts, considering the significance of what these sources "say" (i.e., representations and constructions).

In 1996, Flandrin and Montanari edited *Histoire de l'alimentation*, a survey of European food history from Antiquity to the present.<sup>16</sup> This book is acclaimed as a genuine benchmark.<sup>17</sup> Some believe that it shows the autonomy of cultural history with regard to anthropology and a move away from the too-general "food history" to the more focused "culinary history."<sup>18</sup> However, some reviewers pointed at serious weaknesses.<sup>19</sup> Overall, the importance of this book lies in the richness of the long-term approach, the avid cultural turn, and the variety of sources, including recipe books, letters, literature, accounts, menu cards, and statistics; yet most sources were written texts, with few objects or images. I count forty-four authors (for the French edition), among whom are only three nonhistorians.<sup>20</sup> The introduction's reference community includes older research by G. Schmoller, W. Abel, F. Braudel, C. Lévi-Strauss,<sup>21</sup> work by some *Annalistes*,<sup>22</sup> and the editors' own previous works, as well as current studies, but, astonishingly, no works by Goody, Mennell, Mintz, or Wiegelmann. It looks as if historians had fully incorporated the views, methods, and findings of other disciplines. Flandrin and Montanari's book did influence many researchers, but it did not introduce the cultural turn in European food historiography: the book was a decisive exponent of a broader paradigmatic change that put culture at the center of political, economic, and social historiography. Thus, around the year 2000, food history writing was particularly receptive to new trends in general historiography, perhaps more so than other fields of history.

## A House in Full Expansion since 2005

By 2005, food history had specialized journals, canonical literature, regular conferences, specific teaching, media recognition, and an impact on general history

writing.<sup>23</sup> Because of this, some historians proclaim the arrival of a *new* food history that merges material aspects with symbolic ones but *excludes* plain socioeconomic history (of trade, diet, famines, food aid, agribusiness, and the like).<sup>24</sup> This delineates the field of food history but hacks it loose from one of its inspirational sources. Critics go on stressing the need to incorporate other disciplines as a key element for a bright future of food studies. However, this multidisciplinary approach is precisely why some critics do not perceive food history as a distinct field with one denominator: it lacks common theoretical perspectives, approaches, aims, definitions, and methodologies, as well as secondary literature that may provide reliable, essential information.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, it is emphasized that scholars of past foodways (regardless of their discipline) must take account of developments in mainstream historiography, move from specific investigations to general understandings, avoid reductionism and separatism, and combine the cultural with the social, economic, and political.<sup>26</sup>

Still, the need for a common ground depends on what one aims at when studying past foodways. I suggest two options. First, there is food historiography that is secondary to social, political, economic, cultural, medical, intellectual, and any other history, or that is secondary to sociology, anthropology, economics, dietetics, and any other science. This implies that there is no need for common ground and that food history is subservient to other histories or sciences. Here, food history, and food studies in general, give in to the research agenda of other (sub)disciplines, hence the more or less moderate attention paid by anthropologists, sociologists, natural scientists, or social geographers to (food) history,<sup>27</sup> which has proved to be very gratifying.

Second, there is food historiography that spans social, political, economic, cultural, medical, intellectual, and any other history or science—that is, an umbrella approach that is solidly rooted in historical questions and debates. It is argued that food has all the features to play such a leading role, even to the extent of evoking a new world history (or chronology).<sup>28</sup> Common ground, then, is supplied by the historical sciences' habitual techniques: historical critique, use of historical sources, historical problems, and so on. By no means, however, is one common ground possible or wished for because of the myriad approaches in historical sciences, ranging from positivism to new historicism, from economic history to cultural history, and from emic to etic approaches.<sup>29</sup> This richness appears in today's food historiography on modern Europe and seems to have developed at an ever-increasing pace since 2005. The recent literature—in fact, a torrent of books, papers, and book chapters—can be systematized in five categories that each have clear common features: the commodity biography, long-term history, transnational history, history of inequality, and history of health.<sup>30</sup>

The commodity biography has been around for longer, and Mintz's *Sweetness and Power* is often referred to as a model. After a first wave of successful work in the 1990s (e.g., on salt, cod, tomatoes, and chocolate), it seems that the interest in commodity biographies has revived recently (e.g., beans, potatoes, cheese, milk, tea,

tomatoes, and truffles).<sup>31</sup> In general, sociocultural approaches are preferred, aiming at incorporating production, retailing, image, use, policies, and representations. With the recent interest in culinary heritage and traditional cooking, it seems likely that commodity biographies will flourish, paying interest to so-called forgotten vegetables, fruits, or herbs.<sup>32</sup> Socioeconomic historians have applied a variant of the commodity biography when discovering the benefits of studying the food chain, paying particular attention to food processing and marketing. Often they focus on a single product while increasingly paying attention to cultural matters, although mostly keeping to only one link in the chain.<sup>33</sup> The vivid interest in the history of food retailing is part of this trend. Again, this is not a new field of study, but the focus has shifted from a primarily economic approach to the intersection of histories of business, consumption, and design. Moreover, the understanding of the effects of lengthening the food chain, with the move from markets to supermarkets, has led to interest in the psychology of sellers and buyers.<sup>34</sup>

A second line of interest is the exploration of leading threads in food history from prehistoric times to tomorrow.<sup>35</sup> The commodity biographies noted in the previous paragraph contain some examples of long-run world history,<sup>36</sup> but a growing number of individual authors dare to address *all* food and drink throughout time and place.<sup>37</sup> This seems to offer, too, a fertile field for publishing large, collective overviews,<sup>38</sup> as well as books in the genre of public history (sometimes linked to “historic culinary performances”).<sup>39</sup> Today, all of these books offer the literature that some critics asked for. In general, trained historians publish this kind of work, although some amateurs, without any inhibition and having diverse or no academic training, practice the genre too. Both wish to offer large syntheses of a gigantic and complex development, hoping to bring some clarity to world history as such (although some view their contribution as an “appetizer” or an “amuse bouche”).<sup>40</sup> Naturally, such ventures are risky, leaning toward overgeneralizations and confirming stereotypical knowledge, and, regrettably, they are often nothing more than a collection of anecdotes.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, they are often biased toward Eurocentrism.

A third category is dealing with the criticism of Eurocentrism, putting “Europe” or “the West” within the frame of the global exchange of foodstuffs, migrants, and ideas.<sup>42</sup> This category has attracted much attention for a decade, opening an eclectic field of possibilities where interdisciplinary approaches may flourish.<sup>43</sup> Historians Alexander Nützenadel and Frank Trentmann have published a collection that aims at counterbalancing the fragmentation of food studies by putting food definitely in a global perspective.<sup>44</sup> Their book pays attention to four pairs of dynamics and tensions: markets and empires, migration and identity, global and local actors, and food chains and moral geographies. These are linked to broad—both old and new—questions of socioeconomic historiography, such as the “great divergence” between the West and the rest,<sup>45</sup> colonialism and decolonization, hunger, identity construction, and migration. Such a global project, nevertheless, may be problematic in that the notion of globalization needs to be clearly defined. In this respect, one reviewer

detects “rival and almost mutually exclusive approaches” among the authors of the volume,<sup>46</sup> which obviously adds to fragmentation.

Matters of identity appear within the context of transnational studies. Identity as a tool for analysis is not new, though, and prior to 2005 many researchers had looked for identities that are constructed through food. This line of research has continued.<sup>47</sup> However, what is new is situating food and identity within the study of ethnicity, emphasizing the encounter with “the other” (involving very diverse forms of conflict, hostility, negotiation, incorporation, and acculturation). For example, in 2006 anthropologist Thomas Wilson edited *Food, Drink and Identity in Europe*, in which food is situated within globalization studies that investigate the way peoples grow closer or drift apart.<sup>48</sup> This collection addresses the role of food in the construction of local, national, and international cultures. European culture is the primary focus, which offers a clear example of Eurocentrism. Yet it moves beyond simple Eurocentrism because it examines the matter of Europeanization—that is, the recent process of day-by-day adaptation to or rejection of norms and practices that are constructed as European, which leads to tension between people and institutions, between regions, and between individuals. Issues of identity construction also appear profusely in other work.<sup>49</sup> This interest will likely not disappear from food history writing, and particularly the interest in migrants’ foodways and so-called ethnic cuisine may flourish.<sup>50</sup> This focus incorporates oral history, which proves to be a particularly enriching approach.<sup>51</sup>

One of Nützenadel and Trentmann’s “pairs of dynamics and tensions” refers to “moral geographies,” which addresses the history of hunger. This introduces the fourth category: inequality. This is not a new topic. By and large issues of food scarcity and hunger were left to traditional socioeconomic historians, who supplied highly significant work.<sup>52</sup> James Vernon, however, proposes a history of the perception of hunger in the British Empire (including India and Ireland), applying the tools and concepts of the cultural turn. He deals with social and political protests, hunger marches, policy making, statistics, political controversies, kitchen design, household education, social psychology, cooking utensils, Thatcherism, investigative journalism, workhouse diets, chemical laboratories, new words (“malnutrition,” for example), and consumers’ associations.<sup>53</sup> The thesis that politicians, the media, scientists, social critics, and the general public *construct* hunger and its amplitude and impact, and that hunger is not the sole consequence of the objectively measurable lack of food, will no doubt upset some readers. It has certainly upset some social historians as illustrated by a review by Derek Oddy, one of the leading researchers of modern British food history.<sup>54</sup> Oddy expresses his bewilderment with regard to the cultural approach, methods, and views, “dipping into sensational aspects of the subject without a coherent analytical approach.” Overall, his critique focuses on the lack of materialistic grounds, the use of poststructuralism, and vagueness (of purpose, references, and methodology). On the paradigmatic level, and relevant to my question about interdisciplinarity, the review could have had as a title, “Who Needs

AuQ1

the Cultural Turn?" Vernon's reply is equally sharp, mentioning Oddy's "misrepresentations and factual errors" and stressing that "I wanted to understand hunger as a cultural category, not a biological condition" in order to study "how and why the meaning of hunger changed over time."<sup>55</sup> This intellectual conflict is a telling example not only of diverging paradigmatic views but also of the great difficulty of crossing intellectual borders.

Vernon's book testifies to a renewed, more general interest in the history of hunger.<sup>56</sup> This implies attention to policy, which tightly connects food to political history writing.<sup>57</sup> In turn, the latter leads me to the study of living conditions during world wars, which has benefited from revived attention.<sup>58</sup> Here, approaches remain, in general, very traditional, although new ways are tested, focusing on consumers, retailers, black marketers, and producers as active players within the context of starvation, rationing, and ethics.<sup>59</sup> Research on food during periods of starvation and wars unavoidably addresses the question of food inequality between social classes. This type of research is classic in the field of food historiography; it somewhat lost its sway in the early 2000s but regained attention in the past couple of years, offering a mix of astoundingly traditional socioeconomic history writing with innovative cultural historiography.<sup>60</sup>

The problem of inequality and hunger introduces the fifth category: the history of health in relation to food. Once more, this investigation is not new,<sup>61</sup> but since 2005 an increasing number of researchers have dealt with it in an innovative way (i.e., a fully cultural history of dietary recommendations, laboratory investigations, vegetarianism, taboos, and illnesses). Food fraud, food scares, and food control became popular research themes most likely because these are high on today's public and political agenda.<sup>62</sup> In 2005, economic historian Alessandro Stanziani published a book that deals with the history of food quality in France, studying the *construction* of reputations of products, producers, and regions, using the examples of butter, meat, milk, and especially wine and questioning concepts like "pure," "natural," and "adulterated."<sup>63</sup> He considers changing markets, the hygiene movement, legislation and control with regard to falsification, technological innovation, and the ensuing power relations between consumers, producers, and the state. Reviewers of the book do not situate it in food history writing but stress its importance for economic theory and economic history.<sup>64</sup> In 2010, geographer Peter Atkins brought together his proficient research on the history of milk, which shows the relevance of state regulation, commercial interests, public health, technology, and transport, pleading for more attention to the materiality of foodstuffs. More new approaches to health and nutrition are offered in proceedings of recent conferences demonstrating the intense interest in this topic.<sup>65</sup> These publications take a thorough interdisciplinary scope, incorporating findings and techniques of the natural sciences (by dieticians, physicians, and chemists) and introducing new concepts like "biocultural."<sup>66</sup> Lots of studies have appeared with regard to particular temporal and spatial developments,<sup>67</sup> showing that the alliance between the social and natural sciences in the field of nutrition, medicine, and environment seems to be well on its way.

Five trends, therefore, have clearly developed since 2005. Other new trends may be added, but they are so far less marked. Attention to novels, with their abundant information about foodways, is clearly growing,<sup>68</sup> while the study of material culture of food (places and utensils) has certainly taken off.<sup>69</sup> Both connect historical sciences to literature, design, and (home) architecture, implying (to historians) the use of new sources and methods. Clearly, there are other interests, like the diffusion of taste and *savoir faire* (using cookbooks), the workers of the catering business (labor market, hierarchies, wages, hiring and firing, contracts), or celebrations (public and private occasions), but these are just on the verge of emergence.<sup>70</sup>

The question remains: What is the position of all this food history writing? If it is part of larger historical problems (the standard of living, development of etiquette, globalization process, diversification of taste, etc.), then food history may be perfectly content with a “subordinate” and assisting role as part of economic, social, political, or cultural history. However, food history may do exactly the opposite and surpass or integrate all domains, debates, and approaches, trying to achieve “total” or “integral” history, taking all possible societal changes together via food history. This, too, is justified because it may be argued that “food” has the ability of covering *all possible* developments indeed (see the preceding). So far, I see no examples of such an approach.<sup>71</sup> Still, there is the danger of separatism and reductionism and, hence, the danger that food history could lose track of other historical fields—that is, self-contentedly, food history could exclude itself from other disciplines, debates, approaches, or methodologies.<sup>72</sup> This must certainly be avoided.

### **A Solid House with a View**

Today, food history inhabits a large house with many rooms, with the occasional remodeling of a new room. This house is very visible from a long distance. It is busy and noisy, and lights are on day and night. It looks solid and gleaming, and many people from all over the world pay it a visit. Its confusing atmosphere, which is caused by the many rooms with very different people, conversations, and ambiances, may worry some visitors. Not many other buildings accommodate such a varied collection of people who all wish to contribute to the writing of the history of food. Some dwellers consider food as their main (and sometimes only) concern, whereas others pose questions in which food plays a subordinate role.

The basement is divided into two large rooms. Agricultural historians occupy one room, but periodically imaginative socioeconomic historians visit this place to studying starvation, hunger, and social policy. The other basement room is occupied by ethnologists and archaeologists who study regional ways of cooking, products, and utensils in the past. They do not bother about historical problems, concepts, or literature, just as the historians in the other room do not care about ethnology or anthropology. There is no door between the two rooms, but each basement room



has its own staircase leading to the ground floor. The stairs from the agricultural basement lead to a big room that used to be filled with social historians; a pallid picture of Fernand Braudel is still on the wall. Now and then, an agricultural historian climbs up. He or she may meet with sociocultural historians, geographers, sociologists, anthropologists, economists, philosophers, and even a psychologist, who all apply historical concepts, insights, sources, and methods. This room has many doors and windows that used to be wide open (some of them still are, but others have been closed, like the orthodox Marxist one). The ethnologists' basement has almost emptied out because most climbed the stairs to another large room that is filled with sociologists, anthropologists, and art historians from all over the world who study symbols, icons, objects, and communication related to food in the past and present (here is a recent picture of the venerable Claude Lévi-Strauss). There is a big, open door between this room and the social historians' room, and some social historians feel at ease in both rooms, adopting the theories, concepts, and findings of ethnology or anthropology. Other socioeconomic historians, however, cannot imagine ever entering the ethnologists' room, although they glance at what is going on in it.

Two smaller rooms on the ground floor were added not that long ago, and here is where youngsters particularly love to reside: poststructuralist historians in the one and poststructuralist ethnologists in the other room study representation, significance, exchange, and assimilation of taste and cuisine in past and present. The door between them has been removed, and people circulate easily between these rooms. Some traditional social historians, ethnologists, sociologists, or art historians do stop over in both rooms, although they might feel very uncomfortable. These rooms are in direct contact with a room on the second floor where literary and communication scientists study the role of food in novels and films. The second floor also has a small room where natural scientists have dwelled for very long without having any contact with the other rooms; they study the history of nutrition, nutritionists, and food in relation to health. Recently, more and more people from the ground floor visit this small room, which might turn out to be far too small according to the growing interest in sociocultural matters of health, food quality, and safety. Finally, there is a tiny but cheerful room with journalists, artists, chefs, and amateurs without professional training who "do" food history without having much contact with the other people in the house. They love to publish nice coffee-table books.

All in all, a great variety of people live in this house. Some stay a short while and visit several rooms, perhaps coming back after a while, but others occupy a room for a very long time without ever leaving it. How should the rooms in this house be used? It would be wrong to run through every room and rapidly sniff its atmosphere. Also, it would be limiting to hang around in just one room. Either would lead to impressionistic and unconnected history writing. It would be far better to have a clear set of questions that are embedded in historical traditions and debates: This requires the usage of several rooms and the effort to integrate the other's wisdom in one's own research without, however, losing the basis of one's discipline. This

explicitly implies that “doing” food history supposes the mastering of a discipline’s approaches, methods, questionings, and traditions (be this history, ethnology, sociology, or any other). Furthermore, the dwellers and visitors in this house should make clear what the house is all about, convincing colleagues who live in other, sometimes remote houses to pay them a visit.

Food (culinary/gastronomic/taste) history has obtained great success in the past decade, and a growing number of “established” historians have turned to food history. Does this endeavor have an actual impact on general history, sociology, anthropology, or any other discipline? Should its impact increase? Despite ongoing specialization, I would plead to hang on to an interdisciplinary scope, for this is a guarantee of innovation and progress. This chapter deals with Europe. There are common traits between European food historiography and that in other regions, but to what extent? Which are the differences and similarities? Are there many contacts? This chapter deals with Europe, but which Europe? I focused on English, French, German, and some Italian and Spanish works, and I read journals with papers in English on countries with languages unknown to me. No doubt, I missed a lot of developments in northern, central, and eastern Europe. Finally, I did consider the relevance of food history for general history, but I did not consider the relevance of food history for sociology, anthropology, or other disciplines. This, however, is another chapter to be written.<sup>73</sup>

## Notes

Many thanks to Priscilla Ferguson, Darra Goldstein, Merry White, and especially Kyri Claflin, for talks, thoughts, and comments.

1. Scholliers, 2007.
2. This section is about European history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but similarities with preindustrial Europe are manifold; see Meyzie, 2010, 7–16, and Kyri Claflin’s chapter in this book.
3. With regard to international influence, see, e.g., for Germany, Teuteberg, 2008, 26–29.
4. Teuteberg, 2008, 33–34.
5. Scholliers, 2007, 451.
6. Flandrin, 1999b, 19 and 22.
7. Wiegelmann, 1967 (reprinted 2006, including a postscript with comments and a comprehensive updated bibliography).
8. See Aron, 1976, the second edition of the original French. Subsequent editions appeared in 1989 and 1992. Aron wrote a contribution for the 1975 *Annales* collection, exploring food fraud in the nineteenth century, with no attention to cultural elements, though.
9. Poulain, 2002, 202.

10. Flandrin and Montanari, 1996b, 13.
11. Mintz, 1987; Goody, 1989.
12. Teuteberg, 2008, 32. H.-J. Teuteberg sees G. Wiegelmann as a *Türöffner* (i.e., a “door opener”) for food ethnohistory.
13. Two pertinent articles: Flandrin, 1981, and Flandrin and Hyman, 1986.
14. Flandrin, 1999b, 19–22.
15. E.g., his extensive review of Goody and Mennell in Flandrin, 1987.
16. Flandrin and Montanari, 1996 (translated into Italian [1997], English [1999], and Spanish [2004]).
17. E.g., Ferguson (2005, 692) wrote that the “publication is a convenient benchmark for the coming-of-age of scholarly inquiry about food” and a “guiding book.”
18. E. Spary, e.g., points at it as one of the recent books that “contribute to an increasingly rich cultural history of cuisine, tastes and recipes which stands independently of anthropology” (Spary, 2005, 769).
19. D. Gabaccia sees primarily a Eurocentric and Mediterranean bias, individual (short) essays, and myth deconstruction, but no “historical introduction to world foodways” (Gabaccia, 2001, 987).
20. The authors’ geographical origins are as follows: France: 19; Italy: 15; Germany, the United States, and Spain: 2 each; the United Kingdom, Austria, Canada, and Switzerland: 1 each. The nonhistorians are the sociologist C. Fischler and geographers Y. Péhaut and J.-R. Pitte.
21. Lévi-Strauss is acknowledged via the words “le ton a été donné par C. Lévi-Strauss” (p. 13).
22. Hémardinquer, Stouff, Bernard, Boehler, Aron, Dumon, and Le Roy Ladurie are mentioned.
23. The latter is shown by de Vries, 2008 (“Food” appears in forty-six places in the book).
24. Kirkby, Luckins, and Santich, 2007, 6.
25. Ferguson, 2005, 700; Super, 2002, 175; Atkins, 2010, 4.
26. Ferguson, 2005, 699; Spary, 2005, 771; Super, 2002, 175.
27. Freidberg, 2010.
28. Montanari, 2003, 1 and 16.
29. Miller and Deutsch, 2009, 79–80 and 88.
30. P. Atkins’s (2010, 4) nine dimensions are an alternative: food systems, diets, feasting and fasting, health, cooking, catering, technology, politics, and symbols. Another alternative is J. Pilcher’s five themes: diffusion of food, tension between agriculture and pastoralism, class, identities, and the state (Pilcher, 2006a).
31. E.g., Albala, 2007b; Kaplan, 2008; Portincasa, 2008; Horowitz, 2006; Reader, 2009; Krieger, 2009; Atkins, 2010; Gentilcore, 2010; Rittersma, 2010.
32. Stocks, 2008. An immeasurable number of cookbooks exist that deal with traditional, authentic, genuine, historical, or grandma’s recipes, ingredients, and

- cooking. Moreover, this interest leads to public-history events where old foodways are tested.
33. Sarasúa, Scholliers, and Van Molle, 2005; Bieleman, Buyst, and Segers, 2009; Belasco and Horowitz, 2009. An example of studies that deal with one food item: Godley and Williams, 2009.
  34. Schroter, 2008; Barker, 2009; Alexandre et al., 2010, Teughels, 2010; Van den Eeckhout and Scholliers, 2011.
  35. This approach is enthusiastically welcomed by “world historians,” e.g., Y. Chen, 2010.
  36. E.g., Gately, 2008.
  37. E.g., Civitello, 2004; Rowley, 2006; Freedman, 2007; Pilcher, 2006a; Standage, 2009. With regard to food in one country, see, e.g., Rambourg, 2005.
  38. E.g., Allen, Albala, and Nestle, 2007; Albala, 2011; Parasecoli and Scholliers, 2011.
  39. E.g., Rotherham, 2009.
  40. Civitello, 2004, xi.
  41. E.g., Gélinet, 2008; this fluently written book jumps from one salient chapter (“Le suicide de Vatel”) to another staggering theme (“La fabuleuse histoire du champagne”); hardly any notes or bibliographic references are given.
  42. See Ferguson’s (2005, 700) plea for the study of *movements* between times, places, people, and cultures, i.e., between markets, menus, and meals.
  43. Scholliers and Grieco, 2009, with contributions by P. Atkins, D. Genticore, J. Contreras, M. Galli, J.-P. Williot, S. Zubaida, A. Kershen, and A. Crosby.
  44. Nützenadel and Trentmann, 2008, 2. Noteworthy in terms of an interdisciplinary approach: the first footnotes of the Introduction refer to Lévi-Strauss and Goody (but both names do not reappear in the volume).
  45. The term “great divergence” was coined by Pommeranz, 2000, and is widely used with regard to unequal social and, primarily, economic development between Europe and Asia (especially China and India).
  46. Fernández-Armesto, 2008, 460.
  47. Hache-Bissette and Saillard, 2007; Weinreb, 2011.
  48. Wilson’s book shows the social researchers’ interest in past foodways: it brings together sociologists, anthropologists, literary scientists, and historians.
  49. Tyrrell, Hill, and Kirkby, 2007; Franc, 2006; Warde, 2009; Montanari, 2010.
  50. Cwiertka, 2005; Beyers, 2008; Panayi, 2008; Buettner, 2008; Amenda, 2009.
  51. Duru, 2005.
  52. Fogel, 2004.
  53. Vernon, 2007.
  54. Oddy, 2008.
  55. Vernon, 2008.
  56. Del Arco Blanco, 2010.
  57. Brejon de Lavergnée, 2007; Lhuissier, 2007; Maixé-Altès, 2009; Gurney, 2009.

58. Buccheim, 2010; Mouré, 2010; K. Hunt, 2010.
59. Trentmann and Flemming, 2006; Linne, 2010; Futselaar, 2010.
60. Hyltsoft, 2007; Matalas, 2006; De Vooght, 2011.
61. Fenton, 2000.
62. Gratzler, 2005; Bernabeu-Mestre and Barona-Vilar, 2008; Steere-Williams, 2010; Van den Eeckhout and Scholliers, 2011; Geyzen, 2011; Spiekermann, 2011.
63. See also Stanziani, 2007.
64. Prestwich, 2007; Simmons, 2007.
65. Audoin-Rouzeau and Sabban, 2007; Oddy, Atkins, and Amilien, 2009; Grieco and Scholliers, 2008.
66. Moffat and Prowse, 2010.
67. Waddington, 2006; Wilson, 2008; Barona, 2008; the section “Food Regulation” in Atkins, Lummel, and Oddy, 2007, 77–128 (including chapters by V. Hierholzer, D. Oddy, P. Scholliers, and A. Stanziani); Baumann, 2008; Orland, 2010.
68. Daly and Forman, 2008; Gymnich, Lennartz, and Scheunemann, 2010.
69. Young Lee, 2005 (with contributions on Europe by D. Brantz, K. Claffin, I. McLachlan, C. Otter, and P. Young Lee); Williot, 2006; Januarius, 2008; Kennally and Lebel, 2009; Mutch, 2010.
70. Respectively, Drouard, 2007 (on France); Dennis, 2008 (with a long-term view); Driver, 2009 (on Canada); Lavandier et al. 2005 (on French presidential receptions); Söderlind, 2010 (on the Nobel Prize banquets; see also [http://nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/award\\_ceremonies/banquet/menus/](http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/award_ceremonies/banquet/menus/)).
71. The series *Food Culture around the World* (general editor: Ken Albala) may be seen as attempting this integrated survey (with regard to Europe, this series contains volumes on the Mediterranean, Scandinavia, Belgium, Germany, France, Spain, Great Britain, and Italy).
72. Super, 2002, 175. See, too, Grignon, 2007, 6–7.
73. Food history is only moderately present in, e.g., Germov and Williams, 2008 (sociology) and Counihan and Van Esterik, 1997 (anthropology).

## Author Query

AuQ1: Regarding the phrase “and that hunger is not the sole consequence of the objectively measurable lack of food,” I believe my earlier query was not clear enough. As currently written, this phrase states: “the objectively measurable lack of food has multiple consequences, one of those being hunger.” Per the context and your explanation in your query reply, that is not what you mean.

Rephrasing this as “and that hunger is not solely the consequence of the objectively measurable lack of food” would change the meaning to: “hunger has multiple causes, only one of which is the objectively measurable lack of food.” No change will be made unless you approve, however.

There are many types of housing: detached houses, semi-detached houses, terraced houses and flats. Some of the detached houses are cottages and bungalows. A detached house can take on any form or style. A row of identical looking houses share side walls. In the past, terrace housing used to be only associated with the working class for this type of housing was cheap, small and had very little privacy. As time went by, terrace housing became known as townhouses which were more associated with the rich. A flat or an apartment is a part of a larger building. It has all modern conveniences: central heating, gas, electricity, cold and hot running water, a lift and a chute to carry rubbish down. There are three rooms, a kitchen, a bathroom and a hall in our flat. Medieval Europe was miserable and bloody, but also a period of great innovation. Read on to explore the inventions that shaped Europe. What are some of the most important inventions from the Middle Age? Far from being a period of little to no technological progress, the Middle Ages had its fair share of new inventions, like any other period of history. These 18 medieval inventions and how they made it to Europe are prime examples. But the real importance of coffee in Europe was not the bitter brew, but the coffee houses that sprang up to serve it. These quickly became centers of social activity and communication, and were some of the only places where different classes of people could mix freely. Request PDF | On Jul 1, 2006, John M. Hunt and others published *The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe* | Find, read and cite all the research you need on ResearchGate. To read the full-text of this research, you can request a copy directly from the authors. Request full-text. Download citation. In his study, Paul Zucker (ZUCKER 1959) has distinguished several principal types of town squares in the past. ARCHITECTURE, ARCHAEOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY CITY PLANNING Reformation, regeneration and revitalisation - PROCEEDINGS. Book.