EUROPEAN FOOD ISSUES

Daniëlle De Vooght

The King Invites

Performing Power at a Courtly Dining Table

I. The *raison d'être* of Monarchies in the Western World after 1789

In 1792, Thomas Paine[1] sneered at the sheer existence of monarchy as a system of government:

> We must shut our eyes against reason, we must basely degrade our understanding, not to see the folly of what is called monarchy. Nature is orderly in all her works; but this is a mode of government that counteracts nature. It turns the progress of the human faculties upside down. It subjects age to be governed by children, and wisdom by folly.[2]

Paine was a steadfast advocate of the *res publica*, a form of government with, ideally, the public good as its sole purpose. He believed that the republic would lead to human freedom and that the most natural manner to obtain this freedom was through (full) democratic representation. It is from this conviction, an elaboration of the ideas developed during the Enlightenment by Voltaire and Rousseau, that his support for the American Revolution emanated; since the American government, which integrated the idea of representation in the notion of democracy, was rooted in this system, it was the most easily understandable form of government and the most desirable one in practice.[3] In his pamphlet *Common Sense*, Paine passionately defended the independence of the British American colonies, hereby calling King George III "the Royal Brute of Great Britain."[4] Although this appellation for the king left little to the imagination, Paine strongly denied supporting the eighteenth-century revolutions out of a displeasure with the monarchs personally, especially when discussing the revolution in France. Consequently, in

---

[1] Thomas Paine was an English pamphleteer and intellectual. He played a part in both the American and French Revolution and he was elected to the French National Convention. However, he had to flee France in 1802, because he opposed the execution of Louis XVI, among other things. He resided in the American Republic until his death in 1809.

[2] Paine, T. (1937). *Rights of Man: Being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution (Edited by H.B. Bonner)*. C.A. Watts & Co. Limited, London, p. 156.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154.

[4] Paine, T. (2007). *Common Sense (First Published in 1776)*. ForgottenBooks.org, s.l., p. 38.

his *Rights of Man*, he opposed Edmund Burke's[5] proposition that the rebellion of the French was more furious, outraged and insulting than had ever been demonstrated before, given that this monarch was mild and lawful in contrast with several tyrannic and even illegal rulers from the past.[6] According to Paine, the nation did not stand up to Louis XVI personally. However, it defied the government's despotic propositions and since these had become too deeply rooted in the nation's institutions, they could only be removed by nothing less than a complete and universal revolution.[7] In Burke's opinion though, living in a society without the "original establishment" – i.e. a ruling hereditary aristocracy or monarchy and a strong Church – irrevocably ended up in mayhem, since this meant that morality and social tradition were no longer preserved by their innate guardian.[8] Paine, contrastingly, compared monarchy to a seemingly wonderful secret that was behind a curtain but, when revealed, would only induce laughter. Hence his plea for the representative mode of government that put all its flaws and qualities on public display, was orderly and was, consequently, clearly the most obvious approach to leadership.[9]

In the introduction to the 1937 edition of *Rights of Man*, the English historian and political theorist George D.H. Cole stated that the power of Paine's words lay in their ability to stimulate and inspire the "common people". By writing *Rights of Man*, Paine became the most read and most beloved author while being, at the same time, the most hated political writer in Great Britain. Moreover, his American writings played a significant role in the colonists' revolt;[10] approximately 100,000 copies of *Common Sense* were distributed in the American British colonies in a period of three weeks.

How then, with the publication of Paine's and other writers' republican treatises,[11] and bearing in mind the many republican governmental

---

[5] Edmund Burke was a statesman and philosopher who served in the British House of Commons. He supported the American Revolution, but strongly opposed the French Revolution.

[6] Burke, E. (1986). *Reflections on the Revolution in France and on the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London Relative to that Event (Edited with an Introduction by Conor Cruise O'Brien)*. Penguin Books, London, p. 126.

[7] Paine. *Rights of Man*, p. 9.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. vi.; Burke. *Reflections on the Revolution*, pp. 123-124.

[9] Paine. *Rights of Man*, pp. 155-156.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. v-vi.

[11] Williams, R. (1997). *The Contentious Crown. Public Discussion of the British Monarchy in the Reign of Queen Victoria.* Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, p. 2.

Richard Williams, in arguing why he chose to examine public discourse in order to find out how the people felt about the monarchic institution, defined the importance

forms of great nations, can the continuance of monarchy as a means of government in the nineteenth century be explained?[12]

Indeed, the nineteenth century did not bring forth the extinction of monarchy by republicanism or other antagonistic forces. In his account of the public opinion on the reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901), Richard Williams writes: "It is true that one has only to read the despairing editorials of and letters to George Standring's newspaper, the *Republican* in the late 1870s and 1880s, lamenting the 'sickly "loyalty" of the age' to see that the critics of the monarchy had been overwhelmed by its supporters […]."[13] However, monarchy was subjected to substantial changes. The absolute concept of the ruler's superiority to everyone and everything on earth did not prevail. While the absolute ruler (of which Louis XIV in France is probably the most famous example) most likely had its roots in classical antiquity[14] and thus had been more or less accepted for several centuries, nineteenth-century royals were considered romantic, even magical, but at the same time approachable and human.[15] Edmund Burke, the addressee of Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man*, already drew attention to this dichotomy between ordinary and extraordinary as far as the construction of the monarchic image was

---

of these sources as follows: "The private diaries and letters of important people were read by only one or two contemporaries, even if the writer had an eye on posterity, but newspaper articles, speeches and pamphlets were read and intended to be read by large numbers of people – and therefore it is these sources that are so significant in reconstructing how those in the informed, literary and political society presented the monarchy to the sections of the public whose opinion they believed they reflected and moulded."

[12] Bogdanor, V. (1995). *The Monarchy and the Constitution.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 1-2. "Until the First World War, monarchy was by far the prevalent form of government. Indeed, in 1914 there were only three republican governments in Europe – France, Portugal (whose sovereign had been deposed as recently as 1910), and Switzerland."

De Vooght, D. (2008). Performing Power at the Dining Table. Dinner Guests of the Belgian Kings in the Nineteenth Century. In: *The Dining Nobility. From the Burgundian Dukes to the Belgian Royalty* (Eds Janssens, P. & Zeischka, S.). VUBPress, Brussel, p. 104.

[13] Williams. *The Contentious Crown*, p. 5.

[14] Kantorowicz, E.H. (1997). *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 497-499.

Kantorowicz refers to classical writers whose ideas were well-known and used by theorists defending absolutism throughout the ages. For example: "In a fragment bearing the name of Ecphantus, the author explains that the king […] as a king […] is the copy of the 'supreme Artificer' who, when fashioning the king used himself as an archetype."

[15] De Vooght. Performing Power at the Dining Table, p. 104; van Osta, J. (1998). *Het theater van de staat. Oranje, Windsor en de moderne monarchie.* Wereldbibliotheek, Amsterdam, pp. 14-15.

concerned.[16] As Judith Williamson summarized it perfectly, royalty remained significant and popular due to the fact that they were similar to the people, but at the same time were very much not like their nation's citizens.[17]

According to Maria Grever, the constitutional kings and queens could indeed secure a somewhat assured – notable even – status within national life of the nineteenth century, due to this imaginative attraction.[18] Grever did point out that before settling on a constitutional monarchy as a governmental form, the crown, administration and representative bodies in several nations had (secretly or publicly) battled for their existence and consequently for the legitimation of their power. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the affluent – and ever more prominent – part of the population tolerated the continuation of the monarchy, since it did not impede its aspirations. However, by mid-nineteenth century and especially since the final quarter of the century, the political scene consisted of progressively more and larger sections of the citizenry. Monarchy had to be redefined since a policy of tolerance by the majority of the ruling classes was no longer a given.

> Independently, political thinkers […] conceived of a mediating role for the monarchy: the king, by promoting a policy of reform, would collaborate to reduce social tensions and, in doing so, would be instrumental in holding the nation together. It was up to the politicians to make room for the monarchy's new function and to adapt the king to his new role.[19]

European monarchs relatively quickly realized that if they aspired to hold their position as king or queen they needed to embrace their status as a symbol of continuousness, harmony and national identity. For example, Leopold I, the first king of the Belgians (1831-1865) and one of the *new* monarchs of the nineteenth century, was very aware of the shifts that occurred within the societal pattern in the aftermath of the French Revolution. He realized that difficult times lay ahead for European kings and queens and he even warned Britain's future Queen Victoria, his niece, about "the importance of being loved, and therefore

---

[16] Burke. *Reflections on the Revolution*, p. 23.

[17] Williamson, J. (1986). *Consuming Passions. The Dynamics of Popular Culture.* Marion Boyars, London & New York, p. 75.

[18] Grever, M. (2006). Staging Modern Monarchs. Royalty at the World Exhibitions of 1851 and 1867. In: *Mystifying the Monarch. Studies on Discourse, Power, and History* (Eds Deploige, J. & Deneckere, G.). Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, p. 161.

[19] van Osta, J. (2006). The Emperor's New Clothes. The Reappearance of the Performing Monarchy in Europe, c. 1870-1914. In: *Mystifying the Monarch*, p. 182.

known, by the country's people."[20] During her reign, Victoria succeeded very well in her task to resemble and, consequently, appeal to, the bourgeois wife, as well as the mother and the widow in a later stage of her life, making use of recognizable forms of representation, as well as of the existence of a certain predestination within Victorian culture.[21] Accordingly, by the mid-nineteenth century – with the emergence of mass print and a more visual culture[22] – and unmistakably by the turn of the nineteenth century, new monarchical arrangements occurred all over Europe that, first, increasingly presented monarchs as public figures and, second, augmented the humanizing events – such as births, marriages and funerals – within royal families and converted these happenings into occasions that concerned the nation as a whole; this, in turn, triggered the links between monarch and people.[23]

According to William Kuhn, several notable persons[24] influenced public perception and the organization of royal ceremonies evolved in the course of the nineteenth century, but especially the ideas of Walter Bagehot[25] were often quoted, even canonized:

> No one has been of greater consequence for the modern British monarchy than Walter Bagehot. He is the one authority that both defenders and critics

---

[20] De Vooght. Performing Power at the Dining Table, p. 106; van Osta. *Het theater van de staat*, p. 14.

"Wilde Victoria het straks uithouden op de wankele Britse troon, dan kon Leopold haar maar één goede raad geven: zij moest ervoor zorgen dat zij geliefd zou zijn bij haar onderdanen – haar beide voorgangers waren op dat punt nogal tekortgeschoten. En omdat onbekend nu eenmaal onbemind maakt, was het zaak, zo voegde hij eraan toe, dat zij zich nu al regelmatig onder de mensen zou begeven."

"If Victoria wanted to successfully remain on the unstable British throne, Leopold could offer but one piece of good advice: she needed to be loved with her subjects – something both her predecessors had not been able to do. Since to be unknown equals to be unloved, she would have to, Leopold added, frequently circulate among her citizens" [translation by the author].

A large selection of Queen Victoria's correspondence can be found on the following webpage: http://www.gutenberg.org/catalog/world/readfile?fk_files=275204.

[21] Homans, M. (1998). *Royal Representations. Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837-1876.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, p. xxi.

[22] Grever. Staging Modern Monarchs, p. 162; Plunkett, J. (2003). *Queen Victoria. First Media Monarch.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, p. 1.

"In conjunction with the far-reaching social changes of the century, a burgeoning publishing industry helped to reinvent the position of the monarchy in national life."

[23] van Osta. The Emperor's New Clothes, p. 183.

[24] Kuhn, W.M. (1996). *Democratic Royalism. The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914.* Palgrave, Houndmills, p. 12. He mentions five persons: Bagehot, Gladstone, Brett, Davidson and Fitzalan-Howard.

[25] Walter Bagehot was a nineteenth-century essayist and journalist. He was editor of *The Economist* for seventeen years, until his death in 1877.

of the Crown make it their business to know. Further, Bagehot has now served as an authoritative source on the monarchy for more than a hundred years.[26]

Indeed, essayist and journalist Walter Bagehot had anticipated the inevitability of the reshaping of monarchy. His *The English Constitution*, written in 1867, brought forth several central notions for grasping the concept of the (British) constitutional monarchy. As opposed to a monarchy, that is strictly speaking headed by one hereditary absolute sovereign, a constitutional monarchy is ruled by a crowned head according to the constitution.[27] In all likelihood, it was a French writer, Dupré, who coined the term *la monarchie constitutionelle* (constitutional monarchy).[28] Over the course of the nineteenth century, this term became the label of states lead by a crowned head who reigned but did not rule.[29]

Bagehot distinguished between two parts in the constitution. The *dignified* parts of the constitution, which were necessary for exciting and protecting the population's appreciation and admiration, while the *efficient* parts ensured that the constitution actually worked and ruled.[30] In particular, he differentiated between monarchy and the House of Lords on the one hand, and the House of Commons and the cabinet on the other.[31] According to Bagehot, the monarch's essential task was to lead a private life publicly and, as a result, become the human representation of continuity and consensus that is honored by a nation as a whole.[32] Since no non-descript legislator could expect to receive the same devotion from the masses, the sovereign, or even better the royal family, should be devoted to the constitution's *ceremonial* aspects:[33]

> The elements which excite the most easy reverence will be the *theatrical* elements – those which appeal to the senses, which claim to be embodiments of the greatest human ideas, which boast in some cases of far more than human origin. That which is mystic in its claims; that which is occult in its mode of action; that which is brilliant to the eye; that which is seen vividly for a moment, and then is seen no more; that which is hidden and unhid-

---

[26] Kuhn. *Democratic Royalism*, p. 15.

[27] Bogdanor. *The Monarchy and the Constitution*, p. 1.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Bagehot, W. (1968). *The English Constitution (with an Introduction by the First Earl of Balfour)*. Oxford University Press, London, p. 4.

[31] The British parliament consists of the *upper* House of Lords, to which all members are appointed, and the *lower* House of Commons, to which all members are elected.

[32] van Osta. The Emperor's New Clothes, p. 182.

[33] Billig, M. (1992). *Talking of the Royal Family*. Routledge, London & New York, p. 3; De Vooght. Performing Power at the Dining Table, p. 106.

den; that which is specious, and yet interesting, palpable in its seeming, and yet professing to be more than palpable in its results; this, howsoever its form may change, or however we may define it or describe it, is the sort of thing – the only sort – which yet comes home to the mass of men.[34]

Although Bagehot formulated his ideas as a response to a changing monarchical environment in the nineteenth century, it should be mentioned that similar notions about the ceremonial aspects of court life were postulated in the ancien régime. There was, however, an important difference; while ceremony and splendor created a bond between the sovereign and the people in the nineteenth century, they had resulted in leadership through distance in earlier centuries.[35]

Bagehot's distinction between the efficient and the dignified parts of the constitution, between politics and ceremony, was easily digestible.[36] Furthermore, it was theoretically elaborated by David Cannadine[37] in his article about the British monarchy and the invention of tradition, an article that was called the most authoritative article on monarchical history since the 1960s by Henk te Velde.[38] In his contribution to Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger's volume on the invention of tradition – in which Hobsbawm himself described a pattern of traditions and continuity that was devised as a stabilizing response to new and rapidly emerging situations in the nineteenth century[39] – David Cannadine focused on the British royal ceremonial from the 1820s to the 1970s and wished to understand this ceremonial by placing it firmly in its historical context. He concluded that, while the monarchy and several of the adjoining ceremonies were indeed antique, one should realize that the continuity with this part of the past, which some of the invented traditions wished to attest to, was, for the larger part, illusionary.[40] Although Cannadine's hypothesis and argumentation are definitely noteworthy, what is interesting here is the great significance ceremonial and ritual

---

[34] Bagehot. *The English Constitution*, p. 7.

[35] Olden-Jorgensen, S. (2002). State Ceremonial, Court Culture and Political Power in Early Modern Denmark, 1536-1746. In: *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 27, p. 67 and p. 74.

[36] De Vooght. Performing Power at the Dining Table, p. 106.

[37] Cannadine, D. (1984). The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820-1977. In: *The Invention of Tradition* (Eds Hobsbawm, E.J. & Ranger, T.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 101-164.

[38] te Velde, H. (2006). Cannadine, Twenty Years on. Monarchy and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain and the Netherlands. In: *Mystifying the Monarch*, p. 193.

[39] Hobsbawm, E.J. (1984). Introduction: Inventing Traditions. In: *The Invention of Tradition*, pp. 1-14.

[40] Cannadine. The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual, p. 161.

were allocated. Because of this interest in the symbolic side of the monarchy, it has been argued that Cannadine is a supporter of Bagehot.[41] However, as opposed to Bagehot (who, to be clear, did not think of royal ceremonial as an invented tradition),[42] Cannadine was mostly concerned with the ceremonial – with the dignified parts of the powers-that-be. Cannadine's essay on invented traditions was indeed very important, because it laid the foundations for a new form of monarchical history writing, which takes into account the cultural aspect of the establishment.[43] Moreover, it sped up the alteration of the course of political history, which was being redirected concurrently.[44] Conse-quently, both social and political historians could now investigate the cultural aspects of monarchy and even of the political playing field as a whole. This new cultural approach of monarchy combined the findings of political historians, social historians, as well as sociologists and anthropologists; this was another of the merits of Cannadine's essay. Even though it was controversial and has been criticized by both the monarchy's supporters and detractors, it did bring forth a meeting place for different persuasions.[45] In 1987, Cannadine himself provided for this common ground, by co-editing a volume of essays on the reciprocal relationship between "power and pomp" in the past,[46] explaining that "kings may no longer rule by divine right; but the divine rites of kings continue to beguile and to enchant – and to require explanation and analysis. And if this is so for the present, then how much more true is it of the past?"[47] From this volume of essays, the introduction to it and its bibliography, it becomes clear that several scholars took the leap and produced a common frame of concepts and theories that were applicable to the study of political history in its most extensive definition.[48]

According to Richard Williams, it did not stop with several scholars gaining an interest in ritual and ceremonial in the aftermath of Canna-dine's publications. In his discussion of the public opinion on the reign of Queen Victoria, Williams devoted a chapter on the public attitudes towards royal ceremonial that began: "Of all the themes treated in this

---

[41] te Velde. Cannadine, Twenty Years on, p. 196.

[42] Kuhn. *Democratic Royalism*, p. 13.

[43] te Velde. Cannadine, Twenty Years on, p. 193.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Cannadine, D. & Price, S. (Eds) (1987). *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[47] Cannadine, D. (1987). Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings. In: *Rituals of Royalty*, p. 7.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

book, royal ceremonial has received the most prior attention from historians."[49] Apparently, historians had made up for lost time and the cultural aspects of the monarchy had become one of their main interests in only a decade. This is confirmed by Philip Long, who states that, often, the interest of both scholars and the public opinion is drawn to the ritual, formal and ceremonial dimensions of royalty, which are, mostly, extraordinary.[50]

While historians of all sorts discovered the assets of investigating the "invisible and the ephemeral", – i.e. of looking for what cannot necessarily be found in the archival records[51] – others regretted the almost utter absence of the efficient features in this cultural history of the monarchy. Why should an interest in the dignified parts of the constitution inevitably need to take the efficient parts out of the equation? As Henk te Velde argues, this distinction actually presumes that cultural elements did not transpire in "real" politics and that, consequently, the dignified and cultural components of the constitution should not be regarded as "real" politics.[52] He examined, therefore, the cultural and symbolic aspects of the British and Dutch parliament (the efficient parts), and concluded that this interest is definitely granted when studying the constitution and political culture in general.[53] However, here, the focus on the role and position of the monarchy remains primary. Although Cannadine concentrated on the symbolic characteristics of the monarchic institution, he too acknowledged the inevitable symbiosis of ceremonial and power as he made a plea for breaking down the fences between the study of power and the study of pomp.[54] As stated more boldly by David Kertzer: "To understand the political process, then, it is necessary to understand how the symbolic enters into politics, how

---

[49]   Williams. *The Contentious Crown*, p. 230. Other themes tackled by Williams are: the republic movement's opinion on monarchy, perceptions of political power and partisanship, monarchy, patriotism and nationalism, and reverence and sentimentality towards the monarchy.

[50]   Long, P. (2008). Introduction. In: *Royal Tourism. Excursions around Monarchy* (Eds Long, P. & Palmer, N.J.). Channel View Publications, Clevedon, Buffalo & Toronto, p. 1.

[51]   Cannadine. Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings, pp. 1-2.

[52]   te Velde. Cannadine, Twenty Years on, p. 196.

       This is confirmed by José Fontaine: "Face à ces divergences d'opinions à propos de la monarchie belge, je me demandais, en 1987, si l'existence même de ces divergences d'opinions à propos du roi ne nous renseignaient pas sur la nature de son véritable pouvoir, à la fois réel et irréel, effectif et ornemental." Fontaine, J. (1991). Duplicités structurales et déclin de la monarchie. In: *Les faces cachées de la monarchie belge*. Éd. L'Harmattan, Paris, pp. 7-28.

[53]   te Velde. Cannadine, Twenty Years on, p. 203.

[54]   Cannadine. Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings, p. 19.

political actors consciously and unconsciously manipulate symbols, and how this symbolic dimension relates to the material bases of political power."[55] According to Kertzer, it is by means of these "symbol systems" that people shape and explain the world surrounding them.[56]

This is precisely what Walter Bagehot (and other political thinkers of the time) aspired to achieve when defining the powers-that-be as composed of efficient parts on the one hand and dignified parts on the other. By combining the mystique of a fairy tale with approachability, the sovereign (and by extension the royal family) was to be the symbol of the nation, hence providing the government with the necessary support from the nation's citizens to actually rule the country. Although at the beginning of the nineteenth century most European monarchs were hostile of the ideas of nationalism, the last quarter of the century brought forth a strong allegiance between the monarchy and nationalistic politics. This bond was fortified by the "theatre of the state", ceremonial happenings that were to overwhelm a country's citizens and rectify the sovereign's dignified position within a nation.[57] However, as already mentioned, this rigid divide between efficient and dignified, between *politics* and *ceremony*, was doubted by several scholars. According to Frank Hardie, who examined the published letters of Queen Victoria in the 1960s, Bagehot and his contemporaries clearly failed in actually determining the queen's true political influence.[58] This is confirmed by Ilse Hayden, who posited that royal happenings were a ritual means to display the queen to her people, while her part in the administration had to remain concealed because the actions of the government were best kept a secret from the public eye.[59]

Perhaps the magnificent royal events, such as royal entrances, coronations and weddings, were indeed "invented" royal traditions. Nonetheless, the ceremonial made sure that the people of the nineteenth century identified with their sovereign and that the perennial moral order was defined.[60] That is why one should never neglect the relationship between pomp and power.[61] However, what about minor events? Ac-

---

[55] Kertzer, D.I. (1988). *Ritual, Politics, and Power.* Yale University Press, New Haven & London, pp. 2-3.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[57] van Osta. *Het theater van de staat*, pp. 18-19.

[58] Hardie, F. (1963). *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria, 1861-1901.* Frank Cass & Co Ltd, London, p. 24.

[59] Hayden, I. (1987). *Symbol and Privilege. The Ritual Context of British Royalty.* The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, p. 5.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[61] Cannadine. Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings, p. 19.

cording to Hayden, these acclaimed moderation, while the theme of class privilege predominated. Minor events featured social distance, while grand occasions masked this inequality by emphasizing heroic traditions and national identity, thereby commemorating the continuity with the past.[62] Gita Deneckere too, argued that, by focusing on once-in-a-life-time events such as weddings and funerals that can be regarded as sheer manifestations of the dignified aspects of royal power, Cannadine neglected minor events that bore both dignified and efficient characteristics of regal authority.[63] Following Walter Arnstein's example, who studied the opening and closing ceremony of the British Houses of Parliament, Deneckere investigated the speech from the throne in Belgium. This annual ritual comprised a political and cultural component and, consequently, exhibited both dignified and efficient features. She concluded that the speech from the throne disappeared during the reign of Albert (1909-1934), because the ritual, that should have advocated unity through ceremonial, became ever more politicized. "It appears [...] that, despite the ministerial responsibility, the monarch did exercise influence on the text of the address, and also tried to put his stamp on it."[64]

By analyzing this yearly recurring event in Belgium, Deneckere agreed with the idea that both the cultural and the "hardcore" political aspects of the monarchy are to be examined, since they are often intertwined. Moreover, she participated in the debate about the (declining) political influence of the monarchy in the nineteenth century. This book should be situated within the same historiographical context.

II. Court Food in History

Recently, Peter Scholliers examined review articles, book introductions and conference proceedings, while looking for new themes, approaches and theories within food research of the last twenty-five years.[65] He traced the interest in food from its appearance in economic history and ethnology – with sometimes a hint of anthropological influ-

---

[62] Hayden. *Symbol and Privilege*, pp. 6-7.

[63] Deneckere, G. (2006). The Impossible Neutrality of the Speech from the Throne. A Ritual Between National Unity and Political Dispute. Belgium, 1831-1918. In: *Mystifying the Monarch*, p. 205.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[65] Scholliers, P. (2007). Twenty-Five Years of Studying *un phénomène social total*. Food History Writing in Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. In: *Food, Culture & Society*, 10, p. 449.

ences – during the 1980s, to culture and language in the 1990s, and finally a multidiscipline approach towards the turn of the millennium.[66]

The first "scientific" food related investigations should, indeed, be situated in the social and economic sphere. Already in the late-eighteenth century, administrations on different levels ordered inquiries into the private disbursements of households. Not surprisingly, these investigations demonstrated that wealthier families spent more money on food, and that this was mostly attributable to the greater variety in their diets. In 1855 for example, the Belgian statistician Edouard Ducpétiaux documented – amongst other foodstuff – the per capita consumption of meat, which was considered an undisputed marker of affluence. His findings disclosed remarkable differences between the *rentier, grande aisance* (106kg of meat), the *boutiquier, avec petit commerce de mercerie* (65kg) and the *ouvrier maçon* (13.5kg), all living in Brussels in 1853.[67] By the turn of the century several studies had been published although "obviously, historical food research in Belgium during the 19th century was not a major area of investigation."[68] These studies, performed in various countries, focused mainly on working-class households. They all confirmed the relationship between the household income and both the quantity and quality of the food that was consumed. Based on these findings, the German statistician Ernst Engel (1821-1896) formulated a law, known as Engel's first law. This law stated that, with a given set of tastes and preferences, as income rises, the proportion of income spent on food declines, even if the actual spending on food increases. Engel's law was subsequently endorsed by other research and it was even proven viable through space and time, as well as within a particular society.[69]

While these nineteenth-century inquiries focused on working-class households, by the second quarter of the twentieth century (with the

---

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 461.

[67] Ducpétiaux, E. (1855). Budgets économiques des classes ouvrières en Belgique. In: *Bulletin de la Commission Centrale de Statistique*, VI, p. 415. This historiographical section was partly taken from: De Vooght, D. & Scholliers, P. (2011). Food and Power: Studying Food at (Modern) Courts. In: *Royal Taste. Food, Power and Status at the European Courts after 1789* (Ed. De Vooght, D.). Ashgate, Farnham, pp. 1-12.

[68] Scholliers, P. (1992). Historical Food Research in Belgium: Development, Problems and Results in the 19th and 20th Centuries. In: *European Food History. A Research Review* (Ed. Teuteberg, H.J.). Leicester University Press, Leicester, London & New York, p. 72.

[69] Stigler, G.J. (1954). The Early History of Empirical Studies of Consumer Behavior. In: *The Journal of Political Economy*, April, pp. 95-113.

On the relevance of household budgets: Pierenkemper, T. (1988). Das Rechnungsbuch der Hausfrau. In: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 14:1, pp. 38-63.

First World War bringing a vast number of publications about food scarcity and low-cost cooking),[70] and particularly by the 1950s, other social categories and other classifications (such as dwelling or age) were introduced. Although these changes generated doubts about the close relationship between food and income, they still gave substance to the importance of family income, regardless of family composition, age or dwelling place. What is more, these data demonstrated that making consumption *choices* was the prerogative of a small prosperous group, since "most people who have ever lived ate whatever they could get their hands on."[71] For the majority of the population this meant spending fifty percent or more of their household budget on food, consequently restricting their access to other goods and services.

In the 1960s, the standard of living of working-class households was no longer the sole point of concern for researchers with an interest in food. Another type of research emerged, surveying the way of life of the rich and famous and, consequently, displaying an utterly different world of luxury, conspicuous consumption and snobbery. In 1966, John Burnett, for example, dedicated two chapters of his book *Plenty and Want* to "the food of the rich" and "high living", although in his preface he stated that the book would focus more on the working-class diet than on the upper-class diet.[72] Indeed, this new research topic emerged on the research agenda in several European countries, but it was the 1975 special issue of the distinguished French journal *Annales. Économies. Sociétés. Civilisations* that accounted for its success. The section *Histoire de la consommation* discussed food and, more importantly, it acknowledged the significance of the nobility in this matter.[73]

In the following decades, food history was integrated into the standard of living-debate and food historians continued exploring schools, poor houses and towns, but they added affluent families and even courts to their list of research subjects. To use Bruno Laurioux's words: "La cour est un horizon inévitable pour l'histoire de l'alimentation."[74] Most of these studies explored food at the courts of ancient Roman and Greek rulers, at the castles of medieval kings or at the absolutist courts of the

---

[70]   Scholliers. Historical Food Research in Belgium, p. 72.

[71]   Albala, K. (2007). *The Banquet. Dining in the Great Courts of Late Renaissance Europe.* University of Illinois Press, Urbana & Chicago, p. 1.

[72]   Burnett, J. (1979). *Plenty and Want. A Social History of Diet in England from 1815 to the Present Day.* Scolar Press, London, p. 11.

[73]   Bennassar, B. & Goy, J. (1975). Contribution à l'histoire de la consommation alimentaire du XIVe au XIXe siècle. In: *Annales. Économies. Sociétés. Civilisations,* 30:2-3, pp. 402-430.

[74]   Laurioux, B. (2006). Alimentation de cour, alimentation à la cour au Moyen Âge: nouvelles orientations de recherche. In: *Food & History,* 4, p. 9.

ancien régime;[75] they examined powerful sovereigns, wealthy court life and the complex relationships between court and society. The ancient Roman feasts that evoke images of excess and decadence,[76] the Italian Renaissance courts of Ferrara, Urbino, Milan or Rome and Louis XIV's Versailles, are indeed great fodder for literature of many different natures and with different intentions.[77] As Ken Albala, for example, wrote about food in the late Renaissance, this cuisine was varied, it used staggeringly fresh and diverse ingredients that were carefully selected by cooks and banquet managers – new techniques, serving methods and modes of presentation were also examined and put to the test, in order to aggrandize the meal to a form of high art.[78] Michel Jeanneret took this even further, stating that the (Renaissance) banquet acted as a model that was employed by society to secure both its priorities and contradictions.[79]

The late-eighteenth century brought forth a radical and permanent change in the role and status of the monarchy and thus of courts (cf. *supra*).[80] Absolute rulers disappeared in nineteenth-century Europe,

---

[75] Although these courts too, were not immediately accepted as a research subject: "Such a diversity of functions, it might be thought, would have guaranteed it a measure of prominence in the historiography of early modern Europe. Yet, except for its artistic dimension, the study of the pre-French Revolution court has been, until recently, virtually an academic taboo." Adamson, J. (1999). Introduction. The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court, 1500-1700. In: *The Princely Courts of Europe. Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime, 1500-1750* (Ed. Adamson, J.). Sterling Publishing Co, New York, p. 9.

[76] Rawson, B. (2007). Banquets in Ancient Rome: Participation, Presentation and Perception. In: *Dining on Turtles. Food Feasts and Drinking in History* (Eds Kirkby, D. & Luckins, T.). Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, p. 15.

[77] For example: Albala. *The Banquet*; Bhote, T. (2004). *Medieval Feasts and Banquets. Food, Drink, and Celebration in the Middle Ages.* The Rosen Publishing Group, New York; Jousselin, R. (1998). *Au couvert du Roi.* Editions Christian, Paris; Klingensmith, S.J. (1993). *The Utility of Splendor. Ceremony, Social Life, and Architecture at the Court of Bavaria, 1600-1800* (Edited for publication by Ch. Otto and M. Ashton). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London; Ottomeyer, H. & Völkel, M. (Eds) (2002). *Die Öffentliche Tafel. Tafelzeremoniell in Europa 1300-1900.* Edition Minerva, Wolfratshausen. (A publication that, it should be noted, also takes the nineteenth century into account); Strong, R. (1973). *Splendor at Court. Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power.* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

[78] Albala. *The Banquet*, p. viii.

[79] Jeanneret, M. (1991). *A Feast of Words. Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance.* Polity Press, Cambridge, p. 3.

[80] Barclay, D.E. (1992). Ritual, Ceremonial, and the "Invention" of a Monarchical Tradition in Nineteenth-Century Prussia. In: *European Monarchy. Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times* (Eds Duchhardt, H., Jackson, R.A. & Sturdy, D.). Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, p. 207.

while those monarchs that survived continued their reign within the premises of a constitutional monarchy. Nonetheless, new "courts" emerged as *loci* of power. One should only consider the presidential houses of France and the United States or international organizations like the European Union. There too, food was (and is) an important issue, as confirmed by Marie Lavandier, who suggests that offering a meal fortifies a feeling of peace and friendship and has been used as a diplomatic tool for centuries.[81]

At the same time, however, new powerful groups, the so-called bourgeoisie, constructed a new cultural hegemony, with their own codes and practices, one of these being the fancy restaurant: the new meeting place of the rich and famous and a definite point of interest for food historians of the second part of the twentieth century.

Hence, the historian's interest for (monarchical) courts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and more specifically for food at these courts, seems to have vanished, together with the absolutist rulers in Western Europe. To use Philip Mansel's words in *The Court of France, 1789-1830*: "The court was one of the largest institutions in France […] yet the court remains an enigma."[82] Assuming nineteenth-century courts did preserve a certain amount of influence if not power even, what then was the role of food at these courts and how did this food compare to so-called elite-food in the nineteenth century?

III. This Book

The aforementioned questions about the role of the nineteenth-century monarchy, as well as about the role of food within these courts, remain virtually unanswered by academic researchers.[83] Nonetheless, "rulership and conceptions of rulership [are] constantly borrowed from

---

"It is neither surprising nor coincidental that most studies of monarchical ritual and ceremonial in Europe have so far focused almost exclusively on the Middle Ages and the early modern period. Many reasons can be adduced to explain this situation, but the most obvious is probably the most convincing: the widespread assumption that, after the French Revolution, monarchical forms of rulership had become anachronistic, while monarchs themselves had been placed on the defensive, both politically and culturally."

[81] Lavandier, M. *et al.* (2005). *La table à l'Élysée. Réceptions officielles des présidents depuis la IIIe République*. 5 Continents Éditions, Milan, p. 11.

[82] Mansel, P. (1988). *The Court of France, 1789-1830.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 1.

[83] For example, the (exhaustive) bibliographic database on court history that can be consulted on the website of the Society for Court Studies, contains practically no titles that are concerned with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
http://www.courtstudies.org (accessed on September 10th, 2010).

the past, but they were not simply a static inheritance. […] both conceptions and practices changed and […] they always developed within the context of contemporary political and social needs."[84] Consequently, when attempting to interpret (elite) food to gain further insight into hierarchies, conflicts of power and indeed the general development of (European) society, it is of the utmost importance to also try to understand court society after 1800.

> Necessity, taste, social distinction, opportunity, and values all intersect at the table, dictating who sits where, what is on the plate and whether there is one, who prepares the food and who serves it. On great public occasions, the order of service expresses this formally; but food operates as a social indicator even more powerfully with daily repetition. Everyone in Western societies recognizes the social implications of whether a household normally eats caviar or hot dogs, truffles or frozen dinners and whether they do so standing or sitting and in a kitchenette or under a chandelier.[85]

Grew's statement perfectly summarizes the central paradigm of this book. It originated as an exploration of the food served at the Belgian royal court of the nineteenth century to determine whether court food remained trendsetting and innovating – even a tool of power – in a period of time where monarchic authority was increasingly curtailed. The food served at the court, was thus to be analyzed and compared to common (elite) food at the same moment in time.

However, the Belgian Royal Archives[86] (that hold the most important sources for this research) contain not only the menus of the food that

---

[84] Jackson, R.A. (1992). Introduction. In: *European Monarchy. Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times*, p. 7.

[85] Grew, R. (1999). Food and Global History. In: *Food in Global History* (Ed. Grew, R.). Westview, Boulder & Oxford, p. 2.

[86] These archives were installed as a part of the *Algemeen Rijksarchief*, the Belgian State Archives, in 1962 and they are kept at the *Hôtel d'Assche*, the part of the Brussels royal palace that is also home to the offices of the king's Cabinet, the king's Military Department and the king's Civil List. They consist of documents related to the activities of the different departments and bureaus of the royal palace. Documents go back to July 21st 1831, the day Prince Leopold von Saksen-Coburg took the oath as the first king of the Belgians.
   The archival records are all written in French. This fits in perfectly with the growing domination of the French in governmental departments since the Belgian independence, although one should mention that King Leopold I did not have a particular affection for the French, since he was German and lived in Great Britain for a long period of time.
   A large part of the Archives is composed of letters between the king and his staff and between staff members among themselves. However, one must keep in mind that, even though the different members of staff often recorded their instructions, ideas or comments, this did not come about in a systematic or regular manner. Particularly when the king met regularly with his most important employees (e.g. the lord cham-

was served during the reign of King Leopold II (1865-1909), but also the guest lists[87] of dinner occasions during the reign of both King Leopold I (1831-1865) and King Leopold II; consequently, this valuable

---

berlain and the minister of the king's House), "written evidence" of these meetings is scarce. Moreover, part of the documents may have disappeared over time: not all of the deposited documents were retrieved when the king's confidants were deceased, others were moved to another building and have never resurfaced and in some cases it was a matter of deliberate selection.

The king's House basically consists of those staff members who are employed by the king personally – meaning they only have to respond to the king himself – and who are responsible for advising the monarch and for guiding him in both his political function and his symbolic and representative function. It is composed of four departments. The lord chamberlain's department supervises the public activities of the king and the rest of the royal family as far as they are concerned with their role as leaders of the state and symbols of the nation. More concretely stated, the department is occupied with – among other things – the royal family's domestic and foreign travel, national ceremonies (e.g. Te Deum) and dinners and receptions that were regularly organized at the royal palaces. The king's Cabinet is entrusted with political and administrative issues, as well as with the relationship between the palace and both the domestic and international political world. The Military House has the basically informative function of briefing the king about military and strategic issues. It is also involved with the royal family's daily protection. Finally, the Civil List is responsible for the revenue and expenses (e.g. the maintenance of buildings and the purchase of furniture), and is also entrusted with the palace's *bon ton*, for example by making sure that during the official dinners, the best food is offered.

See also: De Vooght, D. (2006). Culinary Networks of Power. Dining with King Leopold II of Belgium (1865-1909). In: *Food & History*, 4, pp. 85-104; Janssens, G. (2005). *Overzicht van de archieven en documentaire verzamelingen bewaard in het archief van het Koninklijk Paleis.* Algemeen Rijksarchief, Brussel; Koninckx, C. (2000). *Le roi en Belgique. Monarchie et fonction royale.* Éditions Kluwer, Bruxelles; Molitor, A. (1994). *La fonction royale en Belgique.* CRISP, Bruxelles, p. 135; Van Goethem, H. (2008). *De monarchie en "het einde van België". Een communautaire geschiedenis van Leopold I tot Albert II.* Lannoo, Tielt, pp. 15-17.

[87]   Archief Koninklijk Paleis (1845-1865). *Departement van de Grootmaarschalk. Fonds Leopold I* (Diners. Alfabetische lijst der genodigden. Register 56-77); Archief Koninklijk Paleis (1865-1909). *Departement van de Grootmaarschalk. Fonds Leopold II* (Diners. Alfabetische lijst der genodigden. Register 411-451).

The department of the lord chamberlain started keeping track of dinner guests since the very origin of the Belgian monarchy. These guest lists are composed of the same general information: who was invited for dinner or lunch and when? When people were invited, but did not attend, a remark was added next to the date: ill, absent, in mourning, to be excused. This demonstrates that these registers were not merely lists of names, but that they were actually used to keep track of people's response to court invitations (which makes them a reliable source as far as the court's dinner invitees are concerned). Since not every name has a date entry, it seems that these guest lists were compiled on beforehand. These characteristics all suggest that being invited for dinner at the court was not a random event. And since, according to protocol, all invitations were carried out following the king's personal orders, the data provides an insight into the position of the court within Belgian society at a particular moment in time.

information needed to be included as well. Parasecoli makes the argument: "Meals unite and divide. They connect those who share them, confirm their identities as individuals and as a collectivity, and reinforce their mutual bonds," and "at the same time […] exclude those who do not participate in them."[88] Thus, the king and queen's dinner guests were closely examined.[89] Not only was the composition of the guest registers explored, but the frequency of invitations and the formation of the guests at each occasion were all scrutinized to reveal a social structure[90] within the groups of *invités* that might testify to the position and hence influence and power, of the Belgian court at the moment the dinner was given.[91] Consequently, this inquiry goes beyond the scope of a "mere" historical narrative about copious courtly meals, but it is embedded in a broader context of cultural-, social- and political-history.

The particulars that were found in the dinner guest lists, were combined with the data retrieved from the menu cards that are kept in the archives of the king's Civil List.[92] The menu cards provide for a range of

---

[88] Parasecoli, F. (2005). Food: Identity and Diversity. In: *Culinary Cultures of Europe. Identity, Diversity and Dialogue* (Eds Goldstein, D. & Merkle, K.). Council of Europe, Strasbourg, p. 11.

[89] Guest lists from dinners for approximately every five years were examined. Starting in 1845 (one type of guest lists was only kept as of 1844) and considering the years 1845, 1850, 1855, 1860, 1865, 1869, 1871, 1875, 1879, 1886, 1888, 1895, 1900 and 1905. The years that represent King Leopold II's reign were chosen because for these years, menu cards were retrieved in the archives.

[90] Friedkin, N.E. (1998). *A Structural Theory of Social Influence.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 3.

[91] Of course, the source's possible flaws should be acknowledged. Some names may not have been recorded, while others may have been put down twice. Some dining occasions may not have been registered or put down on the wrong date. However, these guest lists were working tools that were used by the palace staff when organizing courtly events. Therefore, their reliability should not be downsized either.

[92] Unfortunately, unlike the dinner guest lists, these menus were not archived for consecutive years. Leopold I's reign did not leave any trace of menus, while menu cards were kept for only eleven random years during Leopold II's reign. Since for some of these years, the data for only a couple of days were recorded, only six years were taken into account: 1869, 1871, 1879, 1886, 1888 and 1895.[92] These years do span most of King Leopold II's reign, allowing for an evolutional analysis to be made.

Information for these years too, is not entirely complete, but vast enough to make a comparison possible. The following months were included in the survey:

1869: August, September, October, November, December

1871: May, June, October

1879: October, December

1886: May, June, July, November, December

1888: January, February, March, April, May, June, September, October, November, December

very rich information. Depending on the year, they contain the (lunch and dinner) menus of the king and queen, of the marshals and the lord chamberlain and of the court personnel. Moreover, for some years, the daily total of consumed bottles of wine and other drinks are listed and the price per bottle is mentioned.[93]

These menu cards were composed to give an account of the daily food (and drink) consumption at the palace (and in particular of different groups of people) and, as such, are a very valuable source material when trying to gain insight in nineteenth-century courtly eating habits as well as when looking for a relationship between food and power. These different menu cards make it possible to look for distinction within the palace walls based on food. Moreover, when combined with the information retrieved from the dinner guest lists, distinction between external guests might also be detected, again investigating the monarch's position within society and contributing to the debate on the power of food.[94]

Interesting secondary sources were nineteenth-century "cookbooks", including the *Larousse gastronomique*.[95] They were extremely useful when positioning Belgian court cuisine within nineteenth-century cuisine as a whole. Second, writings about the nineteenth-century monarchy helped to describe the context in which the establishment and the continued existence of the Belgian monarchy should be understood.[96]

1895: January, February

[93]   De Vooght. Culinary Networks of Power. Dining with King Leopold II of Belgium (1865-1909), p. 97.

[94]   Notwithstanding the obvious advantage of using these menu cards, one should acknowledge their flaws as well. The first one is the possible underestimate of the consumption, since it is not quite clear whether the foodstuffs that were gained from the royal domains were included in the meals' inventories. The second one is that during the years studied, different – and a different amount of – particulars were registered, making a genuine comparison difficult. That is why all the menu cards of the years as a whole were compared to each other in order to provide a general picture of nineteenth-century court food on the one hand. On the other hand, food that was served to one group of people (e.g. the marshalls) was compared to food that was offered to another group of people (e.g. the king and queen and their guests) to help in the examination of whether or not food creates distinction. Nonetheless, since the menu cards too were actually a working tool for the palace staff, they should be quite reliable.

[95]   Dubois, U. & Bernard, E. (2006). *La cuisine classique (1864).* Adamant Media Corporation, Paris; Escoffier, A. (1993). *Le guide culinaire. Aide-mémoire de cuisine pratique (1921).* Flammarion, Paris; Favre, J. (2006). *Dictionnaire universel de cuisine pratique (1894-1906).* Omnibus, Paris; Maubourguet, P.E. (Ed.) (2004). *Larousse gastronomique.* Larousse, Paris.

[96]   For example: Bagehot. *The English Constitution*; Burke. *Reflections on the Revolution*; Cannadine. The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual, pp. 101-164; Conway, M.D. (1894). *The Writings of Thomas Paine. Collected and Edited by Mon-*

Third, theories about the relationship between food and power[97] had to be examined in order to demonstrate the usefulness of studying food to examine relationships of power. And fourth, the ideas about the power of relationships was to be explored, since the court's dinner guest lists were analyzed through the performance of a Social Network Analysis.[98]

By combining the information retrieved from the archival records with the (theoretical and methodological) findings that emerged from the secondary literature, it was possible to investigate the role and position of the Belgian royal court of the nineteenth century through the study of food culture at this court.

The first part of this book places it within a context of research. After the research problem was defined in the introductory chapter, Chapter 1 takes a closer look at the theoretical background. Both the notion of the power of relationships and the power of food, as well as the usefulness of studying court food, are introduced. The theoretical ideas are examined within their historiographical context, after which the applicability of these ideas is explained.

Chapter 2 presents the methodological tools that are employed in this book. The (historical) development of Social Network Analysis and of qualitative analysis is outlined and the methods' usefulness for and applicability to this research are pointed out.

Chapter 3 is the final chapter of the first part. It sketches the conditions in which the happenings that are described in this book occurred,

---

cure Daniel Conway. G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York; Hardie. *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria*. Refer to the Bibliography for more titles.

[97] See for example: Anderson, E.N. (2005). *Everyone Eats. Understanding Food and Culture.* New York University Press, New York & London; Belasco, W. (2002). Food Matters. Perspectives on an Emerging Field. In: *Food Nations. Selling Taste in Consumer Societies* (Eds Belasco, W. & Scranton, P.). Routledge, New York & London, pp. 2-23; Counihan, C. & Van Esterik, P. (Eds) (1997). *Food and Culture: A Reader.* Routledge, New York & London; Scholliers, P. (Ed.) (2001). *Food, Drink and Identity. Cooking, Eating and Drinking in Europe since the Middle Ages.* Berg, Oxford & New York; Wiessner, P. & Schiefenhövel, W. (Eds) (1996). *Food and the Status Quest. An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Berghahn Books, Providence & Oxford. Refer to the Bibliography for more titles.

[98] See for example: Breiger, R. (2004). The Analysis of Social Networks. In: *Handbook of Data Analysis* (Eds Hardy, M. & Bryman, A.). SAGE Publications, London, pp. 505-526; de Nooy, W., Mrvar, A. & Batagelj, V. (Eds) (2005). *Exploratory Social Network Analysis With Pajek.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; Scott, J.P. (2000). *Social Network Analysis: A Handbook.* SAGE Publications, London; Wasserman, S. & Faust, K. (Eds) (1994). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; Wetherell, C. (1998). Historical Social Network Analysis. In: *International Review of Social History*, 43, pp. 125-144. Refer to the Bibliography for more titles.

paying attention to the situation of the Belgian monarchy in the nine-teenth century – since the Belgian temporary government opted (not entirely voluntary) to install a monarch at a moment in time when this type of leadership was doubted all over Europe – while investigating the Belgian ruling classes in the same period of time and introducing the characteristics of elite food in the nineteenth century.

In the second part of this book, the findings that emerged in the first part are put to the test by looking at the concrete example of the Belgian royal court of the nineteenth century. Chapter 4 applies some concrete measures of Social Network Analysis to the data retrieved from the dinner guest lists in order to ascertain whether or not having dinner at the Belgian court was an important event that provided ample oppor-tunity to meet a substantial network of people and consequently supply-ing insight into the role and position of the nineteenth-century Belgian royal court.

Chapter 5 looks even deeper into the data emerging from the dinner guest lists. By using the techniques brought forth by Social Network Analysis, the composition of the king's dining table is analyzed, reveal-ing the center of the dinner guest network and bringing an insight into the evolution of the guest lists, again helping to understand the place and influence of the court in nineteenth-century Belgium.

Chapter 6 temporarily leaves the dinner guests and focuses on the food that was offered at the court. Making use of a qualitative analysis of the menu cards, the food that was served at the palace is scrutinized, investigating the opulence of the royal cuisine and wondering whether this food was typical of nineteenth-century elite cooking.

In Chapter 7, everything is synthesized by examining what kind of food was offered to which people and when, in order to identify "culi-nary networks of power" at the nineteenth-century Belgian royal court. The findings from this chapter should shed some light on the issues that were raised in part I of this book.

Finally, some general conclusions are formulated.