

At present, I have no solution to this dilemma. I do find generic reference to "feasting" in the archaeological record is problematic, due to the immensely varied character of ethnographic feasting. I also believe that "feasting" does generally have definitional implications when used in an archaeological context that it does not necessarily have in an ethnographic one, with regard to the scale and often the material elaboration of the gathering. In regard to this issue of size and elaboration, I argue that we archaeologists need to be open with the broader food community about what kinds of events are and are not including when we refer to feasts. My tendency would be for us to simply say that we are using the word feast as I think the general populace does, to imply meals that are unusually large as well as elaborate in one fashion or another.

As for "feasting's" lack of specific social meaning, that can be largely solved by following up the use of the term with a discussion of its social implications in one's particular cultural context. I suspect that is what is best, as it avoids any need to slot archaeological data into single or ill-fitting categories, and allows inclusion of multiple social motives at the event or events in question. It runs significant dangers in that evaluation of social motives is not built into the label itself, but for informed and careful researchers I believe that at present it is the most straightforward solution.

Conclusion

Archaeologists investigating commensality and other aspects of food behavior in the past face significant methodological and interpretive challenges. I have attempted here to list a few broad methodological issues of which I think interested people should be made aware. I look forward to other voices in the discussion.

8

Medieval and Modern Banquets: Commensality and Social Categorization

Paul Freedman

Introduction

I propose to discuss banquets across different time periods in European and American history, looking at them as more complicated forms of commensality than mere catered celebrations, focusing especially on excess and hierarchy. Excess: for most of European and American history a banquet, in the sense of a major feast, was an occasion where normal boundaries of food supply, appetite, and appropriate consumption were not merely surpassed but rejected. For the peasant, whose usual diet was sparse, fairly monotonous and often inadequate, major church festivals or harvest celebrations represented relief from a penurious routine, so the appeal of large quantities of food, and the opportunity to eat not only one's fill but more, are easily comprehended.

The excess practiced by the aristocracy goes beyond this temporary change from privation to plenty. The nobles' banquets of the Middle Ages and the *ancien regime* were ceremonies of competition (how elaborate one could make the offerings), magnificence (many more dishes than any single person could taste), and largesse. Anthropological approaches to gift-giving and such competitive generosity as is enshrined by the Pacific Coast Indians' "potlatch" are useful in understanding implications of excess among European aristocrats, but not really as pertaining to the role of food which, unlike the potlatch presents, is an ephemeral offering. Food is a common but nevertheless peculiar kind of gift.

In addition to excess, I would also like to consider hierarchy. Pre-modern banquets demonstrated hierarchical divisions that counter the norms of commensality which we think of as tending to break down social distinctions. Who sat where, who was served what and the interaction of ceremonial and informal elements complicate, in creative ways, how we think about dining together.

This chapter concerns formal occasions of feasts usually marking particular events such as religious holidays, treaties, weddings, or diplomatic visits. Nevertheless, far

from being exceptions to the social rules in the way that village feasts might be holidays from a normal regime of austerity, banquets have tended to reify social differences and so subvert their own apparent commensal purpose. They are, for their participants, mundane, or at least repeated and confirmatory. It's not just that people of wealth or political power can show their distinction by being invited to or hosting such functions, but that distinctions are made among those attending the banquet. Especially in the setting of a princely court, be it the Versailles of Louis XIV or Stalin's Kremlin (both rulers profligate, if sinister hosts), the instability of rank and the capriciousness of favor provide strong counter-narratives against the surface celebratory coming together.

Commensality and its discontents

Commensality has many forms as the chapters in this volume demonstrate. The English word is quite venerable, so, although it might seem to be a typical piece of modern social-science terminology, the use of "commensality" is attested since the seventeenth century. The peerless eighteenth-century English lexicographer Samuel Johnson defined commensality as "Fellowship of the table; the custom of eating together." In 1826, writing about members of the House of Commons being invited to meals with the Speaker, an observer imagined that Dr. Johnson might have remarked *à propos* "eating together promotes good will, Sir, commensality is benevolent" (Anonymous, 1826). Indeed, eating together is so common that it has tended to pass unnoticed, much as the subject of food itself has failed until recently to interest historians, in part because of its ubiquity. One might say we have been practicing commensality without being aware of it.

Commensality has been discussed by social scientists, however, in terms of the socially healthful effects of dining together versus the isolated individualism of contemporary customs (Fischler, 2001). Sociability at the table in the developed world has waned in recent times as meals have tended to become brief, solitary opportunities to grab utilitarian sustenance. Academic and popular discourse laments the decline of taking meals with others, part of a supposed crisis of community and the public sphere. In the U.S., Starbucks and other coffee shops are wrestling with the problem of computers and digital devices which not only keep customers occupying space at the expense of potential sales but also create an atmosphere of self-absorbed solitude in what is intended as a communal space with opportunities for exchange and discussion. Some independent coffee shops now ban these devices.

A similar and more generalized loneliness results from the near-disappearance of family meals. I participated in an advertising agency meeting in the summer of 2011 in which experts on housewives were asked about the tensions American mothers felt in trying to get family members to sit down to the same meal. The schedule conflicts, the moms' own activities, the volatile likes and dislikes of older children, and the

tendency even when at the table to tune into other media have so subverted the 1950's ideal of the family dinner that one of these experts hoped that one 15-minute segment of such idealized family time *per week* might be preserved, a forlorn habitat for an endangered species. Probably the reality is not quite that dramatic, although in Robert Putnam's *Bowling Alone: The Rise and Collapse of American Community* we learn that this form of commensality, family dinners, declined in the U.S. by 43 percent in the last quarter of the twentieth century (2000: 100–2).

Of course not all examples of commensality, the imagined Dr. Johnson notwithstanding, are occasions for benevolence. Studies of commensality tend to emphasize its positive effect of breaking down selfish individualism (Hirschman, 1996; Simmel, 1997: 130). However, the pull towards sharing and festivity can be resisted, often dramatically. Fights at festive family meals are a staple of novels and dramas—the terrible altercation over Irish politics at a Christmas dinner in James Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1993: 25–39), for example. And during mundane, non-celebratory meals as well—Jonathan Franzen's *The Corrections* (2001: 25–39) includes a harrowing description of a boy refusing to eat liver, beet greens and rutabagas and being kept at the table for hours by his parents for this defiance.

Business meals form an entire category of charged and often negative commensality. In the movie *Pretty Woman* (1990) the corporate raider played by Richard Gere demonstrates his domination of one such dinner by his flawless, confident gourmet expertise. By means of hurried special coaching, the Julia Roberts character learns something of the necessary table etiquette, although not quite mastering an awkward encounter with snails. The uplifting Pygmalion theme, however, is displaced by the breakdown of commensality. The meal ends in abrupt discord, a confrontation over the predatory machinations of the raider. His "guests," whose company he is taking over, walk out. Not only is this a failure of commensality, but, once having humiliated his opponents, the business tycoon loses all interest in the meal itself. It has been merely a vehicle for insulting behavior, with the pseudo-fellowship of the table heightening the insult (Parasecoli, 1999: 175–6, 188, 340). In all these examples, the official agenda is sharing, but there are other currents and conflicting circumstances.

Banquets are a particular kind of commensality because of their scale and effort at delight or intimidation. They are celebrations of events such as alliances, dynastic weddings or victories in battle, but their public festive nature and apparent commensality fail to cut across the divisions of society. I turn to the more complicated exclusivity of the elite banquets.

Excess

For the wealthy, banquets perform a commensality of excess, but a certain type of excess. The food has to be copious, of course, but also difficult, rare, and expensive

as well. Mere quantity is not sufficient—rural villages have excessive quantities of food as depicted in the peasant weddings painted by Dutch artists or before them in German woodcuts in which rustics feast on beer and sausages while fighting, dancing, vomiting, and enjoying a diversion from normal life (Vandenbroeck, 1984; Moxey, 1989). This is excess, but not, however, a form of culinary distinction.

The banquets of the medieval elite do tend to involve ridiculous and inconsumable amounts of food, but what is offered is appropriate to the upper classes—meat, especially game, or large saltwater fish (during fast days) (*Banquets et manières*, 1996; Aurell et al., 1992; Altenberg et al., 1991; Albala, 2007). The dishes are fragrant with ingredients that must come from far away at great expense, not only the relatively well-known pepper or cinnamon but rarer spices such as galangal and nutmeg, or even perfumes such as musk.

At the enthronement of the Bishop of Salisbury in 1414, the meal began with boiled meats including capon, swan, peacock, pheasant, meatballs in aspic, wheat porridge with scrambled eggs and venison, and “mawmeny” (wine with sugar and spices thickened and mixed with ground pork and chicken). The second service of roasted meat featured piglets, crane, venison, heron, stuffed poussins, and partridges. Fried meats, small birds and, delicacies comprised the third course: meat (bittern, curlew, pigeon, rabbit), birds (plover, quail, larks), and delicacies (fritters, and puff pastries) (Woolgar, 1999: 159–60).

Master Chiquart, chef for the Duke of Savoy in the 1430s, envisaged a banquet for probably about 500 guests lasting two days. It would require six weeks to two months of preparation, mostly involving the collection of an extraordinary amount of game. Purveyors with 40 horses set out to acquire all manner of birds and mammals. Several hundred pounds of spices were needed as well as no less than 12,000 eggs. Twelve pounds of gold leaf was needed for decoration of the dishes to be presented at the meals. Some of the dishes included in Chiquart’s cookbook give an idea of the final product—an edible castle with four towers and a courtyard with a fountain. Atop each castle was a different virtuoso dish typical of medieval culinary display: a pike cooked in three different ways, each way a different color, without being cut into pieces before serving (tricky); a skinned and redressed swan (i.e. cooked, but sewn back into its original skin and feathers); a glazed piglet, and a glazed boar’s head adorn the fortifications. Each animal is breathing fire by means of a camphor-soaked wick in its mouth (Chiquart, 1986: 9, 22–4; Scully and Scully, 2002: 41–2).

Hierarchy

This must have been fun, but a key aspect of pre-modern celebrations is that not everybody got to eat the same delicacies. If the banqueters were sharply distinguished from the mere mob of envious observers, once they entered the site of

the banquet it was the internal distinctions that mattered. The ruler often had his meal at a table apart from the others, eating food reserved for him and usually prepared in a completely separate kitchen. Such extravagant solitude was for reasons of security, to guard against poisoning, but served also to distinguish the ruler while depriving him of convivial company. This is especially noticeable in the ceremonial of Versailles. The king took most meals seated alone but surrounded by standing courtiers, either in a large company (*au grand couvert*) or in a more intimate setting (*au petit couvert*). The others did not dine—a break with a tradition of the king being first among nobles rather than completely set apart (Pinkard, 2009: 129–30). The dinner was a public event, but one without any literal commensality.

Grand dining in the Middle Ages was a bit more hospitable, but nevertheless hierarchical. There were 2,500 guests at celebrations following the enthronement of George Neville as archbishop of York in 1465 and they were seated at tables that spread out over several rooms of the castle of Cawood. A high table set at one end of the principal hall was occupied by bishops, dukes, and earls. Six other tables accommodated high monastic officials and noble lords, and then, at increasing distance from the high table but still in the hall, members of the York cathedral chapter, officials of the city of York, men of law and other lay functionaries, and young esquires of the royal court. Beyond the hall were further rooms seating ladies of prominence, lesser gentlemen and their wives, and finally a gallery where servants of the various guests ate. Each table got a different set of courses, essentially more variety at the higher-rated ones (Benson, 1919: 88–90).

At a series of wedding banquets in Florence in June of 1469, the guests celebrating the marriage of Piero de’Medici and Clarice degl’Orsini were arranged not by status but according to a more complicated demography. The bride and 50 of her girlfriends dined in the garden of the Medici Palace. Invited citizens of Florence sat in the courtyard; young men were served in the ground floor *sala*, and the older women were upstairs on a balcony. The girls were visible to all, but protected by their separate space, intermittently available to talk to when, for example, they went out into the street to dance (Agresta, 2011). Here hierarchy interacted with staging as the young women were favored because of their beauty rather than rank.

Sometimes the carefully performed celebration broke down and disorder and gate-crashing replaced the calibrated hierarchical arrangements. Here excess and hierarchy comically interact. The scale and complexity of pulling off both a public fête and more *soigné* private meal create all sorts of logistical problems. The boy King Henry VI of England was crowned twice, once at Westminster in 1429 at the age of seven, and then two years later in Paris as the English were starting to lose the 100 Years War to the French. The Parisian event was disastrous at least as a catering spectacle. The populace forced their way into the hall where the feast was supposed to take place, eating what had been already set out, stealing salt cellars and other portable table-service items, and resisting all attempts to move them to make way

for the invited members of Parliament, university faculty, merchant officials and other urban dignitaries who very reluctantly shared the disorganized revels with their social inferiors (Huizinga, 1949: 50).

Similar problems occurred in the modern era: for example, the coronation banquet for King George IV of Britain on July 19, 1821 was ludicrously extravagant and the banquet involved almost 4,000 dishes, but the confectionery sculptures melted and, in the near stampede to get something to eat, the guests more-or-less trampled the food (Kelly, 2003: 196–8). Arrangements miscarried similarly at the less ostentatious inaugural celebration for the American president Abraham Lincoln's second term on March 6, 1865. A large table was set up in the corridor of the West Wing of the White House. The menu was quite extensive, although the dishes were fairly plain (roasts, smoked meats). There were 53 items served of which more than half were what we would consider desserts: cakes, tarts, creams, ice creams and fruit ices. Three hundred people were invited to attend the event standing (only the most select of the company actually sitting down to dine), but 5,000 crowded into the building. According to the *New York Times* newspaper, "The crush which followed can better be imagined than depicted ... in less than an hour the table was a wreck ... a demolition in a twinkling of an eye of all the confectioner's handiwork ... as much was wasted as was eaten, and however much there may have been provided, more than half the guests went supperless" (Clarkson, 2009, vol. 1: 163).

President Obama's inauguration in 2009 also had various levels of access and even those who simply were able to get a glimpse of it were considered privileged. Above them were those who were at the White House. A portion of these dined somewhere in the executive mansion, and the elite actually dined with the President.

Thus even when arrangements went according to plan, there was a distinction among the guests that puts this form of commensality into a particular perspective. The interaction of excess and hierarchy made it more likely that the occasion would be difficult to accomplish and that the lower order of guests would not obtain the full satisfaction of the banquet as a meal: but that was part of the unfolding of the event, a combination of order and chaos.

Modern banquets

Certain key aspects of banqueting changed in modern times. Although we are inclined to think of modernity as less splendid, more severe, and altogether less ostentatious than the pre-modern period, in fact this is not at all true. Excess in nineteenth-century banquets was as frequent and extensive as during Middle Ages. What had changed is the diminution of hierarchical distinction among banqueters. To be sure at a royal or state occasion to this day there will be a head table, but banquets are now private affairs, not public spectacles, and even in France or China, home to extraordinary gastronomic and ceremonial traditions, the food served at

official meals will be reasonable in quantity, unexceptional in quality, and served equally.

The nineteenth century witnessed some of the most extraordinarily elaborate banquets ever served. In his brief service for the British Prince Regent, the future George IV, the great chef Antonin Carême in 1817 put together a meal in honor of Grand Duke Nicholas of Russia that included 117 different dishes in nine courses, and these were elaborate preparations such as *Faisans truffées au Périgord* and *Filets de poulardes glacés aux concombres* (Kelly, 2003: 134–40).

To take some examples of modern excess from the United States the so-called "Gilded Age" after the Civil War was a notorious time of gastronomic ostentation. A spectacular meal was offered in 1865, just after the end of the War, by the English railway magnate Sir Martin Peto for 250 guests at Delmonico's in New York, generally acknowledged as the finest restaurant in the country. The cost of this meal was \$200 per person, an astronomical amount at a time when the average weekly wage was \$5 (Clarkson, 2009, vol. 2: 675–8). There were ten courses with 38 separate dishes. These included such difficult creations as *cassolettes de foie-gras*, *châufroid de rouge-gorges à la Bohémienne*, and *Buisson de ris d'agneau Pascaline*. Within two years Sir Martin's speculations had failed and he was bankrupt. There was a kind of spectacular commensality to this event, but in fact it was like a publicity party in which the guests were not really that well-known either to their host or to each other.

A less well-known but quite interesting and friendlier dinner served in 1851 was part of a competition between a group of wealthy gourmands from New York and their fellows from Philadelphia. The New Yorkers of course chose Delmonico's for their banquet, but unfortunately we don't know what was served. The Philadelphia menu, which won against expectations, does survive and it is rather amazing: 17 courses, over 70 dishes and a service of 20 wines. The fish were difficult to obtain fresh—special messengers carried salmon from the Kennebec River in Maine to Philadelphia. The April 19 date was challenging as it is neither full spring nor anywhere near normal harvest time or game season. The meal was splendid but also innovative—roast turkey served with oyster sauce (more commonly seen with boiled fowl); a so-called "coup de milieu," usually Roman Punch, here was a sorbet made from old Tokay (Parkinson, 1874: 28–31; Hines et al., 1987: 29).

Still these American meals did not surpass what the French authority Grimod de la Reynière called for as a general standard in 1805. He actually criticizes pre-revolutionary dinners for 60 guests where the first course alone might contain as many as 128 dishes, proposing a more modest total of 108 dishes in three courses, again for 60 guests. The nineteenth century ended with the beginnings of a much reduced standard of excess. By the time of the monthly journal *La cuisine française et étrangère* (started in 1891), ten dishes were sufficient for 60 guests (Flandrin, 2007: 68–101).

In modern settings that replicate autocratic courts, such as the entourage of Stalin or Mao, there was a perpetuation of some aspects of traditional banqueting

and commensality. Stalin practiced both an ostentatious simplicity and a peculiar kind of luxury and innovation. He would mix two soups and crumble bread into the result in rustic fashion, according to Anastas Mikoyan, but Stalin was also credited with inventing a dish called "Aragvi" (named after a river in Georgia) consisting of mutton, aubergines, tomatoes, potatoes, and black pepper in a spicy sauce. In addition to his many other talents, lauded so profusely by the cult of personality, Stalin was a gourmet. For many years the best-known restaurant in Moscow was the *Aragvi*. Stalin was both generous and intimidating, plying his guests with food, but also making them taste dishes first to make sure they weren't poisoned. He teased KGB chief Laverenti Beria about Polish communists ("where are they anyway?") who, as they both knew, had been killed by Stalin's orders while rejecting Beria's gift of 30 turbot fish alleging they were spoiled. Yet this erratic series of meals constituted the center of Soviet power, especially in the post-war era. Molotov states that the empire was "truly governed from the dining table" while the disillusioned Yugoslav observer Milovan Djilas noted that at these dinners "the destiny of the vast Russian land, of the newly acquired territories and ... the human race was decided" (Montefiore, 2003: 522–5).

How tame are the dining habits of the heads of state of major countries now by comparison! Perhaps some of the court culture has survived in the meals of dictatorial figures such as the former Libyan tyrant Moammar Gadhafi. It's not that celebratory excess is gone—the new global plutocracy organizes spectacular parties, but the emphasis is on having stars entertain, as Rod Stewart did for an enormous fee for the private equity billionaire Stephen Schwartzman in 2007, or vulgar, non-gastronomic spectacle, as at the infamous birthday party on Sardinia thrown by the criminal business executive Dennis Koslovski at which, among other things, an ice sculpture modelled on Michelangelo's "David" spouted vodka from its penis. Country music singer Jimmy Buffett sang here at, presumably, great expense that surpassed that of whatever food was served (Anonymous, 2007; M. Jennings, 2009: 326).

By the late twentieth century, both excess and hierarchy in grand meals were diminished, but so too were banquets in general. It is not just a decline in community or retreat into private, familial life that is responsible for this, but new ways of combining business with pleasure, or, one might say, sociability with networking. In the Middle Ages entertaining was an important part of both friendship and business, from aristocratic open-handedness offered to followers, to court ceremony, to merchant guild occasions. In the nineteenth century as well, private dinners built, confirmed, and maintained social prominence. One is also struck by how many American menus survive from celebratory meals of private associations—the Shakespearean Society of Philadelphia, or the New York Sons of the California Gold Rush, for example. There has been a precipitous decline in such commensal events as well as in private entertainment. Academic dinner parties, a treacherous feature of my early teaching career, which began in 1979, are almost extinct. Business lunches are not what they were in an era that uses the phrase "three-martini lunch" as a term

of opprobrium. And there is that crisis of familial dinners alluded to earlier as part of the general pattern of waning of commensality.

Magnificent meals are eclipsed, but not quite dead. In 2011, one of the farewell dinners at the celebrated restaurant El Bulli featured 44 dishes including classics such as Golden Egg, new items such as Peas 2011, and hard-to-decode offerings such as "Pond" or "Box." Nine wines were also served. Hundreds of thousands of people around the world attempted frantically to participate in this series of dinners marking the end of this restaurant at or near the pinnacle of its success.

It is worth comparing the publicity surrounding the demise of El Bulli with a famous (once-upon-a-time) 31-course meal served in November 1977 by the Parisian restaurant Chez Denis to the restaurant critic of the *New York Times* Craig Claiborne and his friend Pierre Franey. The garishly splendid occasion was the result of winning an American Express contest for a restaurant meal anywhere in the world, at any price. The bill came to \$4,000 and the 11 wines were more expensive than the courses. These included a tart made with Mediterranean red mullet, a chartreuse of partridges, baked truffles with potatoes, ortolans, and chaud-froid of woodcock. This meal earned considerable notoriety and marks both the birth and death of culinary trends: the beginning of the restaurant critic as publicist, but also an important episode in the slow death of French culinary dominance (Davis, 2004).

Neither of these qualifies exactly as a banquet—the Claiborne-Franey *bouffe* was too intimate, the El Bulli fêtes too anonymous. But their differences illustrate the changing criteria of gastronomic prestige. At Chez Denis there was an agreed upon understanding of what constituted elegant dining. In the Paris of 1977, as in the Paris of 1877, or for that matter 1777, such things as ortolans and truffles were expected, even required at grand gastronomic occasions. The vocabulary changed little and there was always an effort to combine innovative delight with such dishes as were necessary to demonstrate that this was a serious event. Thus in Edith Wharton's novel *The Age of Innocence*, a depiction of upper-class New York in the 1870s, a successful dinner party must include terrapin (small turtles) and wild canvas-back duck, the two most prestigious dishes in America throughout the nineteenth century (Wharton, 1996: 18, 29). Five hundred years earlier, a medieval European banquet would have included a different roster of important dishes—glazed wild boar's head perhaps, or fish cooked three ways and in three different colors—but the expectations would be similarly clear. Still, today, many proper Chinese banquets have to feature birds'-nests soup and shark-fin soup.

The notion of a dossier of preparations considered *de rigueur* ended in late-twentieth-century Europe and America, to be replaced by an exaltation of creativity and originality, whether in the form of fusion, modernist cuisine, or even a stylized return to traditional or seasonal ingredients. Copenhagen today is the great gastronomic capital, of course, and very much a leader in creativity and unpredictability.

The eclipse of the banquet is related to this decline of the repertoire of expected and elegant dishes. However much of it is meant to dazzle or impress with its excess

and choreography, a banquet has to be identified by certain gastronomic signs. Private, unceremonial commensality does not suffer from these limitations. Certain local traditions might be built up—the Golden Egg at El Bulli, for example—but they are site specific as opposed to the international demand for shark-fin soup or, in its time, foie gras.

The current gastronomic world offers more variety and opportunities, but fewer agreed-upon criteria of enviable gastronomic pleasures. We are certainly not witnessing anything approaching the end of festive dining, but we are seeing the fading of a certain kind of splendid commensality.

It is Ritual, isn't it? Mortuary and Feasting Practices at Domuztepe

Alexandra Fletcher and Stuart Campbell

Introduction

Archaeologists tend to categorize ritual and domestic activities as separate, discrete, even opposing spheres even though it is widely acknowledged that such a total separation is not found in all societies. In many cases it is exceptional commensality (see Grignon, 2001: 28), for the purposes of this chapter feasting, that is often the focus of archaeological research (Dietler and Hayden, 2001a). This is partly because the nature of exceptional commensal acts increases their visibility within the archaeological record compared with more mundane, everyday practices; even if everyday consumption cumulatively produces more ecofactual, such as animal and plant remains, and artefactual evidence (Grignon, 2001: 28). Equally, however, it is because archaeological practice tends to privilege the social impact of the exceptional over the repetition of the mundane. Although it has been long established that archaeological data are derived from a range of depositional activities whose relationships are often more complex than expected (Brück, 1999; Pollard, 2001: 318; Bradley, 2003: 11–12, 2005: 19–35; Hill, 1995: 106; Hodder, 1987), archaeologists tend to maintain a division between the material remains from highly structured “ritual” activities and other material. This treats the exceptional and unusual as something separate, and isolates these practices from other aspects of the archaeological record (Thomas, 1999: 62–88; Chapman, 2000b; Hill, 1995: 102–14; Martin et al., 2000).

The remains of feasting therefore tend to be treated as if they are highly structured, deliberate deposits that can be clearly defined. Hayden, for example, has attempted to categorize types of feasting and the variety of archaeological signatures that may be created therein (2001: 35–42). Other food-related artifacts and ecofacts tend to be considered separately in terms of discarded and unwanted waste, with little to no structure in their deposition (see Cameron 2006: 25–31). Nevertheless acts of