

A Century of Feasting Studies

Brian Hayden and Suzanne Villeneuve

Archaeology Department, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia,
V5A 1S6, Canada; email: bhayden@sfu.ca, suzanne_villeneuve@sfu.ca

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2011.40:433-49

First published online as a Review in Advance on
June 29, 2011

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at
anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145740

Copyright © 2011 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

0084-6570/11/1021-0433\$20.00

Keywords

archaeology, theory, ethnography, anthropology

Abstract

The study of feasting has gradually emerged from early descriptions and bewilderment to more sophisticated attempts to understand the logic and reasons behind the often lavish displays. We chart the various models that have been, and still are, used by anthropologists and archaeologists to explain this unique human behavior. Acquiring prestige is a popular explanation used by ethnographers, while coping with social conflicts is commonly invoked by archaeologists. However, more practical benefits behind feasts have also been proposed, as well as experiential motivations. Whichever explanation is endorsed, there is widespread agreement that feasts play important roles in establishing social identities and memories, creating political power and inequalities, gender identities, accomplishing work, and developing prestige technologies, possibly including domesticates.

INTRODUCTION

Feasting has undergone a stellar rise in popularity in the past two decades within anthropology and especially archaeology. Theoretical models aimed at explaining various dynamics of feasting practices have flourished, and methodological advancements are providing critical insights in the analysis of the behaviors involved.

This article aims to show how feasting has been used in anthropology and archaeology to understand the dynamics of traditional and prehistoric societies. Over the past four decades a number of connections have been made between feasting and theoretically important issues. Such connections were largely lacking previously, when feasting was regarded as a somewhat trivial or inconsequential activity unrelated to the more serious issues of subsistence, trade, reproduction, survival, warfare, and political power. However, as a number of researchers have demonstrated, feasting plays a central role in most of these domains and others.

Feasting now appears to be an instance of a critical element, almost entirely overlooked in the past, for understanding human cultural evolution and the origins of many aspects of our own type of social system. This article highlights the potential importance of feasting in relation to village dynamics and social integration, the emergence of inequalities and complex societies, the pursuit of agency interests and political power, the creation of prestige objects and new technologies, the development of domesticated plants and animals, the establishment of cultural identities, and the identification of gendered activities.

A HISTORY OF LIVING FEASTING STUDIES

Here, we define feasting as any sharing of special food (in quality, preparation, or quantity) by two or more people for a special (not everyday) event (Hayden 2001). The essential foundations of feasting theory lie in early ethnographies, which established basic

explanatory models that anthropologists and archaeologists have used in their interpretations of cultural behavior and archaeological remains. Like other domains of study such as trade, warfare, subsistence, and social complexity, our understanding of feasting has developed in tandem with the paradigm shifts in anthropology over the past century.

Early Classical Descriptions

In some of the earliest classical literature, there are allusions to feasts hosted by elites: Enki offering Inanna butter cakes and beer in early Sumerian city states (Wolkstein & Kramer 1983, p. 13); worshippers offering ancestors wine, soup, and first fruits from the paddies in Shang China (Waley 1996, p. 316); as well as the numerous scenes of elite beer drinking and feasting on cylinder seals and on the Standard of Ur. The preoccupation in the early literature with describing feasting continues through Mycenaean times, as amply demonstrated in the Homeric epics, *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* (Sherratt 2004), where feasting appears in a number of contexts including the Poseidon feast at Pylos (involving 81 bulls), palace feasts, as venues for epic poetry recitations, as well as for all important aspects of warrior/elite lives. Similar descriptions occur in other classical literature including the remarkable description by Hippolochus (c. 300 B.C.) of a wedding feast in Macedonia featuring an unbelievable amount and variety of food, gifts, and entertainment replete with singers, clowns, naked female jugglers, and ithyphallic dancers (Bullitt 1969, pp. 56–58). Scenes and accounts of feasts multiply exponentially in Roman times, even with the appearance of feasting manuals such as that of Apicius (Edwards 1984, Dunbabin 2003, Gold & Donahue 2005).

Ibn Fadlān was one of the first ethnographically oriented chroniclers of feasts in other cultures. His stunning account of a Viking chief's funeral feast in A.D. 921, including the debauched sacrifice of one of the chief's young female slaves, is one of the most remarkable accounts in the literature (Montgomery 2000).

Other indigenous accounts of feasts continue on into the medieval period in Europe, including descriptions in *Beowulf*, and many other graphic depictions (Pollington 2003; Fletcher 2004, p. 16ff).

What all of these early records have in common is that they are fundamentally descriptive accounts of events that were important to the observers or participants. The classical literature portrayed feasting as part of an elite or palace cultural life. However, we are never told why the feasts themselves were important or what role they played in the broader dynamics of society. This “descriptive stage” of feasting studies usually lacked any moral judgment, except perhaps the vituperations of early Christian zealots concerning pagan festivals and their feasting. It was not until early colonial exploration that a greater interest seemed to arise in understanding why people would often go to excessive lengths to host feasts.

The Colonial Phase

With the creation of colonies by European powers from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, the initial focus was largely on description and the cataloguing of various cultures that were brought under the colonial umbrella [e.g., by Sahagun (Anderson & Dibble 1970) and LeJeune (Tooker 1964)]. However, eventually, policies were formulated for interactions with native cultures and their traditions, with the result that some colonial administrators and missionaries made attempts to understand native traditions (Harris 1968, p. 516; e.g., Stevenson 1943, Forde 1953).

In the case of lavish feasting, what appeared to be a sheer waste of resources was beyond comprehension for most European administrators whose mandate was to produce profits for their governments or companies. Lavish feasts adversely affected revenues and were simply viewed as irrational wasteful behaviors that had become part of “primitive” cultural traditions for unknown reasons. This attitude has characterized developing industrial economies from the past to the present, whether the dominant

regimes were capitalist, socialist, or communist (Hayden 2011a). Traditional feasting was therefore frequently banned (e.g., by the Dutch, British Columbian, and Vietnamese governments) as economically backward, and arguments were advanced about the idolatrous character of the feasting practices. Thus, the potlatch on the Northwest Coast was outlawed from 1884–1951, the Dutch outlawed cattle sacrifices in Indonesia, and various Vietnamese provinces banned traditional feasts. In addition, feasting practices often succumbed to world economic pressures, indigenous loss of control over resources, and proselytizing religious missions.

The Early Ethnographic Phase

With the development of anthropology and ethnology as disciplines, more concerted efforts began to document non-Western behavior and understand why people acted in such unfamiliar ways. The early practitioners sought to understand how customs made sense in terms of beliefs, social networks, subsistence, and environments. Of all the types of behavior that were encountered, lavish feasting remained one of the most perplexing phenomena, and hence was often dealt with the least insightfully.

Foremost among the pioneers in the new field of anthropology was Franz Boas who focused on documenting Northwest Coast cultures. Despite his particularist theoretical leanings, Boas fundamentally viewed the potlatch system in very Western terms, explicitly describing it in terms of highly rational investments, interest-bearing loans, contracts, and economic competition (Codere 1950), similar in many ways to Mauss’s (1924) contemporaneous treatment of prestige gifts. However, Boas also advocated viewing Northwest Coast cultures from a particularist, culture historical perspective, and he succeeded in establishing that perspective as the dominant one in anthropology until the mid-twentieth century. Thus, many ethnographic accounts of feasts during this period and even succeeding periods were highly descriptive and largely atheoretical.

With the Great Depression and World War II, there was a lull in ethnographic research in general, and concerning feasting in particular. A few of Boas' followers described feasts in some detail, such as the White Deer Skin Feast in California (Goldschmidt & Driver 1943) and the secret dance societies of the Northwest Coast (Drucker 1941), and they occasionally had insightful observations on the competitive display functions of some feasts. Other ethnographers cited cosmological beliefs surrounding feasts as a means to increase productivity. Certain feasts among the Chin, for example, were viewed as associated with belief in their ability to enhance fertility of the host (Stevenson 1943, pp. 137–38). Similarly, Simoons' (1968, pp. 112, 128) description of lavish feasts among the Nagas emphasize them as a means to transfer life forces from successful hosts to monuments, which the village members could then access and use to increase their own productivity. Other ethnographers such as Post (1938) stayed closer to the descriptive aspects of feasts. Outside academic circles, amateur ethnographers in the British Colonial Service, such as Stevenson (1943) and McIlwraith (1948), made some insightful observations on the importance of feasting and its role in society or in acquiring political power.

The Structural-Functionalist Phase

With the midcentury rise of the structural-functionalist school in anthropology under the aegis of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski, feasts began to be viewed in terms of maintaining the cultural systems of which they were a part. Conflict elements in societies were generally downplayed in favor of the integrative, solidarity-creating elements that provided the aura of stable, unchanging social systems (Harris 1968, p. 516). Thus, the theme of feasts serving to create social solidarity became entrenched and has continued to be the most common explanation of feasting in archaeology today.

Examples of this view were provided by Raymond Firth (1951, pp. 230–31), who maintained that feasting created social unity. Similarly, Rosman & Rubel (1971) explained

potlatches as stemming from social structure needs. However, in *Fighting with Property*, a synthesis of Boas' work, Codere (1950) argued for a more conflict-oriented interpretation of potlatch feasting. Following Malinowski's emphasis on the psychological foundations of social structure, the notion of hosting feasts to increase individual prestige or status also became a popular explanation and continues to be so today among ethnographers. Yet, overall, ethnographers of this period lapsed into basic description of feasts and minimized any explanations or modeling of the detailed cultural dynamics concerning feasting.

The Exploratory Phase

With the return of economic prosperity and research funding in the 1960s–1970s, interest in feasting and theoretical issues blossomed, and some of the most detailed accounts and varied theoretical interpretations were written in these decades. In the functionalist ecological paradigm that became popular in the 1960s (largely inspired by systems theory), a number of ethnographic studies portrayed feasting systems as serving primarily to even out local and temporal variable subsistence production. Examples of this view can be seen in Piddocke's (1965) and Suttles' (1968) explanation of potlatches of the Northwest Coast as a means of banking temporary surplus credits that could be cashed in when needed, and in Sahlins' (1972, p. 190) interpretations of chiefly feasts in Polynesia as a means of redistributing resources from different specialized production areas. Rappaport (1968) made similar suggestions to the effect that periodic pig feasts in New Guinea made meat protein available to people episodically when they were in need of it.

In contrast to the functionalist ecology approach, European ethnographers emphasized the prestige and status motivations of individuals to explain elaborate feasting behavior. *Fighting with Food*, for example, chronicled the intensely competitive nature of major feasts on Goodenough Island in Melanesia (Young 1971, pp. 211, 224), but ultimately related these behaviors back to the competition between

leaders for prestige. Strathern (1971, Nairn 1991) appealed to status motivations for holding moka exchange in New Guinea while overlooking practical benefits. In *Guerres et Festins*, Lemonnier (1990, pp. 47, 49) continued this interpretive theme arguing that in New Guinea prestige had an inherent value and was the foremost goal in competition between big men.

Meanwhile, in contrast to earlier “communitarian” structuralist-functionalist views, other ethnographers began emphasizing the more agency-driven self-interested motivations behind feasting (e.g., Feil 1987). In a precocious study of Maori feasting, Firth [1959 (1929), pp. 309ff, 335] identified a number of purposes for hosting feasts including the establishment of social links and alliances, increased production, and political negotiations. Kirsch (1973) later examined the sociopolitical dynamics of feasting in the consolidation or contestation of power in Southeast Asia. Somewhat later, Weiner (1988, pp. 43–48, 117, 122–23, 134–35) suggested that funeral feasts, including gift exchanges, were critical for demonstrations of lineage strength among coastal New Guinea groups, which, in turn, were critical for brokering political power within and between communities. Wiessner (2001) observed big men in New Guinea organizing egalitarian cult feasts in order to quell social unrest stemming from inequalities in the society. In an even more explicit vein that foreshadowed later political ecological interpretations, Ruyle (1973) emphasized the exploitative nature of Northwest Coast elites and their feasts. Reay (1959) and Sillitoe (1978), too, emphasized the self-interested motivations of feast organizers and big men, although whether this was merely for prestige purposes or for other more tangible benefits such as political power, reproduction, or security was not clear. In any event, these latter studies emphasized the more “exploitative” use of feasts by manipulative aggrandizers or big men.

FEASTING IN ARCHAEOLOGY

The period of archaeological interest in feasting has been considerably shorter and

more recent than the ethnographic or historic period of interest but has paralleled the outlooks developed by ethnologists. In archaeology there have been three basic phases of feasting studies: an early descriptive phase prior to 1970; a formative theoretical phase in the 1970s and 1980s; and a developmental theoretical stage from the 1990s to the present. During these periods, archaeological studies of feasting emerged independently in at least four distinctive areas, including Classical Aegean archaeology, Neolithic and Bronze Age archaeology of Western Europe, the archaeology of South America, and the archaeology of the Southern United States. Over this time, the number of feasting studies in archaeology has become too vast in scope to fully encompass them all here given our publication constraints. We therefore only review key developments in the archaeological theory of feasting and apologize to researchers such as Mike Parker-Pearson and his intriguing research on feasting in the Stonehenge area for not being able to discuss all meritorious projects.

The Descriptive Phase

Prior to the 1970s, the treatment of feasting generally involved little theoretical development concerning cultural dynamics. In good Boasian fashion, prehistoric material remains of feasts were usually simply described as part of the culture history of an area with no necessary links to other aspects of the culture. One notable exception was Thurnwald who, in the 1920s, linked feasting to group solidarity and the political use of feasts to motivate people (see Kaulicke 2005). However, in general, most archaeologists seemed content to identify remains of feasts and describe them as part of the tapestry of cultural history.

The Formative Phase: 1970s and 1980s

It remained for Friedman & Rowlands (1977) and later Bender (1985) to develop some initial theoretical archaeological models of how and why feasts were important in prehistoric

societies and why groups devoted so many resources to holding lavish feasts. Typical of Structural-Marxism in the 1970s, Friedman & Rowlands' (1977, pp. 202–3) interpretive framework focused on the way in which social structures determined economic production and how social forms had their own internal laws of development, largely divorced from economic or environmental considerations. They argued that early tribal political (surplus) economies were driven by competition between lineages for prestige, prestigious marriages, and ancestral blessings (in the form of prosperity and wealth). This competition primarily took the form of competitive feasts (Friedman & Rowlands 1977, p. 207) and created a positive feedback loop, in which greater production permitted more feasts thereby increasing prestige, which led to more wives and more children, resulting in increased production enabling more and larger feasts, and so on. Friedman & Rowlands used this internal dynamic to explain the subsequent development of chiefdoms. Although there was little attempt at the time to link such feasting systems to greater practical benefits, these authors did place feasting at the theoretical forefront of archaeology concerning resource intensification and economically based competition.

It was particularly during this period that archaeologists in a number of areas began to focus attention on prehistoric indications of feasting. Classical archaeologists were among the first to take notice of the archaeological evidence for feasting. This interest is perhaps attributable to the rich descriptions of feasting in the earliest Mycenaean-based epic literature together with Linear B accountings, very abundant faunal remains at palaces, abundant earthenware used for drinking and feasting, and scenes of feasting depicted on earthenware and murals. Mycenaean and other classical archaeologists have developed a number of interpretive and theoretical insights from the feasting record dealing with elite construction of political power via feasting, especially at palaces (exclusive elite feasts) and sanctuaries [inclusive feasts for the general populace (Hamilakis 1999,

Wright 2004, and authors cited therein; Girella 2007)].

In Western Europe, excavations of Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments including ditched enclosures, causewayed camps, henges, and barrows provided abundant remains of ceramics, cattle, suids, ovicapids, and other animals generally associated with funerary monuments. These were often duly noted and described as probable remains from feasts (especially where evidence suggested considerable wastage of food) (e.g., Smith 1965, Wainwright & Longworth 1971, Thomas 1991). Little attempt was made at the time to understand the roles that such feasts could have played in the social or political dynamics of these cultures, other than representing periodic gatherings of dispersed populations. One exception includes Bradley's (1984, pp. 21, 28–29, 51, 64–65, 126, 162) suggestions that Neolithic feasts played a role in the emergence of elites through building personal prestige including tangible benefits, a view potentially influenced by Friedman & Rowlands' publications. This approach continued to be popular during later developmental years in Iberian Bronze Age interpretations of funerary feasting (e.g., Aranda & Esquivel 2006, 2007; Garido-Pena 2006).

South American archaeologists were privileged by rich ethnohistoric archives describing the political role of feasting, as well as excavations of abundant pottery, and architectural or feature remains related to feasting. Morris (1979) was one of the first to draw upon this wealth of information in developing models of how the Incan state used feasting to run its administrative organization and meet its many labor needs. Thus began a strong tradition of elite feasting studies that continued unabated into the developmental phase of feasting theory, primarily focusing on elite uses of feasts to achieve political goals (Bray 2003, Kaulicke & Dillehay 2005, Williams et al. 2005, Langebeck 2005). This focus has expanded in more recent years with studies that deal with lineage and elite funeral feasts by Lau (2002), Hastorf (2003), Gummerman (2010), and Shimada et al. (2004, pp. 383, 386), and a spate of more detailed

studies involving gender roles (e.g., Isbell & Groleau 2010), specialists, elite versus nonelite feasts, and other new areas of investigation (see Bray 2003, Klarich 2010a). In the 1980s, attention also began to focus on the importance of funerary feasts in Costa Rica (Snarkis 1984, p. 220ff; Blanco Vargas et al. 1986).

In the Southwest United States, archaeologists drew heavily upon ethnohistoric and ethnographic records for their work on prehistoric feasting in kivas, great houses, and other ritual structures. The history of feasting studies in the Southwest has been nicely summarized by Wills & Crown (2004). Of particular note were the early studies of Toll (1985), who emphasized the scale of feasts and the possible redistribution functions of feasting at Chaco Canyon great houses. Blinman (1989) focused on other aspects, suggesting that feasts in ritual structures in the Pueblo period could reflect ranked social groups and could have served to promote community unity and defuse social conflicts [following similar suggestions by Longacre (1964) and Hill (1966) concerning the social integration role of great kivas in communities aggregated from previously independent groups]. In the subsequent studies, Potter (2000) and Lindauer (2000) followed this same interpretive tradition, while B. Mills (2007) later expanded the scope to examine feasting in terms of lineage dynamics.

Similarly, in the Central and Southeastern United States, Seeman (1979) began documenting Hopewellian charnel house feasts that were probably intercommunity events (he assumed to redistribute foods but plausibly also to form alliances), an interpretation supported by Shryock (1987). Knight (2001) and Heyman et al. (2005) extended intercommunity feasting to the use of early platform mounds, as did Lindauer & Blitz (1997, pp. 186–87) who argued for communitarian social integration as the main reasons for these feasts. In dealing with later Mississippian chiefdoms in this region, a number of studies have identified abundant feasting remains from elite and public contexts (Welch & Scarry 1995, p. 414; Kelly 2001; Jackson & Scott 2003; Yerkes

2005). In the far Southeast coast, Late Archaic shell rings and massive shell constructions have also been interpreted as the product of feasting aggregations and relatively complex socioeconomic systems featuring feasting (Russo 2008, Schwadron 2010), although these are contentious views.

There were also a number of more isolated investigations into feasting that developed case-specific models, but which did not result in regional trends at the time. Some examples include the documentation of feasting remains associated with Classical Mayan ball courts (Fox 1996), feasting structures among prehistoric hunter/gatherers of Labrador (Schwarz 1996, Pastore 1985), the men's structures of the Bering Strait Eskimo (Sheehan 1989), and Junker et al.'s (1994) insightful analysis of feasting remains in Philippine chiefdoms.

During this formative theoretical period, connections were drawn between feasting and theoretically important issues such as domestication (Bender 1978, 1985), including cognitive models to explain how feasting might be linked to the adoption of domestication in northern Europe (Jennbert 1985, 1987). From a geographer's perspective, Brookfield (1972) suggested a connection between feasting and the intensification of agriculture. Friedman & Rowlands also suggested this connection for agricultural intensification in the Pacific, views that were later echoed by Kirch (1994, 2000, pp. 164, 319) in his interpretation of Polynesian archaeology.

The occurrence of elaborate funeral feasts also began to be noted more during this period, and understanding why they developed has become a major bone of contention between varying interpretive factions in archaeology and ethnography (Hayden 2009a and comments therein).

The Developmental Phase: 1990s through the 2000s

As part of an upsurge of interest during the 1990s in the importance of feasting for dealing with theoretical archaeological issues, a number of ethnoarchaeological studies emerged.

In Africa, Dietler (1990) became interested in feasting as a means of understanding sociopolitical dynamics in village-level societies. Hayden (1990, 2009b) proposed feasting as a possible context for the domestication of plants and animals, leading to a series of ethnoarchaeological studies of feasting with coworkers spanning more than a decade in Southeast Asia and Polynesia (Hayden 2001; Clarke 2001; Adams 2004, 2007a,b; Hayden & Villeneuve 2010). Both Hayden and Dietler's work stemmed from their previous ethnoarchaeological research, and both recognized the unexplored potential that feasting provided for understanding a wide range of developments in prehistory.

In the developmental years, a number of conference symposia and edited volumes on feasting laid the foundation for more current trends in archaeological modeling (e.g., Weissner & Schiefenovel 1996, Bray 2003, Halstead & Barret 2004, B. Mills 2004, Wright 2004, Kaulicke & Dillehay 2005, Aranda 2008, Klarich 2010a). Of these, the 1996 Society for American Archaeology symposium organized by Hayden and Dietler, and the resulting edited volume *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics and Power* (Dietler & Hayden 2001a) constituted something of a watershed in feasting studies. Perhaps for the first time, this publication focused on feasting as a general phenomenon and provided a panorama of some of the major theoretical positions and possibilities for the study of feasting. Discussions were neither exhaustive nor entirely original, but for the first time a wider range of possibilities and applications were opened up, and there was some attempt to chart future directions of research for productive insights. This endeavor appeared to reinvigorate the study of feasting in areas where it was already of some interest, to initiate new interests (e.g., Aranda & Esquivel 2006, 2007; Garrido-Pena 2006; Rosenswig 2007), and to broaden the scope of feasting studies in general.

Within the past decade, archaeologists have developed a more diversified understanding of the dynamics involved in feasting. Some re-

searchers have begun to examine the interplay between individual political interests of leaders in hosting feasts and community support that creates expectations and pressure on leaders to maintain certain levels of feasting for community purposes (Norman 2010). Feasting has also been related to ideological and cognitive domains involving social memory, individual emotions, community values (Hastorf 2003), and sensory experiences (Hamilakis & Kon-solaki 2004), as well as visual and performance aspects of feasting (B. Mills 2008). Others argue that although feasts "touch emotions," this is only temporary and political actors need strategies "that result in more long-term benefits" (Lucero 2003, p. 525), and some even view ideology as a source of power in mobilizing feasting systems (Vaughn 2005).

The broadening of theoretical investigations has led to proposed links between feasting and major technological innovations such as storage (Kuijt 2009), agriculture (Hayden 1990, 2009b), the production of alcohol (Jennings et al. 2005), luxury foods (e.g., Hastorf 2003, Van der Veen 2003, Yerkes 2005), the development of pottery and other prestige technologies (Hayden 2009c), the elaboration of funeral feasts (Gummerman 2010, Hayden 2009a), the construction of monuments (e.g., Iriarte 2008, Andrushko et al. 2011) and in understanding "cuisine" (Hastorf 2003, 2008). Research has also expanded to explore the use of feasts in creating complex political systems with differential demographic consequences for feasters and nonfeasters (Morris 1979, Schmandt-Beserat 2001, Hayden 2003), in establishing communitarian-based complexity (Potter 2000), in practice theory (Bruno 2009), in creating gender roles (Klarich 2010b, Isbell & Groleau 2010), in the creation of ethnic identities (Sánchez 2008), and in developing costly signaling behaviors (Bleige-Bird & Smith 2005).

Despite these theoretical explorations, middle-range material correlates have received surprisingly little attention. Distinctions between rituals, feasting, sacrifices, offerings, and other similar phenomenon, for example,

are generally undefined. A few archaeologists have attempted to define criteria to assist with the general identification of feasting in the archaeological record (Hayden 2001, 2011b, Rosenswig 2007, Twiss 2008). However, modeling the material correlates of specific kinds of feasting behavior is something that requires greater attention. Funeral feasts and work feasts associated with building episodes have been some of the more successfully identified feasting events (e.g., Vega-Centeno 2007).

Feasting behavior, in general, has often been inferred from the quantity and types of fauna (Hamilakis & Konsolaki 2004, Aranda & Esquivel 2006, 2007, Kansa et al. 2009, Grimstead & Bayham 2010, Munro & Grosman 2010), ceramics (Lindauer & Blitz 1997, Potter 2000, Bray 2003, Deagan 2004, Vaughn 2005, B. Mills 2007), and from iconography. Less common are studies that include archaeobotanical results (Deagan 2004, Megaloudi et al. 2007), lithic analyses, or micromorphology, which could all potentially add important insights. More recently, soil chemistry (e.g., Wells et al. 2007) and isotopic analysis (White 2001, Pechenkina et al. 2005, Viner et al. 2010) have been applied to examining past feasting locations and practices. Ethnoarchaeological studies have also provided important contributions to understanding the material correlates of feasts (Dietler 2001, Clarke 2001, Hayden 2001, Adams 2004, Hayden & Villeneuve 2010).

The literature is now replete with analyses from individual sites, yet few regional syntheses occur (Twiss 2008, Hayden 2011b). In particular, Hayden (2011b) has advocated the use of culture synthetic analyses of feasting over entire interacting regions in order to model a fuller range of feasts and avert problems of limited and biased excavation areas of single sites. Despite the above developments, much more effort is needed to tie the material evidence of feasting to more specific types of feasts and to link these to other aspects of past cultural systems. Overall, the above studies demonstrate the potential for different analytical domains to advance our interpretations and provide

contributions to the theoretical understanding of the dynamics involved in feasting.

OVERVIEW OF THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENTS

The study of feasting has become a complex interpretive process, in terms of both modeling the social dynamics involved and of understanding archaeological remains. As we have seen, a number of interpretive schools concerning elaborate feasting have emerged over the past few centuries. The atheoretical emic or observational accounts in classic times ultimately gave way to colonial explanations founded on the irrationality of feasting practices and the cultural values behind them. With the development of anthropology, a number of more rational explanatory models developed: cultural particularism (the Boasian school); psychological functionalism (the drive to acquire prestige or status); structural-functionalism (communitarian needs for social solidarity and cooperation); ecological functionalism (banking or redistribution of resources); costly signaling theory (human behavior ecology); agency models and self-interested motivations (for practical benefits); and cognitive models (emphasizing ideological motivations and phenomenological experiences).

These are obviously not mutually exclusive explanations or motivations. Almost all feasts entail some element of solidarity creation among participants, they are used to signal various kinds of information both to participants and spectators, and they result in enhanced prestige for hosts. However, the critical question is whether these were the fundamental purposes of elaborate feasts, their *raison d'être*. There is still no consensus in the literature, but the above, fundamentally divergent, interpretations have provided the basis on which archaeologists have interpreted evidence of feasting from prehistoric societies.

Overall, Structural-functionalist models constitute the explanations most commonly invoked for explaining feasting. This tradition reflects the enduring influence of mid-century

ethnographers. Feasting has thus been frequently interpreted as communitarian in origin (community solidarity or social identity) (Thurnwald 1925 cited in Kaulicke 2005; Blinman 1989; Whittle 1996; Lindauer & Blitz 1997; Potter 2000; Bar-Yosef & Belfer-Cohen 2002; Marciniak 2004, pp. 133–35, 2005, pp. 207–8; Pappa et al. 2004; Goring-Morris & Horwitz 2007; Twiss 2008, pp. 227, 436–37; Sánchez 2008), and sometimes as multicomunity events (presumably for trade, marriage, defensive alliances, or other purposes—e.g., Pappa et al. 2004, Heyman et al. 2005, Abrams & LeRouge 2008, Taché 2011).

On the other hand, the use of standard ecological models that emphasize resource distribution roles of feasts is surprisingly rare in archaeology, with some exceptions published by Halstead (1990, 2007), Seeman (1979), and possibly Jackson (1991) with his “trade fair” model for Poverty Point.

More recently, agency models have emphasized strategies used by ambitious individuals to achieve social or political ends [Friedman & Rowlands 1977; Bradley 1984; Kim 1994; Clark & Blake 1994, p. 25; Dietler 1990, 2001; Hayden 1990; Patton 1993; Hamilakis 1999; Van Derwarker 1999; Wright 2004 (and authors therein); Garrido-Pena 2006; Rosenswig 2007; Aranda & Esquivel 2006, 2007], or simply as strategies to differentiate elites from others or to legitimate inequalities (Dietler 2001; Isaakidou et al. 2002, p. 90; Girella 2007).

Practical benefits of feasting are strongly emphasized in the political-ecology model endorsed by Hayden (2001). The underlying premise of this agency and ecology approach is that behaviors that are costly (in terms of time and effort), that persist over time, and that are widespread are likely to have practical advantages (adaptive values). Surpluses (such as those generated in and for feasting systems) can be used to obtain practical benefits such as obtaining allies for conflict situations, creating socioeconomic safety nets for times of need, acquiring mates for reproduction, establishing power, and enhancing the quality of material

life. In the political-ecology paradigm, the range of motivations for hosting feasts includes the promotion of tangible benefits for hosts, undertaking large work projects, and the socioeconomic solidarity of variously sized groups.

Independently, Junker et al. (1994, Junker 2001) developed similar political models of feasting based on ethnohistorical accounts of chiefdoms in the Philippines. Newer theoretical developments in human behavioral ecology also focus on similar principles of feasting in terms of costly signaling behavior (Bleige-Bird & Smith 2005). From this perspective, costly feasts signaled to competitors the relative power of the hosts and the likely outcome of physical confrontations, thereby dissuading conflict and sparing expenditures and damages.

In addition to the above schools of interpretation, there are also archaeologists who have explored the cognitive and experiential/phenomenological basis of feasts and how changes in these variables could have affected other cultural domains. Examples of cognitive models can be found in Pauketat & Emerson’s (1997, Pauketat et al. 2002, Emerson & Pauketat 2008) claims for ideological, cognitive, and phenomenological causes for the emergence of Mississippian centers. Hamilakis (1998), Vaughn (2005), Price (2008), and Whitley (2008) have also presented similar paradigms for other regions.

Thus, a considerable diversity of approaches is currently being used to understand the curious behaviors that make up feasting. These approaches range from cultural history to phenomenology. The fields of anthropology and archaeology have made remarkable advances in understanding feasting in the past 40 years, both in theoretical modeling and in methodological techniques for documenting its occurrences archaeologically. Feasting has assumed a central role in proposed models of social complexity, domestication, agency, prestige technologies, and gender. However, we have only just begun to understand many of the details, complexities and roles of feasting phenomena. There is still much work to do.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Given the remarkable florescence and theoretical productivity of the recent studies on feasting, the prospects are very good for feasting studies to continue to provide important new insights into past cultural organization and dynamics. We suggest that the areas that would profit from more ethnoarchaeological and ethnographic exploration include the following:

1. We need more ethnoarchaeological and historical comparative studies of feasting focusing on their roles in community dynamics and politics, their benefits to hosts and participants, and the relationship of feasts to the productive social units. We need to know why the entire store of wealth of the deceased is liquidated at some funeral feasts. We also need to test many assumptions about the material correlates of feasting at the household, corporate kinship, and community levels. Practices such as borrowing materials and ultimate disposal of gift food remains need to be documented.
2. Studies can also profit from more indigenous documentation of their own feasting practices. Some notable examples include the details and dynamics of feasting that have come about from land claims by native groups such as the Gitksan (A. Mills 2005) and from the recording of autobiographies (e.g., Ford 1968). In these cases, native elders and title holders have recounted the central role of feasts in their societies and engaged anthropologists to document the importance of feasts. A few earlier accounts by native individuals were recorded under the aegis of academics trained in the European traditions [e.g., George Hunt working for Franz Boas, and William Beynon (2000) working with Marius Barbeau]. However, native community leaders instigated the recent wave of accounts. Among the Gitksan, giving feasts was and is still central to the possession of titles in

corporate kinship groups that control traditional hunting, gathering, and fishing localities (J. Adams 1973). What is frequently missing, however, is the full range of feasting descriptions from nonelites as well as elites, an omission that should be addressed.

3. We need to know more about the rates of interest that are expected from loans and gifts, and why they vary from simple reciprocity in some cases or with some individuals, to double returns or more in other cases. We also need to know much more about the relative contributions of a broad range of individual households including those who do not host (or even attend) feasts, and the consequences of defaulting on expected feasting returns.
4. As part of understanding feasting in its relation to community dynamics, it will also be important to create models to explain why large-scale traditional feasts persist, intensify, or fade away under changing modern economic or other conditions.
5. Substantially more needs to be known about feasts among generalized hunter/gatherers (if feasts can even be said to exist) and what their distinctive characteristics are.
6. We need more information on the material correlates of feasts: the types, quantities, and preparations of foods used; the items and features used for preparing and consuming foods including their sizes and especially their locations.
7. Much more attention is also required in most areas in order to document the faunal and botanical remains associated with suspected feasting features. This has been a major deficiency in most areas, sometimes with the exception of funerary deposits (e.g., Aranda & Esquivel 2006, 2007; Munro & Grosman 2010).

Overall, consideration of broader ranges of explanatory possibilities would be useful, with more supporting arguments and tests of ideas in order to make interpretations more credible. The preceding kinds of observations and

analyses will be particularly critical in understanding the evolution of feasting behaviors in human history. With such an array of stimulating past insights and potential future topics, we expect that this feast of ideas will continue for a long time to come.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Michael Dietler for encouraging this journey through the history and evolution of feasting studies in the discipline.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abrams E, LeRouge M. 2008. Political complexity and mound construction among the Early and Late Adena of the Hocking Valley, Ohio. In *Transitions: Archaic and Early Woodland Research in the Ohio Country*, ed. M Otto, B Redmond, pp. 214–31. Athens: Ohio Univ. Press
- Adams J. 1973. *The Gitksan Potlatch*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Adams R. 2004. An ethnoarchaeological study of feasting in Sulawesi, Indonesia. *J. Anthropol. Archeol.* 23:56–78
- Adams R. 2007a. Maintaining cohesion in house societies of West Sumba, Indonesia. In *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*, ed. RJ Beck, pp. 344–62. Carbondale: South. Ill. Univ. Press
- Adams R. 2007b. *The megalithic tradition of West Sumba, Indonesia*. PhD thesis. Simon Fraser Univ., Burnaby, Br. Columbia
- Anderson A, Dibble C, eds. 1970. *Florentine Codex of Fray Bernardino de Sabagún*. Santa Fe: Sch. Am. Res.
- Andrushko A, Buzon M, Gibaja A, McEwan G, Simonetti A, Creaser R. 2011. Investigating a child sacrifice event from the Inca heartland. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 38:323–33
- Aranda G, ed. 2008. Power and prestige in Iberian prehistoric societies: the social context of food and drink consumption. *Cuad. Prehist. Arqueol. Univ. Granada (Spec. Iss.)* 18
- Aranda G, Esquivel J. 2006. Ritual funerario y comensalidad en las sociedades de la edad del bronce del sureste peninsular: la cultura de El Argar. *Trab. Prehist.* 63:117–33
- Aranda G, Esquivel J. 2007. Poder y prestigio en las sociedades de la cultura de El Argar El consumo communal de bovidos y ovicapridos en los rituales de enterramiento. *Trab. Prehist.* 64(2):95–118
- Bar-Yosef O, Belfer-Cohen A. 2002. Facing environmental crisis: societal and cultural changes at the transition from the Younger Dryas to the Holocene in the Levant. In *The Dawn of Farming in the Near East*, ed. R Cappers, S Bottema, pp. 55–66. Berlin: Ex Oriente
- Bender B. 1978. Gatherer-hunter to farmer, a social perspective. *World Archeol.* 10:204–22
- Bender B. 1985. Emergent tribal formations in the American midcontinent. *Am. Antiq.* 50:52–62
- Beynon W. 2000. *Potlatch at Gitsegukla*. Vancouver: Univ. Br. Columbia Press
- Blanco Vargas A, Guerrero Miranda J, Salgado González S. 1986. Patrones funerarios del Policromo Medio en el sector sur de Gran Nicoya. *Vínculos* 12:135–58
- Bleige-Bird R, Smith E. 2005. Signaling theory, strategic interaction and symbolic capital. *Curr. Anthropol.* 46:221–48
- Blinman E. 1989. Potluck in the protokiva: ceramics and ceremonialism in Pueblo I Villages. In *Architecture of Social Integration in Prehistoric Pueblos*, ed. W Lipe, M Hegmon, pp. 113–24. Cortez, CO: Crow Canyon Archaeol. Cent.
- Bradley R. 1984. *The Social Foundations of Prehistoric Britain*. London: Longman
- Bray T, ed. 2003. *The Archaeology and Politics of Food and Feasting in Early States and Empires*. New York: Kluwer Acad./Plenum
- Brookfield HC. 1972. Intensification and disintensification in Pacific agriculture. *Pac. Viewp.* 13:30–48

- Bullitt O. 1969. *Search for Sybaris*. London: J.M. Dent
- Clark J, Blake M. 1994. The power of prestige: competitive generosity and the emergence of rank societies in lowland Mesoamerica. In *Factional Competition and Political Development in the New World*, ed. E Brumfiel, J Fox, pp. 17–30. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Clarke M. 2001. Akha feasting: an ethnoarchaeological perspective. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 144–67
- Codere H. 1950. *Fighting with Property*. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
- Deagan K. 2004. Reconsidering Taino social dynamics after Spanish conquest: gender and class in culture contact studies. *Am. Antiq.* 69(4):597–626
- Dietler M. 1990. Driven by drink: the role of drinking in the political economy and the case of Early Iron Age France. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* 9:352–406
- Dietler M. 2001. Theorizing the feast: rituals of consumption, commensal politics, and power in African contexts. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 65–114
- Dietler M, Hayden B. 2001a. Digesting the feast—good to eat, good to drink, good to think: an introduction. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 1–22
- Dietler M, Hayden B, eds. 2001b. *Feasts Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian. Inst. Press
- Drucker P. 1941. Kwakiutl dancing societies. *Univ. Calif. Publ. Anthropol. Rec.* 2:201–30
- Dunbabin K. 2003. *The Roman Banquet*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Edwards J. 1984. *The Roman Cookery of Apicius*. Vancouver: Hartley and Marks
- Emerson T, Pauketat T. 2008. Historical-processual archaeology and culture making: unpacking the Southern Cult and Mississippian religion. See Hays-Gilpin & Whitley 2008, pp. 167–88
- Feil D. 1987. *The Evolution of Highland Papua New Guinea Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Firth R. 1951. *Elements of Social Organization*. London: Watts
- Firth R. 1959 (1929). *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*. Wellington, NZ: R.E. Owen
- Fletcher N. 2004. *Charlemagne's Tablecloth*. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Ford C. 1968. *Smoke from Their Fires*. Hamden, CT: Archon
- Forde C. 1953. Applied anthropology in government: British Africa. In *Anthropol. Today*, ed. A. Kroeber, pp. 841–65. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Fox J. 1996. Playing with power: ballcourts and political ritual in southern Mesoamerica. *Curr. Anthropol.* 37:483–509
- Friedman J, Rowlands M. 1977. Notes towards an epigenetic model of the evolution of 'civilization.' In *The Evolution of Social Systems*, ed. J Friedman, M Rowlands, pp. 201–76. London: Duckworth
- Garrido-Pena R. 2006. Transegalitarian societies: an ethnoarchaeological model for the analysis of Copper Age Bell Beaker using groups in Central Iberia. In *Social Inequality in Iberian Late Prehistory*, ed. P Diaz-del-Rio, L García, pp. 81–96. Oxford: Hadrian
- Girella L. 2007. Forms of commensal politics in Neopalatial Crete. *Creta Antica* 8:135–68
- Gold B, Donahue J, eds. 2005. *Roman Dining: A Special Issue of the American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 124. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- Goldschmidt W, Driver H. 1943. The Hupa white deerskin dance. *Univ. Calif. Public Am. Archaeol. Ethnol.* 35:103–31
- Goring-Morris N, Horwitz L. 2007. Funerals and feasts during the pre-pottery Neolithic B of the Near East. *Antiquity* 81:1–17
- Grimstead N, Bayham F. 2010. Evolutionary ecology, elite feasting, and the Hohokam: a case study from a southern Arizona platform mound. *Am. Antiq.* 75(4):841–64
- Gummerman G. 2010. Big hearths and big pots: Moche feasting on the north coast of Peru. In *Inside Ancient Kitchens*, ed. E Klarich, pp. 111–32. Boulder: Univ. Colo. Press
- Halstead P. 1990. Waste not, want not: traditional responses to crop failure in Greece. *Rural Hist.* 1:147–64
- Halstead P. 2007. Carcasses and commensality: investigating the social context of meat consumption in Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Greece. In *Cooking Up the Past*, ed. C Mee, J Renard, pp. 25–48. Oxford, UK: Oxbow
- Hamilakis Y. 1998. Eating the dead: mortuary feasting and the politics of memory in the Aegean Bronze Age societies. In *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, ed. K Branigan, pp. 115–32. Sheffield: Academic

- Hamilakis Y. 1999. The anthropology of food and drink consumption and Aegean archaeology. In *Palaeodiet in the Aegean*, ed. S Vaughan, W Coulson, pp. 55–63. Oxford, UK: Oxbow
- Hamilakis Y, Konsolaki E. 2004. Pigs for the gods: burnt animal sacrifices as embodied rituals at a Mycenaean sanctuary. *Oxford J. Archaeol.* 23(2):135–51
- Harris M. 1968. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell
- Hastorf C. 2003. Andean luxury foods. *Antiquity* 77:545–54
- Hastorf C. 2008. Food and feasting, social and political aspects. In *Encyclopedia Of Archaeology*, ed. D Pearsall, pp. 1386–95. Orlando: Academic
- Hayden B. 1990. Nimrods, piscators, pluckers, and planters: the emergence of food production. *J. Anthropol. Archeol.* 9:31–69
- Hayden B. 2001. Fabulous feasts: a prolegomenon to the importance of feasting. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 23–64
- Hayden B. 2003. Hunting and feasting: health and demographic consequences. *Before Farming* 4:166–76
- Hayden B. 2009a. Funerals as feasts: Why are they so important? *Cambridge Archeol. J.* 19:29–52
- Hayden B. 2009b. The proof is in the pudding: feasting and the origins of domestication. *Curr. Anthropol.* 50:597–601, 708–9
- Hayden B. 2009c. Forward. In *Ceramics Before Farming*, ed. P Jordan, M Zvelebil, pp. 19–26. Walnut Creek: Left Coast
- Hayden B. 2011a. Traditional corporate group economics in Southeast Asia. *Asian Perspect.* In press
- Hayden B. 2011b. Feasting in the Epipaleolithic of the Fertile Crescent. In *Guess Who Came to Dinner*, ed. G Aranda. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press. In press
- Hayden B, Villeneuve S. 2010. Who benefits from complexity? A view from Futuna. In *Pathways to Power*, ed. T Price, G Feinman, pp. 95–146. New York: Springer
- Hays-Gilpin K, Whitley D, eds. 2008. *Belief in the Past*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast
- Heyman M, Abrams E, Freter A. 2005. Late Archaic community aggregation and feasting in the Hocking Valley. In *The Emergence of the Moundbuilders: The Archaeology of Tribal Societies in Southeastern Ohio*, ed. E Abrams, A Freter, pp. 67–81. Athens: Ohio Univ. Press
- Hill J. 1966. A prehistoric community in eastern Arizona. *SW J. Anthropol.* 22:9–30
- Iriarte J, Gillam JC, Mazozzi O. 2008. Monumental burials and memorial feasting: an example from the southern Brazilian highlands. *Antiquity* 82:947–61
- Isaakidou V, Halstead P, Davis S, Stocker J. 2002. Burnt animal sacrifice at the Mycenaean ‘Palace of Nestor’, Pylos. *Antiquity* 76:86–92
- Isbell W, Groleau A. 2010. The Wari brewer woman: feasting, gender, offerings, and memory. In *Inside Ancient Kitchens: New Directions in the Study of Daily Meals and Feasts*, ed. E Klarich, pp. 191–220. Boulder: Univ. Colo. Press
- Jackson H. 1991. The trade fair in hunter-gatherer interaction: the role of intersocietal trade in the evolution of Poverty Point culture. In *Between Bands and States*, ed. S Gregg, pp. 265–86. Carbondale: South. Ill. Univ. Press
- Jackson H, Scott S. 2003. Patterns of elite faunal utilization at Moundville, Alabama. *Am. Antiq.* 68(3):552–72
- Jennbert K. 1985. Neolithisation—a Scanian perspective. *J. Dan. Archeol.* 4:196–97
- Jennbert K. 1987. Neolithisation processes in the Nordic area. *Swed. Archeol.* 1981–1985:21–35
- Jennings J, Antrobus K, Atencio S, Glavich E, Johnson R, et al. 2005. Drinking beer in a blissful mood: alcohol production, operational chains, and feasting in the ancient world. *Curr. Anthropol.* 46(2):275–303
- Junker L. 2001. The evolution of ritual feasting systems in prehispanic Philippine chiefdoms. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 267–310
- Junker L, Mudar K, Schwaller M. 1994. Social stratification, household wealth, and competitive feasting in 15th/16th-century Philippine chiefdoms. *Res. Econ. Anthropol.* 15:307–58
- Kansa S, Kennedy A, Campbell S, Carter E. 2009. Resource exploitation at Late Neolithic Domuztepe: fauna and botanical evidence. *Curr. Anthropol.* 50(6):897–914
- Kaulicke P. 2005. Las fiestas y sus residuos. *Bol. Arqueol. PUCP* 9:387–402
- Kaulicke P, Dillehay T, eds. 2005. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP, Encuentros: Identidad, Poder y Manejo de Espacios Públicos*, Vol. 9. Lima: Univ. Catol. Peru, Dep. Humanid.

- Kelly L. 2001. A case of ritual feasting at the Cahokia Site. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 334–67
- Kim S. 1994. Burials, pigs, and political prestige in Neolithic China. *Curr. Anthropol.* 35(2):119–33
- Kirch P. 1994. *The Wet and the Dry: Irrigation and Agricultural Intensification in Polynesia*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Kirch P. 2000. *On the Road of the Winds*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Kirsch A. 1973. Feasting and social oscillation. *Southeast Asia Program, Data Pap.* 92, Cornell Univ., Dep. Asian Stud., Ithaca, NY
- Klarich E, ed. 2010a. *Inside Ancient Kitchens: New Directions in the Study of Daily Meals and Feasts*. Boulder: Univ. Colo. Press
- Klarich E. 2010b. Behind the scenes and into the kitchen: new directions for the study of prehistoric meals. See Klarich 2010, pp. 1–16
- Knight V. 2001. Feasting and the emergence of platform mound ceremonialism in Eastern North America. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 311–33
- Kuijt I. 2009. What do we really know about food storage, surplus and feasting in preagricultural communities? *Curr. Anthropol.* 50(5):641–44
- Langebaek C. 2005. Fiestas y caciques muisecas en el Infeiernito, Colombia: un análisis de la relación entre festejos y organización política. *Bol. Arqueol. PUCP* 9:281–95
- Lau G. 2002. Feasting and ancestor veneration at Chinchawas, North Highlands of Ancash, Peru. *Latin Am. Antiq.* 13(3):279–304
- Lemonnier P. 1990. *Guerres et Festins*. Paris: Maison Sci. l'Homme
- Lindauer O. 2000. A Schoolhouse Point perspective on Salado community development. In *Salado*, ed. J Dean, pp. 219–40. Albuquerque: Univ. N.M. Press
- Lindauer O, Blitz J. 1997. Higher ground: the archaeology of North American platform mounds. *J. Archeol. Res.* 5(2):169–207
- Longacre W. 1964. Archaeology as anthropology: a case study. *Science* 144:1454–55
- Lucero L. 2003. The politics of ritual: the emergence of classic Maya rulers. *Curr. Anthropol.* 44(4):523–58
- Marciniak A. 2004. Everyday life at the LBK settlement: a zooarchaeological perspective. In *LBK Dialogues: Studies in the Formation of the Linear Pottery Culture*, ed. A Lukes, M Zvelebil, pp. 129–41. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Marciniak A. 2005. *Placing Animals in the Neolithic: Social Zooarchaeology of Prehistoric Farming Communities*. London: UCL Press
- Mauss M. 1924. *The Gift*. New York: Free Press
- Megalousi F, Papadopoulou S, Sgourou M. 2007. Plant offerings from the classical necropolis of Limenas, Thasos, northern Greece. *Antiquity* 81:933–43
- McIlwraith T. 1948. *The Bella Coola Indians*. Toronto: Univ. Tor. Press
- Mills A. 2005. 'Hang Onto These Words': *Johnny David's Delamuukw Evidence*. Toronto: Univ. Tor. Press
- Mills B, ed. 2004. *Identity, Feasting and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*. Boulder: Univ. Press Colo.
- Mills B. 2007. Performing the feast: visual display and suprahousehold commensalism in the Puebloan Southwest. *Am. Antiq.* 72:210–39
- Montgomery J. 2000. Ibn Fadln and the Rsiyyah. *J. Arab. Islam. Stud.* 3:1–25
- Morris C. 1979. Maize beer in the economics, politics, and religion of the Inca Empire. In *Fermented Food Beverages in Nutrition*, ed. C Gastineau, W Darby, N Turner, pp. 21–35. New York: Academic
- Munro N, Grosman L. 2010. Early evidence (ca. 12,000 B.P.) for feasting at a burial cave in Israel. *Roc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107:15362–66
- Nairn C. 1991. *Ongka's Big Moka (Kawelka)*. London: Image Media Services, Granada Telev.
- Norman N. 2010. Feasts in motion: archaeological views of parades, ancestral pageants, and socio-political process in the Hueda Kingdom, 1650–1727 AD. *J. World Prehist.* 23:239–54
- Pappa M, Halstead P, Kotsakis K, Urem-Kotsou D. 2004. Evidence for large-scale feasting at Late Neolithic Makriyalos, N. Greece. In *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*, ed. P Halstead, J Barrett, pp. 16–44. Oxford, UK: Oxbow
- Pastore R. 1985. Excavations at Boyd's Cove: the 1985 field season. In *Archaeology in Newfoundland & Labrador 1985*, ed. J Sproull Thomson, C Thomson, pp. 218–32. St. John's: Newfoundl. Mus.

- Patton M. 1993. *Statements in Stone: Monuments and Society in Neolithic Brittany*. London: Routledge
- Pauketat T, Emerson T, eds. 1997. *Cahokia: Domination and Ideology in the Mississippian World*. Lincoln: Univ. Neb. Press
- Pauketat T, Kelly L, Fritz G, Lopinot N, Elias S, Hargrave E. 2002. The residues of feasting and public ritual at early Cahokia. *Am. Antiq.* 67(2):257–79
- Pechenkina E, Ambrose S, Xiaolin M, Benfer R Jr. 2005. Reconstructing northern Chinese Neolithic subsistence practices by isotopic analysis. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 33:1176–89
- Piddocke S. 1965. The potlatch system of the Southern Kwakiutl: a new perspective. *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 21:244–64
- Pluckhahn T, Compton J, Bonhage-Freund M. 2006. Evidence of small-scale feasting from the Woodland Period site of Kolomoki, Georgia. *J. Field Archaeol.* 31:263–84
- Pollington S. 2003. *The Mead-Hall: Feasting in Anglo-Saxon England*. Hockwold-cum-Wilton, UK: Anglo-Saxon Books
- Post R. 1938. The Sinkaietk or southern Okanagon of Washington: the subsistence quest. In *The Sinkaietk or Southern Okanagon of Washington: Gen. Ser. Anthropol., Contrib. Lab. Anthropol.*, ed. L Spier, 2(6):11–34. Menasha, WI: George Banta
- Potter J. 2000. Pots, parties, and politics: communal feasting in the American Southwest. *Am. Antiq.* 65(3):471–92
- Price N. 2008. Bodylore and the archaeology of embedded religion: dramatic license in the funerals of the Vikings. See Hays-Gilpen & Whitley 2008, pp. 143–66
- Rappaport R. 1968. *Pigs for the Ancestors*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press
- Reay M. 1959. *The Kuma: Freedom And Conformity In The New Guinea Highlands*. Melbourne: Melbourne Univ. Press
- Rosenwig R. 2007. Beyond identifying elites: feasting as a means to understand early Middle Formative society on the Pacific coast of Mexico. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* 26:1–27
- Rosman A, Rubel P. 1971. *Feasting with Mine Enemy*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press
- Russo M. 2008. Late Archaic shell rings and society in the Southeast U.S. *SAA Archaeol. Rec.* 8(5):18–22
- Ruyle E. 1973. Slavery, surplus, and stratification on the Northwest Coast: the ethnoenergetics of an incipient stratification system. *Curr. Anthropol.* 14:603–17
- Sahlins M. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Sánchez M. 2008. El consumo de alimento como estrategia social: recetas para la construcción de la memoria y creación de identidades. *Cuad. Prehist. Arqueol. Univ. Granada* 18:17–39
- Schmandt-Besserat D. 2001. Feasting in the ancient Near East. See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 391–403
- Schwadron M. 2010. Prehistoric landscapes of complexity: Archaic and Woodland period shell works, shell rings, and tree islands of the Everglades, South Florida. In *Trend, Tradition and Turmoil: What Happened to the Southeast Archaic?*, ed. D Thomas, M Sanger, pp. 113–46. New York: Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.
- Schwarz F. 1996. Recent Indian communal feasting structures in Newfoundland and Labrador. Presented at Can. Archaeol. Assoc. Annu. Meet. Abstr., Halifax
- Seeman M. 1979. Feasting with the dead: Ohio Hopewell charnel house ritual as a context for redistribution. In *Hopewell Archaeology, The Chillicothe Conference*, ed. D Brose, N Greber, pp. 39–46. Kent, OH: Kent State Univ. Press
- Sheehan G. 1989. In the belly of the whale. *Archaeology* 42:52–64
- Sherratt S. 2004. Feasting in Homeric epic. In *The Mycenaean Feast*, ed. J Wright, pp. 181–213. Princeton, NJ: Am. Sch. Class. Stud. Athens
- Shimada I, Shinoda K, Farnum J, Corruccini R, Watanabe H. 2004. An integrated analysis of pre-historic mortuary practices. *Curr. Anthropol.* 45(3):369–86
- Shryock A. 1987. The Wright Mound reexamined. *Midcont. J. Archeol.* 12:243–68
- Sillitoe P. 1978. Big men and war in New Guinea. *Man* 13:252–71
- Simoons F. 1968. *A Ceremonial Ox*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Smith I. 1965. *Windmill Hill and Avebury*. Oxford: Clarendon
- Snarkis M. 1984. Central America: the lower Caribbean. In *The Archaeology of Lower Central America*, ed. F Lange, D Stone, pp. 195–232. Albuquerque: Univ. N.M. Press

- Stevenson H. 1943. *The Economics of the Central Chin Tribes*. Bombay: Times India Press
- Strathern A. 1971. *The Rope of Moka*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Suttles S. 1968. Coping with abundance: subsistence on the Northwest Coast. In *Man the Hunter*, ed. R Lee, I Devore, pp. 56–68. Chicago: Aldine de Gruyter
- Taché K. 2011. *Structure and Regional Diversity of the Meadowood Interaction Sphere*, Univ. Mich. Mem. 48. Ann Arbor, MI: Mus. Anthropol.
- Thomas J. 1991. *Rethinking the Neolithic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Toll H. 1985. *Pottery, production, public architecture and the Chaco Anasazi system*. PhD thesis. Univ. Colo., Boulder
- Tooker E. 1964. *An Ethnography of the Huron Indians*, Vol. Bull. 190. Washington, DC: Bur. Am. Ethnol.
- Twiss K. 2008. Transformations in an early agricultural society: feasting in the southern Levantine Pre-Pottery Neolithic. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* 27:418–42
- Van Derwarker A. 1999. Feasting and status at the Toqua site. *Southeast. Archaeol.* 18(1):11–24
- Van der Veen M. 2003. When is food a luxury? *World Archaeol.* 34(3):405–27
- Vaughn K. 2005. Crafts and the materialization of chiefly power in Nasca. *Archaeol. Pap. Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 14:113–30
- Vega-Centeno Sara-Lafosse R. 2007. Construction, labor organization, and feasting during the Late Archaic period in the Central Andes. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* 26:150–71
- Viner S, Evans J, Albarella U, Pearson M.P. 2010. Cattle mobility in prehistoric Britain: strontium isotope analysis of cattle teeth from Durrington Walls (Wiltshire, Britain). *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 37:2812–20
- Wainwright G, Longworth I. 1971. *Durrington Wall, Excavations 1966–1968*. London: Soc. Antiq.
- Waley A. 1996. *The Book of Songs*. New York: Grove
- Weiner A. 1988. *The Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Welch P, Scarry M. 1995. Status-related variation in foodways in the Moundville chiefdom. *Am. Antiq.* 60(3):397–419
- Wells C, Novotny C, Hawken J. 2007. Quantitative modeling of soil chemical data from inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectroscopy reveals evidence for cooking and eating in ancient Mesoamerican plazas. *Archaeol. Chem.* 968:210–30
- Wills W, Crown P. 2004. Commensal politics in the prehispanic Southwest. See B Mills 2004, pp. 153–72
- White C. 2001. Isotopic evidence for Maya patterns of deer and dog use at Preclassic Colha. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 28:89–107
- Whitley D. 2008. Cognition, emotion, and belief: first steps in an archaeology of religion. See Hays-Gilpen & Whitley 2008, pp. 85–104
- Whittle A. 1996. *Europe in the Neolithic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Wiessner P. 2001. Of feasting and value: Enga feasts in a historical perspective (Papua New Guinea). See Dietler & Hayden 2001b, pp. 115–13
- Williams P, Nash D, Moseley M, deFrance S, Ruales M, et al. 2005. Los encuentros y las bases para la administración política Wari. *Bol. Arqueol. PUCP* 9:207–32
- Wolkstein D, Kramer N. 1983. *Inanna, Queen of Heaven and Earth*. New York: Harper & Row
- Wright J, ed. 2004. *The Mycenaean Feast*. Princeton, NJ: Am. Sch. Class. Stud., Athens
- Yerkes R. 2005. Bone chemistry, body parts, and growth marks: evaluating Ohio Hopewell and Cahokia Mississippian seasonality, subsistence, ritual, and feasting. *Am. Antiq.* 70(2):241–65
- Young M. 1971. *Fighting with Food*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press



Contents

Prefatory Chapter

Anthropological Relocations and the Limits of Design
Lucy Suchman 1

Archaeology

The Archaeology of Consumption
Paul R. Mullins 133

Migration Concepts in Central Eurasian Archaeology
Michael D. Frachetti 195

Archaeologists and Indigenous People: A Maturing Relationship?
Tim Murray 363

Archaeological Ethnography: A Multitemporal Meeting Ground
for Archaeology and Anthropology
Yannis Hamilakis 399

Archaeologies of Sovereignty
Adam T. Smith 415

A Century of Feasting Studies
Brian Hayden and Suzanne Villeneuve 433

Biological Anthropology

Menopause, A Biocultural Perspective
Melissa K. Melby and Michelle Lampl 53

Ethnic Groups as Migrant Groups: Improving Understanding
of Links Between Ethnicity/Race and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes and
Associated Conditions
Tessa M. Pollard 145

From Mirror Neurons to Complex Imitation in the Evolution
of Language and Tool Use
Michael A. Arbib 257

From Hominoid to Hominid Mind: What Changed and Why? <i>Brian Hare</i>	293
The Human Microbiota as a Marker for Migrations of Individuals and Populations <i>Maria Gloria Dominguez-Bello and Martin J. Blaser</i>	451
Linguistics and Communicative Practices	
Publics and Politics <i>Francis Cody</i>	37
Ritual and Oratory Revisited: The Semiotics of Effective Action <i>Rupert Stasch</i>	159
Language and Migration to the United States <i>Hilary Parsons Dick</i>	227
The Balkan Languages and Balkan Linguistics <i>Victor A. Friedman</i>	275
International Anthropology and Regional Studies	
Central Asia in the Post–Cold War World <i>Morgan Y. Liu</i>	115
The Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine <i>Khaled Furani and Dan Rabinowitz</i>	475
Sociocultural Anthropology	
Substance and Relationality: Blood in Contexts <i>Janet Carsten</i>	19
Hallucinations and Sensory Overrides <i>T.M. Lubrman</i>	71
Phenomenological Approaches in Anthropology <i>Robert Desjarlais and C. Jason Throop</i>	87
Migration, Remittances, and Household Strategies <i>Jeffrey H. Cohen</i>	103
Climate and Culture: Anthropology in the Era of Contemporary Climate Change <i>Susan A. Crate</i>	175
Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times <i>Didier Fassin</i>	213

The Cultural Politics of Nation and Migration <i>Steven Vertovec</i>	241
Migrations and Schooling <i>Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, Tasha Darbes, Sandra Isabel Dias, and Matt Sutin</i>	311
Tobacco <i>Matthew Koberman and Peter Benson</i>	329
Transnational Migration and Global Health: The Production and Management of Risk, Illness, and Access to Care <i>Carolyn Sargent and Stéphanie Larchanché</i>	345
Concepts and Folk Theories <i>Susan A. Gelman and Cristine H. Legare</i>	379
Migration-Religion Studies in France: Evolving Toward a Religious Anthropology of Movement <i>Sophie Bava</i>	493
Theme I: Anthropology of Mind	
Hallucinations and Sensory Overrides <i>T.M. Lubrman</i>	71
Phenomenological Approaches in Anthropology <i>Robert Desjarlais and C. Jason Throop</i>	87
From Mirror Neurons to Complex Imitation in the Evolution of Language and Tool Use <i>Michael A. Arbib</i>	257
From Hominoid to Hominid Mind: What Changed and Why? <i>Brian Hare</i>	293
Concepts and Folk Theories <i>Susan A. Gelman and Cristine H. Legare</i>	379
Theme II: Migration	
Migration, Remittances, and Household Strategies <i>Jeffrey H. Cohen</i>	103
Ethnic Groups as Migrant Groups: Improving Understanding of Links Between Ethnicity/Race and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Conditions <i>Tessa M. Pollard</i>	145
Migration Concepts in Central Eurasian Archaeology <i>Michael D. Frachetti</i>	195

Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times <i>Didier Fassin</i>	213
Language and Migration to the United States <i>Hilary Parsons Dick</i>	227
The Cultural Politics of Nation and Migration <i>Steven Vertovec</i>	241
Migrations and Schooling <i>Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, Tasha Darbes, Sandra Isabel Dias, and Matt Sutin</i>	311
Transnational Migration and Global Health: The Production and Management of Risk, Illness, and Access to Care <i>Carolyn Sargent and Stéphanie Larchanché</i>	345
The Human Microbiota as a Marker for Migrations of Individuals and Populations <i>Maria Gloria Dominguez-Bello and Martin J. Blaser</i>	451
Migration-Religion Studies in France: Evolving Toward a Religious Anthropology of Movement <i>Sophie Bava</i>	493

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 31–40	509
Cumulative Index of Chapter Titles, Volumes 31–40	512

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at <http://anthro.annualreviews.org/errata.shtml>