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Abstract: The changing nature and meaning of luxury foods is reviewed. It is proposed that the storage pits of iron Age southern Britain were used to store grain surpluses, rather than seed corn, that the grain stored in such pits was used in large, communal feasts, and that the hillforts, where many such pits are found, functioned as locations for feasting. By the late Iron Age this particular evidence for feasting disappears, to be replaced in some areas by the deposition of imported luxuries in individual graves, implying the use of such items for the display of the individual's prestige. During the early Roman period a further shift is observed, with the importation and consumption of exotic foods at military and urban sites, possibly representing class membership. The evidence implies that food, initially through communal feasting and later through the individual consumption of exotics, was used as an instrument of social change.

The importance of feasting in past societies has recently been highlighted (e.g., Dietler and Hayden 2001). There are many different types of feast, but what they all have in common is the communal consumption of food and the social component of display. Feasts typically include the consumption of luxury foods. While definitions of such foods vary, they all emphasize expense, exotic origin, or exclusivity in terms of access and desirability (Van der Veen 2003). They are, by definition, foods that are outside the reach of day-to-day mass consumption. The consumption of such foods is regarded primarily as a means of advertising and displaying social status—as the lavish consumption of food with a view to enhancing one's prestige (e.g., Appadurai 1986; Douglas and Isherwood 1979; Miller 1995). This association of luxury foods with elites has led some scholars to suggest that such foods will occur only in societies with strong social stratification (Diamond 1997). Others, however (e.g., Dietler and Hayden 2001; Goody 1982; Leach 2003; Van der Veen 2003), have identified that in less highly stratified societies the consumption of luxury foods is not so much absent as takes a different form. Here, large communal feasting events form the prime context for luxury food consumption, and ethnographic evidence suggests that the emphasis at such feasts lies not on expensive and exotic foods (though these may also be used), but on staple foods that are elevated in status by the sheer quantity consumed, the elaborate way in which they are displayed, and the diversity in which they are prepared (i.e., quantity over quality). Some prefer to call such foods "feasting foods" (e.g., Hayden 2001) to distinguish them from rare, exotic, and expensive foods. Such a distinction is useful in that it highlights differences in the kinds of foods consumed, but it conceals the fact that for many people the consumption of large quantities of food was (and is) a luxury, normally unattainable, and thus a rare but much desired event. In this chapter the term luxury foods is used to cover all foods consumed at special occasions where the acquisition, maintenance, and display of prestige and social power are at stake, while recognizing that this masks distinctions in the foods eaten. These distinctions and their meaning are discussed below.

As luxury foods are manifestations of the status of individuals or communities, the identification of such foods in the archaeological record may be used to identify differential status between groups of individuals and communities (e.g., Bakels and Jacomet 2003; Emery 2003; Kirch and O'Day 2003). This is, however, not the whole story. Food, after all, is material culture and as such is both a manifestation of social identity and a tool with which social identities and relations are created, maintained, and transformed. Hosting a feast is not just an expression of one's prestige and status but also a way of acquiring it (Dietler 1996; Dietler and Hayden 2001). By eating the food, the guests accept the obligation to give something in return, either deference or labor. Feasting and the associated consumption of luxury foods may thus become an instrument in the acquisition of social status.

This study will identify the occurrence and use of luxury foods in Iron Age and early Roman Britain and explore the extent to which their consumption was used in the creation of social change. This period (ca. 800 B.C.-A.D. 100) represents a time of major change in Britain (and in Europe more generally) in terms of population growth, settlement pattern, and agriculture, as well as society in general. At the start of the period most people in Britain were farmers engaged in mixed farming practices. After the Roman conquest we see the establishment of military settlements, the rise of towns, a complex road system, specialized craft production, markets, long-distance trade and exchange, and the emergence of different social classes. As far as food is concerned, these changes have been studied primarily in terms of agriculture and food production, often specifically.
to assess the impact of the Roman invasion on the agricultural system (e.g., Grant 1989; Jones 1981, 1989; Van der Veen and O'Connor 1998). This chapter will, instead, focus on food consumption and regard food as material culture, rather than a purely economic commodity. The focus will be restricted to plant foods only and to central and southern Britain. Moreover, only developments that took place at the start of the Roman period will be considered here; the remainder of this period will be the subject of a future paper.

Iron Age Britain (ca. 800 B.C.–A.D. 43)

For a detailed discussion of Iron Age Britain the reader is referred to Cunliffe (1991), Haselgrove (1999), and Hill (1995a). To summarize briefly, the Iron Age starts around 800–700 B.C. with the introduction of the new iron technology. The period ends with the invasion of the Roman army in A.D. 43, though it is not until about A.D. 100 that most of England and Wales are incorporated within the Roman Empire.

Iron Age Britain may be characterized as a country populated by farmers. Indeed, mixed farming was the basis of all Iron Age communities (Cunliffe 1991; Hill 1995a). During the period, we see an expansion of agriculture, and it is a time of growing regionalism, not just in settlement and subsistence but also in social organization and belief systems (Cunliffe 1991). While these changes in agriculture and settlement were undoubtedly linked to a significant rise in population, changes in social organization may have formed the main impetus for change (Hill 1995b).

Most settlements consisted of small, isolated farmsteads dispersed throughout the landscape, though agglomerations or even small villages existed in some parts of the country. The only other main category of site is hillforts. These are much larger sites, typically circa 300–600 m in diameter, and usually found on prominent hilltop locations. They are characterized by substantial bank and ditch ramparts. Such sites are known from the Bronze Age, but most of them were built during the Iron Age and only in a restricted part of the country (Figure 6-1). While they are not a rigidly uniform class of site, in central-southern Britain the first Iron Age hillforts appear around 600 B.C., some 200 years after the start of the Iron Age. Initially they are simple in outline and of medium size (approximately 300 m in diameter). Although they were originally seen as central places and residences of the elite (part of redistributive chiefdoms), it is now clear that these sites may not have been occupied permanently, since little evidence for occupation or indeed for their elite status has been found (Hill 1995b). More recent interpretations emphasize their communal role, possibly as foci for rituals (Hill 1995a, 1995b; Sharples 1991).

From about 300 B.C. we see a dramatic change. Several of the hillforts increase in size and receive very substantial additions to the ramparts; moreover, there is evidence for increased occupation. These later hillforts are referred to as "developed" hillforts. At the same time, we see that most other hillforts and smaller settlements in the vicinity of these developed hillforts are being abandoned, and

there is clear evidence of settlement nucleation. The very appearance of the developed hillforts is strongly suggestive of a need to emphasize power and dominance, with the earthworks being far in excess of what was needed in terms of defense. They may thus represent a symbol of the community’s prestige (Haselgrove 1999).

By the Late Iron Age (ca. 100 B.C. onward) the pattern changes: the hillforts are abandoned and settlement disperses again. It is not clear exactly what causes these changes, but most authors refer to a combination of internal and external factors (Cunliffe 1994; Haselgrove 1999; Hill 1995a). At this same time we see the first signs of long-distance exchange, although the evidence is currently restricted to southeast England only. Here we see evidence for overseas coinage and the first imports of exotic foods, such as wine brought in amphorae from the Mediterranean world. Throughout the period there is little evidence of social stratification, with the exception of the Late Iron Age in southeast England.
Food in Iron Age Britain

The principal foods identified for Iron Age Britain are cattle, sheep, and pigs in terms of animal protein and emmer wheat, spelt wheat, and barley in terms of plant foods (Jones 1981, 1989; Hambleton 1999). Regional variations in the relative proportions of these main staple foods are usually explained with reference to local environmental conditions and social form. The most striking aspects of cereal production patterns in Iron Age Britain are (1) the distribution of grain-rich samples and (2) the distribution of large-scale grain storage facilities. Most carbonized seed assemblages found on Iron Age sites consist of cereal chaff fragments and weed seeds, that is, the by-products of the cereal harvest (Figure 6-2). Grain-rich samples are rare and usually interpreted as the accidental destruction of a grain store by fire (Hillman 1981). Surprisingly, however, we do find some sites with large quantities of burnt grain, implying that at these sites the amount of grain handled for either production or consumption was substantially greater than average and that, consequently, such accidents had a higher chance of occurring (Hillman 1981 and contra Jones 1985; see Van der Veen and Jones 2006a and 2006b for a detailed discussion of the interpretation of scale in the production and consumption of cereals). Significantly, assemblages with a large number of grain-rich samples occur exclusively in central-southern Britain.

This distribution coincides with that of storage pits and, to a lesser extent, four-post structures (Figure 6-3; Gent 1983). These have both been widely identified as storage facilities for cereal grain (Bersu 1940; Cunliffe 1992; Reynolds 1974). Recent four-post granaries use ventilation and the act of raising the grain off the ground as mechanisms to prevent damage by heat, moisture, or vermin, while pits use a hermetic seal—by a clay layer or similar means—to prevent all three of the preceding problems (any oxygen present is soon used up thus preventing any biological activity and thus any real damage), plus fire and theft. The geographical distribution of the four-post structures is wider than that of the storage pits, but both have their greatest concentration in central-southern Britain, and they are especially common within hillforts (Figure 6-4), though their distributions do not totally coincide. Four-post structures are usually interpreted as granaries to which access is needed on a regular basis, while storage pits, which only function as satisfactory storage features as long as the content of the pit remains hermetically sealed, are interpreted as silos for long-term storage, specifically of seed corn (Bradley 1978; Cunliffe 1992:2000:130; Jones 1984; Reynolds 1974). This is, in fact, contra Bersu (1940:98), who first discussed the presence of the storage pits on Iron Age sites. He argued that seed corn was probably stored in above-ground granaries, not in pits (see below).

While storage pits are known from earlier periods, these are not common and usually much smaller than the Iron Age examples, and storage pits disappear quite abruptly during the Late Iron Age, not just in Britain. Their chronological spread is very specific: they occur between circa 800 and 100 B.C. in Britain (Cunliffe 1992) and, similarly, circa 900 and 20 B.C. in northern France (Gransar 2000). It is true that the geographical distribution of these storage pits (Figure 6-4) is mostly conditioned by the underlying geology (they are found primarily on calcareous bedrocks but also on gravels and clays: Bradley 1978; Cunliffe 1992; Fenton 1983), but this alone cannot explain their presence. The pits also predominate on certain types of site, that is, on hillforts (Cunliffe 1992; Gent 1983), and the amount of storage available often exceeds the needs of the individual site, especially in the Early Iron Age, suggesting the practice of some form of centralized storage (Cunliffe 1992; Sharples 1991). Thus, the very specific chronological and geographical distribution of these pits in both Britain and northern France implies a close tie with a particular agricultural or social system.
As indicated above, many archaeologists believe that storage pits were used for seed corn—their assumption is that seed corn needed to be stored for a long period, over the winter, to safeguard the grain between harvest (July/August) and sowing the following spring (e.g., Bradley 1978; Cunliffe 1992, 2000:130; Jones 1984; Reynolds 1974). There are problems with the interpretation that storage pits were used for the storage of seed corn. First, it is incorrect to assume that wheat sown during the Iron Age was spring-sown. During the Neolithic and Bronze Age emmer wheat was the principal wheat crop in Britain, but it was rapidly replaced by spelt wheat in the Iron Age (Jones 1981). Some authors (e.g., Jones 1981), referring to Percival (1974), have assumed that emmer wheat was a spring-sown crop, but Hillman (1981) has argued convincingly that this is unlikely. All wild cereals germinate in autumn and early cultivars must initially have been autumn-sown. Spring-sown varieties developed later (the date of the earliest introduction is not known) in response to specific environmental or agronomic conditions. When Percival undertook his research in the early 1920s, however, emmer wheat had ceased to be an important crop and as a rare and minor crop was only grown in spring, hence the biased information provided by Percival (Hillman 1981). Spelt wheat is universally regarded as best suited to an autumn sowing regime (Jones 1981). Thus, the crop most commonly stored in these pits, spelt wheat, would have been an autumn-sown crop, and this would have meant that the time between harvest and sowing was so short (no more than two months) that it would not justify the construction of pits for the storage of seed corn. Campbell and Hamilton (2000) have, in fact, suggested that spring sowing was first practiced in Britain at the end of the Iron Age, with spelt wheat and barley prior to that being sown as a malting in autumn (at least in central-southern Britain).

Second, there is no ethnographic evidence for the storing of seed corn in underground pits. Sigaut (1988:22) refers to the storage of grain in such silos as the storage of bulk grain on a rather large scale, and Fenton (1983:586) refers to pit storage as a way of securing surplus grain for long periods and keeping it safe.
from intruders. He goes on to say that “there is nowhere in the more recent literature a suggestion that seed-grain is stored in this way, but rather surplus grain” (Fenton 1983:586).

For these reasons I suggest that the Iron Age storage pits were used for storing surplus grain, not seed corn. It is worth mentioning here that a large proportion of these storage pits have so-called special deposits placed in the bottom of the pit, after the grain was removed (Grant 1984a, 1991; Hill 1995c). These deposits consist of complete or partial human skeletons, complete or partial dispositions of animal skeletons such as dog and horse, and tools and other objects. They are witness to the importance of ritual in the “domestic” life of Iron Age people (Hill 1995c) and are usually interpreted as offerings to the deities, associated with fertility rites, and as a form of thanksgiving for the safe preservation of the grain (Cunliffe 1992; Hill 1995c).

Archaeological Recognition of Luxury Food Consumption

As luxury foods are culture specific it is not easy to recognize them in the archaeological record. When no ethnographic or historical evidence directly related to the society under study is available, we have recourse to just a few lines of enquiry. First, tracing the import of foreign, exotic foods is the most straightforward and frequently used. Such evidence exists for the Roman period (e.g., Bakels and Jacomet 2003; Miller 1969; Wilcox 1977) and the earliest evidence for foods imported into Britain dates to the Late Iron Age (see below).

Second, we can identify foods that are rare and/or difficult to obtain or are closely associated with ritual practices by comparing assemblages from different sites and analyzing the relative abundance and context of specific foods. The only foods in Iron Age Britain that have been identified as having received a special status are wild mammals and birds (e.g., deer and raven), primarily through their occurrence in “structured” or “special” deposits at the bottom of grain storage pits (Grant 1984b; Hill 1995c).

Finally, we can identify the context of consumption. In societies where luxury food consumption is strongly associated with communal feasting we can try to identify such occasions. Communal feasts are large-scale consumption events, both in terms of the number of participants and in terms of the quantity of food consumed and are identifiable as such by the sheer quantity or size of cooking and serving vessels, food preparation installations, special display constructions, and so on (Blitz 1993; Dietler and Hayden 2001; Hayden 2001). In terms of Iron Age Britain, I propose that the hillforts of central-southern Britain represent locations for such feasting events. They are large communal sites, prominent in the landscape, and contain cereal storage facilities that far exceed the needs of the occupants, especially as occupation is thought to have been seasonal or at least nonpermanent during the Early Iron Age. Moreover, I suggest that these storage pits are silos used for the medium-term preservation of surplus grain (not seed corn), which was intended for use during these feasts.

Feasting in Iron Age Britain

During the Late Bronze Age in Britain, elites had maintained their position by controlling the long-distance trade of precious metals. With the introduction of the new iron technology the role of this trade was reduced and their position threatened. This led to an increased reliance on the creation of—and control over—agrarian surpluses during the Iron Age (Cunliffe 2000:135–196; Haselgrove 1999; Sharples 1991).

A possible scenario is that during the Early Iron Age (from ca. 800 B.C.) many communities in central-southern Britain worked to achieve grain surpluses, which were stored in pits and used for occasional feasts; some of these feasts may have been small domestic feasts and others larger, communal ones. By circa 600 B.C. communal centers are constructed, the hillforts, which become the loci for the storage of surplus grain and for communal feasts. By the Middle Iron Age (ca. 300 B.C.) the leaders of certain communities appear to have succeeded in enhancing their status and prestige to such an extent that they are able to move into the hillforts, making these sites their residence (the developed hillforts). They could raise the required manpower to enhance the earthworks at these sites, probably by using corvée labor and involving further large-scale feasting. This would explain the evidence for increased occupation at these sites, the reduction in settlements around them, the increased storage facilities, the evidence for elaborate rituals such as the “special deposits” in the pits, and also the concentration of shrines at such sites. Finally, during the Late Iron Age (from ca. 100 B.C.) a major change occurs: the hillforts are abandoned and settlement disperses. The storage pits disappear from the record. If surplus grain is still produced, it is no longer stored in pits. In some parts of the country so-called oppida develop, but they are presumed to fulfill different functions from those of the classic Wessex hillforts (Hill 1995c).

The disappearance of both the hillforts and the evidence for surplus grain storage suggests some sort of collapse of the system, the reasons for which are not well understood. What is evident is that there is a shift of emphasis away from the communal to the more individual, with a variety of settlement forms developing in the former “hillfort” zone (Cunliffe 1994, 2000). This also manifests itself in the first appearance of formal cemeteries (absent during the Early and Middle Iron Age). Individual burials now occur and some of these are marked by imported goods and personal ornaments that emphasize the wealth and status of the deceased or his or her family (Hill 1995a; Sharples 1991). Most authors refer to a combination of internal and external factors to explain these changes (Cunliffe 1994; Haselgrove 1999; Hill 1995a). In terms of the production of agricultural surplus, there are three possible hypotheses: first, if agricultural production flourished, then the ability to produce enough surplus for feasting may, in itself, no longer have been sufficient to maintain one's prestige and power, resulting in the break up of the nucleated community. Second, agricultural production may have deteriorated, making repeated surpluses difficult to achieve, again resulting in a loss of power and the break up of the community. Finally, the use of grain surplus
may have been switched from feasting toward the purchase of prestige goods. To test these hypotheses we need to carry out a detailed statistical analysis of the archaeobotanical data from the relevant sites (which is planned for the near future).

During the Late Iron Age, long-distance trade reemerges, part of the growing influence of Rome on northwest Europe, though the evidence for this comes primarily from southeast England rather than the central-southern part of the country. Coinage and imported ceramics, especially wine amphorae and tablewares, as well as glass from France and farther south, are now entering Britain. Moreover, there is an increase in the variety and shape of locally produced pottery types, suggesting a change in both the way food was served and the types of food consumed (Hill 2002). Wine is the best attested imported food, but fig seeds have been found in the port at Hengisbury Head on the south coast (Cunliffe 2000:191–192; M. Robinson, personal communication 2003). Strabo, writing at the end of the first century B.C., mentions grain and cattle as the first two items in his list of principal exports of Britain (Cunliffe 1991:435). Could this evidence mean that, at least in southeast England, some grain surpluses are starting to leave the country in exchange for new consumer goods?

Exotic Foods in Roman Britain

The Roman conquest heralds many changes, including the emergence of new social divisions. Apart from the introduction of the military, we see the birth of towns, markets, and high-status settlement in the countryside, the so-called villas (Cleary 1999; Jones and Mattingly 1990; Millett 1990). In terms of food we see the introduction of a new type of luxury food: the exotics. Many new foods, such as grapes, olives, figs, coriander, pine nuts, melon, and cucumber, are being imported from the circums-Mediterranean region (Dickson 1994; Greig 1991; Hall and Kenward 1990; Murphy and Scaife 1991; Robinson 1981, 1992; Wilcox 1977). Mostly these are foods that cannot be cultivated in Britain because of climatic conditions, but locally cultivated (rather than wild) fruits and nuts also appear for the first time. To these we can add the importation of wine, olive oil, and fish sauce, as witnessed by the occurrence of amphorae on many sites (e.g., Sealey and Tyers 1989). The Vindolanda writing tablets are a further source of information, providing marvelous insights into the mechanisms by which such foods arrived in Britain (Bowman 1994). Ornamental gardens are also first recorded in the Roman period (Dickson 1994; Murphy and Scaife 1991).

As symbols of individual wealth they deserve mention here, but they are otherwise outside the scope of this article. We also see the more frequent appearance of imported tableware and glassware (Millett 1990).

While during the Late Iron Age the new imports were found primarily in individual graves (e.g., the burial chamber at Welwyn, Hertfordshire, contained five wine amphorae and a silver cup, as well as other French and Roman imports; Cunliffe 1991:139), following the Roman conquest most of this material is found in settlement sites: first in the military forts, probably for use by the officer class, and later also in the towns and some of the villas. Only a few of these foods are ever found in the native rural settlements (see Murphy et al. 2000 for an example). A quantitative analysis to determine the exact patterning is currently under way. The distribution of these luxuries clearly implies that they are used to display the individual’s social status and they may have been desired as a potential route to membership in a certain class.

The Nature and Role of Luxury Foods

What we appear to observe is a classic change in the way food is used, either to create and enhance social relations or to emphasize increasingly unequal relations (cf. Appadurai 1981; Dieterl 1996; Van der Veen 2003). During the Early Iron Age grain surpluses may have been accumulated for celebratory feasts. Such feasts served to enhance social bonds in societies with little social inequality. Over time, certain communities or individuals managed to increase their standing and prestige by hosting more feasts and, by eating the food, the guests accepted the obligation to give something in return, either deference or labor. The shift toward the developed hillforts around 300 B.C. may point to these communities or individuals having achieved special status, and communal hospitality may now have been used to reiterate and legitimize growing differences in status and power (Dieterl’s [1996] entrepreneurial and patron-role feasts).

By the Late Iron Age, we see a move away from communal feasts toward the use of foods by individuals. The emphasis is no longer on the consumption of the same foods (common staples) by many people, in large quantities and at special occasions, but on the consumption of different foods, in small quantities and by select numbers of individuals only. Now the consumption of food is associated with imported ceramics and glass to enhance the display component of the meal, helping to create a distance between the consumer and the audience (Dieterl’s [1996] diacritical feasts). Thus, we see a move from communal feasts to exclusive dining, and with that a change in both the nature and meaning or role of the luxury foods.

While the above may appear to imply a complete shift in the social use of food, this is unlikely to have been the case. After all, the different types of feast do not represent evolutionary stages, and societies in which diacritical feasting occurs also tend to have the other two types of feast (Dieterl 1996:99). Collective feasting probably continued within parts of the community, but the disappearance of hillforts and large grain storage pits implies that such feasts took on a different form, possibly emphasizing meat rather than surplus grain and using different, less prominent locations in the landscape. A good example of this is the Late Iron Age hoard recently recovered in Leicestershire (Priest et al. 2003). Here some 3,000 Late Iron Age and Roman Republican gold and silver coins were recovered on a low hilltop, separated by a ditch from a large deposit of pig bones. The site is thought to represent an important religious center, where coin hoard deposition and feasting took place.

The move from communal feasts to exclusive dining resonates with the distinction Goody (1982) drew between his “low” and “high” cuisines, the former
associated with hieratic societies, the latter with more strongly hierarchical ones. He used the term *low cuisine* to describe an emphasis on the consumption of quantities of common staple foods at communal feasts in contrast to an emphasis on the consumption of rare and expensive foods often prepared in complex ways, his *high cuisine*. While his specific linking of low cuisine with African societies is far too limited a generalization and his use of the terms *high* and *low* may now seem to convey a set of value judgments rather than descriptors, this does not take away the fact that these differences in cuisine do exist, even in modern British society. We only have to look at the contrast between parties of working-class communities that often use large quantities of beer and a buffet (tables loaded with food) and the exclusive dinner parties of the rich, where small numbers of participants wine and dine on exclusive wines, numerous but small, set courses, and select ingredients, all presented on elegantly decorated tables.

The strength of archaeology is that it allows us to test these ethnographic models by applying them to different regions and by adding time depth to these often static concepts. While in this particular instance we have identified a shift from a low to a high cuisine, there is no evidence for a simple evolutionary process, as by the early medieval period British society once again emphasized quantity (of meat especially; see Thomas, this volume). Goody's classification has helped us identify the patterns; archaeology is starting to reveal the shifts and the process by which these occur.

**Conclusion**

If the placement of cereal grain in large underground pits was intended to store surplus grain (rather than seed corn) for occasional large feasts, as I suggest, then both the food plants and storage evidence point to the emergence of new leaders in Iron Age Britain who used their ability to control the agricultural resources first to acquire eminence within their communities and second to enhance this position by occupying the communal hillforts and using feasting as a way of making these locations the centers of local prestige. By the end of the Iron Age we see a shift of emphasis: in central-southern England grain surpluses are no longer stored in pits and consumed during large feasts, and the communal sites disappear. At the same time items of elite display start to be imported into southeast England, possibly in exchange for grain. Thus, during the Early and Middle Iron Age in central-southern Britain the grain surplus (the economic capital) was used to acquire social power (prestige, status within the community); and by the end of the period it may have been used to acquire cultural power (exclusivity, elitism, distance), especially in southeast England. This process developed further during the subsequent Roman period when the import of Mediterranean foods became more commonplace, and the number of people who claimed access to these foods grew over time. Thus, we see a change in both the nature and meaning of luxury foods during the Iron Age and Roman period, but in both periods these foods were used as instruments of social change.
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