

Food

For millennia the obvious facts about food and eating have carried with them a particularly heavy cultural weight in India. After being laboriously produced, food can be manipulated and transformed in manifold ways: it may be shared, offered, distributed, or exchanged. Culinary practices are subject to explicit or implicit rules: what, with whom, and how food is eaten is prescribed as well as proscribed. Food is ingested and becomes part of the body. Therefore, food is a key symbol of personhood and social identity. It is the first object in everyone's life that is loved, but it may become an object of hate or disgust as well. Commensality makes and breaks groups.

Three aspects of food and eating among Hindus seem to be particularly pertinent. First, food is at the same time a material, moral, and mental fact; it is concrete as well as abstract. Dichotomies of Western thinking are applicable only with difficulty (Marriott & Inden, 1977). With the ingestion of food, one is also digesting a moral quality that influences the very nature of the eater. In particular, notions of ritual → purity guide considerations of cooking and consumption. The ingestion of relatively impure food may affect not only a person's health and social status but also the prospect of a favorable rebirth. Hence, transacting and consuming food involves risk.

Second, related to these moral aspects of food, Hindus display a preoccupation with states and transition. Alimentary practices frequently aim at boundary maintenance in order to control the circulation of wanted and unwanted qualities. To a significant extent, families, → castes, and persons try to maintain their moral and ritual integrity through regulating consumption. In such an environment, transgressions of boundaries such as in inter-commensality have a particular cultural relevance.

Third, considering the role of food in Hindu religion (see → ritual food), one has to note that food practices are relational, even oppositional (see Ulrich, 2007); one person's affection is another's abomination. If not cannibals, the others certainly are "dog-cookers" (Śvapacas) as Brahmans used to classify despised groups in *Manusmṛti* (10.51;

see White, 1992; see → Dharmaśāstra). Hindu disgust at beef and love of milk contrast with the tribal consumption of the former and indifference to the latter. Brahmanical devotion to the five products of the cow (*pañcagavya*, including milk, clarified butter, curd, cowdung, and urine) finds its inversion in tantric practices (*pañcamakāra*, practices or symbolism surrounding the five "m": flesh [*māṃsa*], fish [*matsya*], liquor [*madya*], the female consort in sexual intercourse or, in alternative interpretations, "salty food" [*mudrā*], and sexual intercourse [*maithuna*]). Brahmanical concern with ritual purity (*śuddhi*), which finds expression not only, but especially, in contexts of consumption (Khare, 1976a), has its opposite in the Aghora ascetic (→ Aghorīs), who supposedly dines on urine and feces (Parry, 1994, 251–271). The → Kṛṣṇa devotee's love of the "mountain of food" (Toomey, 1992) stands out against the "fear of food" and the value of fasting of the Jain ascetic (Jaini, 2000).

Violence, Power, and Consumption

During the early vedic period, the paradigm of food in the violent model of eaters and eaten pervaded ideas of nature and society alike. The *matsyanyāya* ("law of the fishes"), as it was later called, prescribed that the weak are the food of the strong and that ultimately every being is someone's food. Humans provided the gods with food (meat, milk, and wheat) and drink (made from the *soma* plant; see → intoxication) through their sacrifices and dined in turn on animals, whose foods were the plants, which feed on water, the basis of all food (Smith, 1990, 180). The *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* thus states,

The great one is Agni (the fire), and the great (thing) of that great one are the plants and trees, for they are his food; and the great one is Vāyu (the wind), and the great (thing) of that great one are the waters, for they are his (the wind's) food; and the great one is Āditya (the sun), and the great (thing) of that great one is the moon, for that is his food; and the great one is man, and

the great (thing) of that great one is cattle, for they are his food. (*ŚBr.* 10.3.4.4)

The sun and moon are part of this cosmological cuisine where eating always entails destruction and subjugation. As is stated at a different place in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, the sun (Indra) and moon (Vṛtra) are not only eater and eaten, but also hostile to each other, the sun “[h]aving sucked him [the moon] empty, he [the sun] throws him out” (*ŚBr.* 1.6.4.18–20).

As B.K. Smith (1990) has pointed out, this violent alimentary imagery in which the stronger consume and annihilate the weaker is confined not only to nature but also to society, which is conceived as governed by the same laws. This is clearly stated in *Manusmṛti*:

Those that do not move are food for those that move, and those that have no fangs are food for those with fangs; those that have no hands are food for those with hands; and cowards are the food of the brave. (*MaSm.* 5.29)

Furthermore, in the classification of the *varṇa* scheme, the ruling *varṇas* of Brahmans and Kṣatriyas feed on the masses, the lower Vaiśyas and Śūdras, who are food. Due to their sacrificial privileges, only the Brahmans are not food. Similarly, the relationship of dominance between man and woman is expressed in alimentary terms, where the husband is the eater and his wife the eaten (Olivelle, 2002a, 29; *ŚBr.* 1.3.8.5–6).

This seemingly inevitable link between violence and consumption was broken through the gradual introduction of the values of nonviolence (→ *ahimsā*) and → liberation (*mokṣa*) and the accompanying practice of vegetarianism (see Zimmermann, 1999, 1). From the 7th century BCE onward, Brahmans probably adopted both these values from wandering ascetics and recodified their texts in such a way that the social order now became based on ritual purity, signified by abstention from violence and killing, which also opened up the possibility to escape → *saṃsāra* and attain liberation. Thus, in this “revolution of values” (Smith, 1990) in Indian history, alimentary ideas and practices played a key role. Accordingly, in the → Upaniṣads, vegetables are considered to be the paradigmatic food, and vegetarianism is also expected from the animals that are actually eaten. Thus, in the classification of edible animals, their own vegetarian diet became one of the central criteria, alongside the distinctive feature of

living in the village (prohibited) or wilderness (allowed; Olivelle, 2002a, 27f.). In the philosophical texts of the Upaniṣads, food (*anna*) is related to the contemplation of the ultimate reality or → *brahman*, mystically equated with the cosmos: “food is *brahman*” (*TaiU.* 2.2; 3.2; see Moreno, 1992; Syed, 2000).

However, since Brahmans continued to be identified with sacrifice, the Brahmanical tradition became ambiguous, as is very evident in *Manusmṛti* (5.27–56), which on the one hand praises nonviolence (5.47; 10.63) and threatens meat-eaters with becoming the victims of those they kill in a later rebirth (5.55), but on the other hand states,

Someone who eats meat, after honoring the gods and ancestors, when he has bought it, or killed it himself, or has been given it by someone else, does nothing bad, (*MaSm.* 5.32)

since “killing in a sacrifice is not killing” (*MaSm.* 5.40). By contrast, the ayurvedic doctors acknowledged the value of meat consumption for “violent therapeutics” (Zimmermann, 1999, 170), especially the meat that is most disgusting from an orthodox, postvedic Brahmanical perspective – that of carnivores (Zimmermann, 1999, 2), which is classified as “forbidden food” (*abhakṣya*) in the legal texts (Olivelle, 2002a; 2002b).

Sacrifice and Cooking

Sacrifice (→ *yajña*) is the ultimate activity and process in vedic thought and likewise is crucial in later forms of Hindu religion. Referring mainly to the Brāhmaṇas (→ Vedas and Brāhmaṇas), C. Malamoud (1998, 23–53) argues that every sacrificial process is also a form of cooking (*pakti*). Only humans have the ability to sacrifice, which is a distinctive feature of their humanness, and every sacrificial performance reenacts the primordial sacrifice of Prajāpati, the cosmic man (see → vedic gods). Of all humans, Brahmans are not only the paradigmatic sacrificers but also the foremost cooks. They cook for others, and they are “cooking the world” (*lokapakti*) through their sacrifices. Sacrificing and cooking entail transformations, and the nexus in both processes is the heat (*tapas*), which is associated with Agni, the god of fire. As the agent of transformation, heat converts the original desire (→ *kāma*, the condition of all action) into outward action, such as the creation

of the world in the case of Prajāpati or the manipulation of external objects through Brahman priests. In this scheme, all food that humans consume is sacrificial food, since the gods demand only cooked food and since “that which is cooked, indeed belongs to the gods” (*ŚBr.* 3.8.3.7). Humans eat only the remainder of the sacrificial meal.

In addition to real cooking, vedic thought applies the metaphor of cooking/sacrificing to all kinds of transformative processes. As the cosmos is cooked, so are “twice-born” individuals in the course of life-cycle rituals or → *samskāra* (lit. refinement, cooking). In the ultimate stage (→ *āśrama*) – that of the renouncer (*saṃnyāsīn*) – the person has to extinguish the sacrificial fire that he maintained as householder and become his own sacrificial oblation, cooking his self in the internalized fire to attain liberation (*mokṣa*). Because he is already sacrificed/cooked after death, he need not be cooked again and sacrificed on the funeral pyre, but is to be buried.

In the ethnographic work of anthropologists, many of the themes elaborated in the textual traditions reverberate. The topic of food has been encountered by most anthropologists “in the field”; however, due to certain trends within the discipline as well, the thematic (and theoretical) focus has varied. R.S. Khare (1976a; 1976b; 1992; Khare & Rao, 1986) is the most devoted anthropologist dealing specifically with Hindu ideas and practices concerning food.

Status and Caste

Anthropologists investigating the nature of local caste hierarchies from the 1930s onward soon noted the relevance of food and its close relationship to the notions of ritual purity and pollution. The particular diet of a local caste group accounted for the evaluation of its purity and thus its place in the village hierarchy. Related to the value of non-violence and the impurity of killing, the vegetarian diet associated with the Brahmans was accorded the highest status, while meat-eating groups were ranked lower and beef eaters the lowest (Stevenson, 1954). In a process described as “Sanskritization” by M.N. Srinivas (1962, 42–62), local caste groups may strive for upward mobility within the local caste system by changing their dietary patterns, along with other aspects such as seeking high-status marriage partners.

In addition to the question of vegetarianism and meat eating as attributes of caste status, food transactions between castes became the focus of investigation. Local hierarchies were represented as a consequence of a sum total of transactions (Marriott, 1968; 1976). While the general rule is that receivers of food rank lower than givers, the type of food transacted was also relevant, since different kinds of food transmit pollution to a greater or lesser extent. Food cooked in water, called *kaccā* (unripe), is susceptible to pollution and is thus not exchanged or shared across caste boundaries. Food refined through being cooked in clarified butter, called *pakkā*, is more resistant to impurity and can thus be transacted across caste boundaries. The lowest type of food to be transacted from high to very low castes is leftovers (*jūthā*; Mayer, 1960, 33f.; Dumont, 1980, 130f.).

Patterns of consumption and commensality have undergone considerable change in the last decades, particularly in middle-class urban areas and in contexts of migration (Appadurai, 1988; Mayer, 1996; Nandy, 2004; Osella & Osella, 2008). However, the question of who eats with whom and what, and what is cooked by whom, still has the potential for the communication of social messages. Workers of a public-sector power project in Orissa, for example, deliberately violate norms of intercaste dining and thus express modern values of equality in the industrial settlement, while adhering to the caste rules when they visit their native villages (Strümpell, 2008).

Ritual and Worship

Although arguably all food is religious for the orthodox Hindu, in addition to questions about food and social structure, anthropologists have investigated food in relation to the religious sphere in a more direct way. In fact, one debated question was whether relationships between humans and gods were conceptualized by Hindus as analogous to the relationship between castes, based on the opposition of the pure and the impure. L. Dumont (1970) argues in regard to the South Indian cult of Aiyāṅār that, like the relationship between castes, the Hindu pantheon was structured by relative purity expressed in the distinction between meat-eating (relatively low) and vegetarian (relatively high) gods. C.J. Fuller (1987), by contrast, suggests that the crucial

difference lies rather in the contrast between worship (→ *pūjā*) and sacrifice (*bali*).

Hindu deities are distinguished by what they eat (see Eichinger Ferro-Luzzi, 1977). However, worship consists not only of oblations given to the gods but also of an interaction between deity and devotee, an exchange of vision (*darśana*), and also of food. At least L.A. Babb (1970) argued that Hindu worship could be defined as an asymmetrical transaction of food. Hindus use food offerings (*naivedya*) to honor the deity, who returns the food as *prasāda* (lit. grace) to the worshippers. The whole transaction is modeled on the transactional logic between castes, as mentioned above. The gods can retain their superior position and can thus be honored, although they are receivers of food, by defining the returned food as *jūṭha*, that is, leftovers. However, the divine leftovers are still of such a relative purity that they temporarily eclipse caste distinctions within the groups of worshippers, who become one *vis-à-vis* the deity as they commensally participate in the divine grace. Like L. Dumont, L.A. Babb thus suggests that the religious sphere is structured by the same principles as the social domain, which is again contested by C.J. Fuller (1979), who states that religious rituals have to be understood on their own terms. Like the other substances that are regarded as *prasāda*, such as ash or water, C.J. Fuller (1992, 74–79) claims that the food is transmuted through contact with the deity; it is not actually exchanged.

Ritual food as *prasāda* not only is important for the merit of individual worshippers and the domestic sphere but also is a crucial feature in the economy of major temples and was for centuries an arena of regional politics. The magnitude of a temple deity can be measured in relation to the amount of *prasāda* it is able to distribute among its many worshippers. Not only are a multitude of temple servants of various categories (see Rösel, 1980, 52–66, with reference to the Jagannāth Temple in Puri, Orissa) necessary to cook and feed hundreds or thousands of pilgrims each day, but the temple also needs to own land to produce the indispensable crops. In addition to military campaigns, one of the chief ways for a local ruler to gain, maintain, and legitimize dominance in a region and be acknowledged by the population was to donate land to a reputable temple and become the patron of the deity. Likewise, for other men with political ambitions, donations as well as hosting and feeding pilgrims could be converted

into status and influence (see Appadurai Breckenridge, 1986). However, “gastro-politics” are evident not only on the macrolevel of regional power games, but also on the microlevel of personal relationships (Appadurai, 1981; see Hanchett, 1975). Within the field of kinship and marriage, food transactions between individuals and groups are frequently strategically performed in such a way that, within the acknowledged social parameters, gains in status are achieved.

The themes of heat, cooking, and transformation that are recurrent in the textual traditions are also part of an observable reality in Hindu ritual practices today – for example, in the aforementioned *saṃskāras* or life-cycle rituals. After a series of “refinements” or “cooking” throughout life, a person is finally fit for the “last sacrifice” (*antyeṣṭi*), as the cremation is called, that is, to be given to the fire (Agni) as an oblation. J.P. Parry (1994, 151–225) investigated the meanings of food in the complex mortuary rituals in Benares. Food and the processes of eating and digesting (the latter has the same Hind. root as “cooking,” *pakānā-*) are core metaphors for the transformation of the liminal ghost (*pret*) into the benevolent ancestor (*pitṛ*). Like heat on the cosmic level (sun) or in the domestic fire, the digestive fires transform food, which in the ritual process variously signifies the nourishing food provided for the ghost on his way to the abode of the ancestors, or represents the deceased himself. This symbolism is also evident in the name of the rice balls that are prepared and fed in three series, called *piṇḍa* (consisting of rice, barley flour, and milk paste; Parry, 1994, 191), meaning “substance” or “body.” The most important consumers and digesters of the food are the chief mourner (ideally the eldest son of the deceased) and the funeral Brahman, who both eat on behalf of the deceased and the deceased himself, since the latter is identified with the food they consume. Through digesting the food they also digest the sins or demerit (*pāpa*) of the deceased so that only the morally approvable aspect of the person reaches the afterworld in order to guarantee a good rebirth.

Body and Environment

Food has material and moral implications, which is why M. Marriott (1976, 110) describes it as “substance-code” (see Marriott & Inden, 1977). However, food is only one of innumerable sub-

stances that from the Hindu point of view are conceptualized as constantly circulating and constituting entities or genera of various kinds; bodies (Holdrege, 1998), houses, villages (Daniel, 1984, 61–162), and castes (Marriott, 1976) are among the entities that are part of this ongoing process of mixing and separation, of boundary maintenance and transgression. To each entity pertains a certain code of conduct (→ *dharma*), and the genera strive for equilibrium in their substance-codes, which may correspond to or conflict with their *dharma*. Substance-codes such as food are characterized by a range of features that are elaborated in textual traditions but influence conspicuously – though often only implicitly for the actors – current practices. For example, the high-caste cuisine in North India is partly guided by ayurvedic principles, such as the theory of the six savors (*rasa*) (Conzelmann, 2001, 609–613; Zimmermann, 1999, 118). Furthermore, the theory of the three qualities or → *guṇas* that holds that all existent phenomena are constituted through a mixture of, in simple terms, goodness, intelligence (*sattva*), badness, stupidity (*tamas*), and energy (*rajas*; see Inden, 2006, 216f.) is evident in considerations about food in contemporary Gujarat (Ghassem-Fachandi, 2009, 86). As the example of digesting sins in Benares highlighted, eating food that is dominated by *sattva* (e.g. butter) has different moral and soteriological implications than does consuming mainly *tamas* food (e.g. meat or food related to death). In addition to these characteristics, there are a number of other attributes that play a role in this combinative system, such as the three humors (*doṣas*; see → Āyurveda), five elements (→ *mahābhūtas*), 20 qualities (*guṇas*), or the distinction between gross (*sṭhūla*) and subtle (*sūkṣma*) substances (see Khare, 1992, 201–220; Zimmermann, 1999, 118; Marriott, 1990). Certainly in daily food practices, Hindus do not constantly engage in these philosophical discourses; however, these key ideas are part of the cultural repertoire (high rather than low caste) and thus inform, frequently implicitly, Hindu practices.

Devotion

In the devotional (→ *bhakti*) Hindu traditions, food is love and Kṛṣṇa is the most important deity representing love through food. Kṛṣṇa as the “butter thief” (Hind. *mākhān corī*) is a very popular mythological figure, which is enacted in plays

(Hind. → *līlās*), particularly in the Braj region associated with the deity (Hawley, 1979). In contrast to Brahmanical intellectualism and ritualism, the devotional perspective favors an experiential participation in the divine through consumption; and in opposition to the Hindu ascetic, who renounces the social world and his bodily desires, devotees of Kṛṣṇa seek liberation in the world without negating emotion or the body. Thus, when his foster mother Yaśodā asks Kṛṣṇa during the play whether he would like to learn about *mukti* (*mokṣa*, liberation), the child replies, “Is there bread and butter in *mukti*?” (Hawley, 1979, 209). His repeated stealing of the butter as well as spilling it (i.e. love) into the audience exemplify an ideally subversive element in *bhakti* traditions – that of transgressing conventions and caste boundaries. These features of devotionalism are confirmed by P.M. Toomey’s (1992) study of the *annakūṭa* (mountain of food) festival in Braj. Kṛṣṇa is here identified with food and love, and, through sharing *prasāda*, pilgrims are able to share in both (which are one). Just as in the play about the butter thief, the food festivals display “gastro-hyperbolicism,” a prodigal abundance of food, and “hypersensuality” in their stress on emotions as expressed in the *mastrāma* ideal of lustful happiness (Toomey, 1992, 118).

The Nation, Nationalism, and “Hindutva”

As much as food can be identified with devotional love, it can be emotionally empowered in other ways, instilling, for example, nationalism or hatred. Throughout the history of the Indian nation, food played a crucial role in its political discourses, conflicts, and struggles. In one of the key events in Indian history, the Great Mutiny of 1857, the rebellion of the (Hindu and Muslim) sepoys was supposedly sparked by a protest against the newly provided cartridges rumored to be packed in beef and pork fat that had to be opened with the mouth. Also in the struggle of M.K. → Gandhi for independence, diet was a key expression of his ethics of nonviolence, and he “spectacularized” vegetarianism by turning it into a public and political affair (Roy, 2002, 68).

In recent Hindu nationalist discourse, alimentary practices are a vital concern. In the disingenuous attempt to reduce Hinduism from a complex

and heterogeneous religion into a core of “Hinduness” (*hindutva*), food practices (vegetarianism linked to the value of nonviolence) have become the badge and essence of the “true” Hindu as well as of the alleged enemies of Hinduism (meat and especially beef eating, as linked to an inherent propensity for violence). As such, cow slaughtering and the consumption of beef have become a major political, legal, and also violent issue, while still remaining a “religious” topic at the same time. For example, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) government in Madhya Pradesh in 2004 accounted for their rigid Cow Slaughter Ban Ordinance by making reference to *Manusmṛti* and the strict forms of punishment prescribed there (Chigateri, 2008, 16; see Osella, 2008).

In his analysis of “visceral nationalism” (Ghassem-Fachandi, 2009, 81; 2010) in relation to the anti-Muslim pogrom in Gujarat in 2002 (one of the most “vegetarian” states), P. Ghassem-Fachandi outlines the various processes entailed in the significations of meat and their connections to a sacrificial terminology and logic. When Muslims are stereotyped as “meat eaters,” disgust for meat can be easily transformed into disgust for Muslims. In this way, Hindu nationalist discourse makes anger and violence against Muslims appear to be a “natural” and corporeal reaction. At the same time, meat is associated not only with low status and impurity but also with virility and potency. Thus, Bajrang Dal (youth wing of the Hindu nationalist organization → Vishwa Hindu Parishad) leaders provided members of → Ādivāsī and Scheduled Caste groups, who were among those who carried out violence against Muslims, with meat and liquor as stimuli for aggression (Ghassem-Fachandi, 2009, 102). They thereby replicated and utilized the sacrificial logic underlying Devī (→ Mahādevī) worship, during which bloody offerings are supposed to lead to “heat,” which is then externalized as violent actions against demons. The way Muslim men were actually killed provides evidence for the “performative quality of the violence,” informed as it is by a sacrificial imagery insinuated by the media and politicians (Ghassem-Fachandi, 2010, 9).

Although Hindu nationalist discourse tries to establish the equation that what is Indian is Hindu and what is Hindu is vegetarian, claiming this to have always been the case (although beef eating was common in vedic times, and also nowadays there are meat-eating Brahman groups [Khare, 1966]), culinary and dietary traditions have not

been codified on a pan-Indian level throughout most of Indian history. A. Appadurai (1988) argues that a “national cuisine” only developed from the late 1960s onward, when members of the urban middle classes increasingly were transferred as employees throughout the country and found themselves in foreign alimentary, regional, and multicaste settings. Because culinary practices allow for considerable contextual variation along the lines of public/private, domestic/work-related, or rural/urban oppositions, caste boundaries were – although certainly not everywhere (Osella & Osella, 2008) – more often softened in culinary respects in comparison with the still very conservative marriage rules that allow for less scope of action. The reason that Indian civilization did not, until recently, develop a textualized high cuisine on a broad regional range is, according to A. Appadurai (1988, 11), due to the fact that eating is inseparably linked to a moral-religious universe in which actors try to control the moral implications of food transactions and the soteriological repercussions of their diet. The culinary realm never emancipated itself from this encompassing discourse in order to develop a more hedonistic approach to food necessary for the evolution of a high cuisine.

Migration and Transnationalism

Recipes and cookbooks – nowadays mainly by means of the Internet – have gained importance in the context of migration, where culinary habits or foodways have become signifiers of the “homeland.” While culinary practices have become standardized and certain dishes iconic (Osella & Osella, 2008, 197) in transnational frameworks, the “homeland” is often idealized and transfigured at the same time. Especially in foreign environments, food memories and practices amount to existential questions of being, and kitchens become the place where cultural and national identities are supposedly maintained and authentically reconstructed. Accordingly, in Indian immigrant households in New York, as elsewhere, especially women continue cultural traditions in culinary terms in the domestic sphere. Beyond providing the desired ingredients and spices for reproducing the Indian cuisine, grocery stores may become social centers where indigenous languages may be spoken, and news concerning cultural and religious activities is spread (Khandelwal,

2002, 37–41, 137). In addition to the above-mentioned emotional potential of Hindu food (love and hate), diasporic contexts emphasize the relationship of food, longing/belonging, and nostalgia (Mannur, 2007; Saunders, 2007).

Outside their homes, Indians face a multitude of culinary practices in the diaspora. This is in itself not a new experience for them, since in urban and rural Indian contexts, neighbors and local communities follow different, frequently caste-specific, food practices. As such it is not so surprising that an Indian restaurant owner in New York had his food qualified as “kosher” by a rabbi to accommodate his Jewish customers (Khandelwal, 2002, 42). What is new, however, is that usually there are no social mechanisms in the migration context for dealing with intercommunity commensality. In India – heterogeneity in foodways being the norm – letting a Brahman do the cooking, serving vegetarian food, or supplying raw ingredients to be cooked by different groups themselves are accepted strategies to include different persons and groups. In migratory settings, in contrast, particular consumption patterns, such as vegetarianism, may become an embarrassment for a Hindu when he or she is invited to a non-Indian household. Moreover, while dietary practices in India hardly require explanation, to make themselves – and their particular foodways – a badge understood is a major challenge for migrants (Khandelwal, 2002, 39).

Bibliography

- Appadurai Breckenridge, C., “Food, Politics and Pilgrimage in South India, 1350–1650 A.D.” in: R.S. Khare & M.S.A. Rao, eds., *Food, Society and Culture: Aspects in South Asian Food Systems*, Durham, 1986, 21–53.
- Appadurai, A., “How to Make a National Cuisine: Cookbooks in Contemporary India,” *CSSH* 30/1, 1988, 3–24.
- Appadurai, A., “Gastro-politics in Hindu South Asia,” *AE* 8/3, 1981, 494–511.
- Babb, L.A., “The Food of the Gods in Chhattisgarh: Some Structural Features of Hindu Ritual,” *SJoA* 26/3, 1970, 287–304.
- Chigateri, S., “‘Glory to the Cow’: Cultural Difference and Social Justice in the Food Hierarchy in India,” *JSAS* 31/1, 2008, 10–35.
- Conzelmann, E., “Speisefolge und Geschmack. Zum Kulinarischen Code im Ehemaligen Fürstentum Mandi,” in: D.W. Lönne, ed., *Thofa-e-Dil: Festschrift Helmut Nespi-tal*, Reinbeck, 2001, 593–616.
- Daniel, E.V., *Fluid Signs: Being a Person the Tamil Way*, Berkeley, 1984.
- Dumont, L., *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*, Chicago, 1980.
- Dumont, L., *Religion, Politics and History in India: Collected Papers in Indian Sociology*, The Hague, 1970.
- Eichinger Ferro-Luzzi, G., “Ritual as Language: The Case of South Indian Food Offerings,” *CuA* 18/3, 1977, 507–514.
- Fuller, C.J., *The Camphor Flame: Popular Hinduism and Society in India*, Princeton, 1992.
- Fuller, C.J., “Sacrifice (Bali) in the South Indian Temple,” in: V. Sudarsen, G. Prakash Reddy & M. Suryanarayana, eds., *Religion and Society in South India*, Delhi, 1987, 21–35.
- Fuller, C.J., “Gods, Priests and Purity: On the Relation between Hinduism and the Caste System,” *Man* 14/3, 1979, 459–476.
- Ghassem-Fachandi, P., “Ahimsa, Identification and Sacrifice in the Gujarat Pogrom,” *SocA* 18/2, 2010, 155–175.
- Ghassem-Fachandi, P., “The Hyperbolic Vegetarian: Notes on a Fragile Subject in Gujarat,” in: J. Borneman, & A. Hammoudi, eds., *Being There: The Fieldwork Encounter and the Making of Truth*, Berkeley, 2009, 77–112.
- Hanchett, S., “Hindu Potlatches: Ceremonial Reciprocity and Prestige in Karnataka,” in: H.E. Ulrich, ed., *Competition and Modernization in South Asia*, New Delhi, 1975, 27–59.
- Hawley, J.S., “Thief of Butter, Thief of Love,” *HR* 18/3, 1979, 203–220.
- Holdrege, B.A., “Body Connections: Hindu Discourses of the Body and the Study of Religion,” *IJHS* 2/3, 1998, 341–386.
- Inden, R., *Text and Practice: Essays on South Asian History*, Oxford, 2006.
- Jaini, P.S., “Fear of Food: Jaina Attitudes on Eating,” in: P.S. Jaini, ed., *Collected Papers on Jaina Studies*, Delhi, 2000, 281–296.
- Khandelwal, M., *Becoming American, Being Indian: An Immigrant Community in New York City*, Ithaca, 2002.
- Khare, R.S., “Annambrahman: Cultural Models, Meanings, and Aesthetics of Hindu Food,” in: R.S. Khare, ed., *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*, Albany, 1992, 201–220.
- Khare, R.S., ed., *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*, Albany, 1992.
- Khare, R.S., *Culture and Reality: Essays on the Hindu System of Managing Foods*, Simla, 1976a.
- Khare, R.S., *Hindu Hearth and Home*, New Delhi, 1976b.
- Khare, R.S., “A Case of Anomalous Values in Indian Civilization: Meat-Eating Among the Kanya-Kubja Brahmans of the Katyayan Gotra,” *JAS* 25/2, 1966, 229–240.
- Khare, R.S., & M.S.A. Rao, eds., *Food, Society and Culture: Aspects in South Asian Food Systems*, Durham, 1986.
- Malamoud, C., *Cuire le monde: Rite et pensée dans l’Inde ancienne*, Paris, 1989; ET: *Cooking the World: Ritual and Thought in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1998.
- Mannur, A., “Culinary Nostalgia: Authenticity, Nationalism, and Diaspora,” *Melus* 32/4, 2007, 11–31.
- Marriot, M., “Constructing an Indian Ethnology,” in: M. Marriot, ed., *India through Hindu Categories*, London, 1990, 1–39.

- Marriott, M., "Hindu Transactions: Diversity without Dualism," in: B. Kapferer, ed., *Transactions and Meaning: Directions in the Anthropology of Exchange and Symbolic Behavior*, Philadelphia, 1976, 109–142.
- Marriott, M., "Caste Ranking and Food Transactions: A Matrix Analysis," in: M. Singer & B.S. Cohn, eds., *Structure and Change in Indian Society*, Chicago, 1968, 133–171.
- Marriott, M., & R.B. Inden, "Toward an Ethnosociology of South Asian Caste Systems," in: K. David, ed., *The New Wind: Changing Identities in South Asia*, The Hague, 1977, 227–238.
- Mayer, A.C., "Caste in an Indian Village: Change and Continuity 1954–1992," in: C.J. Fuller, ed., *Caste Today*, New Delhi, 1996, 32–64.
- Mayer, A.C., *Caste and Kinship in Central India: A Village and Its Region*, London, 1960.
- Moreno, M., "Pañcāmirtam: God's Washings as Food," in: R.S. Khare, ed., *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*, Albany, 1992, 147–178.
- Nandy, A., "The Changing Popular Culture of Indian Food: Preliminary Notes," SAR 24, 2004, 9–19.
- Olivelle, P., "Abhaksya and Abhojya: An Exploration in Dietary Language," JAOS 122/2, 2002a, 345–354.
- Olivelle, P., *Food for Thought: Dietary Rules and Social Organization in Ancient India*, Amsterdam, 2002b.
- Osella, C., "Introduction," JSAS 31/1, 2008, 1–9.
- Osella, C., & F. Osella, "Food, Memory, Community: Kerala as Both 'Indian Ocean' Zone and as Agricultural Homeland," JSAS 31/1, 2008, 170–198.
- Parry, J.P., *Death in Banaras*, Cambridge UK, 1994.
- Rösel, J., *Der Palast des Herren der Welt. Entstehungsgeschichte und Organisation der indischen Tempel- und Pilgerstadt Puri*, Munich, 1980.
- Roy, P., "Meat-Eating, Masculinity, and Renunciation in India: A Gandhian Grammar of Diet," *Gender and History* 14/1, 2002, 62–91.
- Saunders, J.B., "'I Don't Eat Meat': Discourse on Food among Transnational Hindus," CIS 41/2, 2007, 203–223.
- Smith, B.K., "Eaters, Food, and Social Hierarchy in Ancient India: A Dietary Guide to a Revolution of Values," JAAR 58/2, 1990, 177–205.
- Srinivas, M.N., *Caste in Modern India and Other Essays*, Bombay, 1962.
- Stevenson, H.N.C., "Status Evaluation in the Hindu Caste System," JRAI 84, 1954, 45–65.
- Strümpell, C., "'We Work Together, We Eat Together': Conviviality and Modernity in a Company Settlement in South Orissa," CIS 42/3, 2008, 351–81.
- Syed, R., "Das Heilige Essen – Das Heilige Essen. Religiöse Aspekte des Speiseverhaltens im Hinduismus," in: P. Schmidt-Leukel, ed., *Die Religionen und das Essen*, DGR 163, Munich, 2000, 97–144.
- Toomey, P.M., "Mountain of Food, Mountain of Love: Ritual Inversion in the Annakūta Feast at Mount Govardhan," in: R.S. Khare, ed., *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*, Albany, 1992, 117–145.
- Ulrich, K.E., "Food Fights: Buddhist, Hindu, and Jain Dietary Polemics in South India," HR 46/3, 2007, 228–261.
- White, D.G., "You Are What You Eat: The Anomalous Status of Dog-Cookers in Hindu Mythology," in: R.S. Khare, ed., *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*, Albany, 1992, 53–93.
- Zimmermann, F., *La jungle et le fumet des viandes*, Paris, 1982; ET: *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats: An Ecological Theme in Hindu Medicine*, Delhi, 1999.

PETER BERGER