

acter by this means is at the root of religious cannibalism (*q.v.*).

The contagion of death is supposed to enter food.¹ Murderers, among the American Indians, were not allowed to cook for themselves or others. They could not drink out of any other dish than their own.² In Samoa those attending to a dead person were careful not to handle any food, and for days were fed by others.³ The Moorish custom of *L'ar* seems to depend on the theory of the transmission of curses by food. 'The food will repay' is an explanatory phrase. The food eaten in such compacts contains a conditional curse; the persons eating together take it upon themselves in the event of breaking their word⁴ (see CURSING AND BLESSING, vol. iv. p. 372 f.).

The ceremonies of eating together are worldwide, and bring into relief the social sacredness attaching to food. Eating together is a mode of forming an alliance between two peoples, as between two individuals.⁵ Following the tabu often observed which prevents the two sexes, in particular two affianced persons, from sharing meals, is the marriage ceremony of eating together. There is here the acceptance of mutual gifts, as well as the responsibility of eating food which is representative and which renders the persons 'of one flesh.'⁶

5. Food of the gods.—The conception that the gods are superior members of the community involves the view that sacrifice is largely developed from the social ideas of food and its assimilation. The notions of offering and of covenant supervene. Food is rendered sacred by various critical circumstances. In particular the food of chiefs and of sacred persons acquires a sanctity which helps to explain the value of sacrificial meat. The supply of food to the gods, Payne observes, multiplies man's energy. 'Food and drink are the materials of sacrifice. Health, so far as this is an attribute of the gods, is secured by the continuance and abundance of the sacrifices.'⁷ Moreover, the choicest foods are reserved for the gods.⁸ The gods of Peru, for instance, had their own herds of llamas whose flesh was consumed on their altars.⁹ Flesh also was placed in the idol's mouth.¹⁰

On similar lines is developed the ritual of offering food to the dead¹¹ (see FOOD FOR THE DEAD).

¹In some cases the custom of fasting before the performance of a sacrifice may be due to the idea that it is dangerous or improper for the worshipper to partake of food before the god has had his share.¹²

Into this principle the idea of purity in the worshipper naturally intrudes. Conversely the 'sacredness' of tabu states, such as mourning, is particularly liable to be communicated to food. Hence a multitude of precautions in the feeding of persons in such states.¹³

Particular examples of divine foods are the shewbread (*q.v.*) of the Hebrew ritual, and the Christian Eucharist (*q.v.*). In these and similar cases the ideas of sacred food, of offering, and of eat-

¹ W. Gregor, *Folklore of the North-East of Scotland*, London, 1881, p. 206.

² S. Hearne, *Journey to the Northern Ocean*, London, 1795, p. 204 f.

³ G. Turner, *Samoa*, London, 1884, p. 145; for rules of caution followed in handling food see *GE*² i. 319, 322, 326, 332, 339, 373, iii. 207.

⁴ Westermarck, *MI* i. 586 f., ii. 623 f.

⁵ J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige Rassen*, Hague, 1886, pp. 379, 279, 128 f.; see Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, 244-252, 375 ff.

⁶ Examples in Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, 378-384. For the tabu against eating together see *ib.* 163-178.

⁷ Payne, i. 437, 434. ⁸ *ib.* 435.

⁹ *ib.* 437. Parallel with libations before a meal is the rather rare custom of throwing morsels of food on the ground; cf. Bancroft, *Native Races*, New York, 1875-6, ii. 285.

¹⁰ Cf. Bancroft, ii. 307. In many religions—*e.g.* Central American, Greek, and Roman—dough miniatures of animals were offered to the gods instead of the animals themselves.

¹¹ See Payne, i. 439.

¹² Westermarck, *MI* ii. 296 f.

¹³ *ib.* ii. 298-310.

ing the god himself are usually combined. The early ritual of eating ceremonially the firstfruits of a crop, and of assimilating the 'soul' thereof, is of a similar character.¹ Since in Greek and Roman theological theory all flesh-meat was sacrificial, the early Christians found here a practical difficulty.²

6. Food in symbol and metaphor.—The contrasted views of Roman Catholics and Protestants as to whether the Eucharistic bread is changed in substance or is a symbol of the flesh of Christ, supply a crucial case of the mystical valuation of food.

To obtain the favour of a deity by self-affliction the Central Americans would eat earth or grass.³ Conversely, the twice-born Hindu is exhorted to 'worship his food and eat it without contempt; when he sees it let him rejoice, show a pleased face, and pray that he may always obtain it. . . . Food that is always worshipped gives strength and manly vigour, but eaten irreverently it destroys them both.'⁴

A Mexican exhortation says:

'There is no man in the world but what eats, for each one has a stomach and intestines. . . . By the sustenance of the body life is upheld, by it the world is peopled.'⁵

In the Upanisads it is written:

'From food are born all creatures that live on earth; afterwards they live on food, and in the end (when they die) they return to it.' Food is 'the root of the body.'⁶

The *Satapatha Brāhmana* has it that food, when enclosed in the body, becomes the body itself.⁷ Food, according to the same, is linked to the body by means of the vital airs.⁸ The essence of food is invisible. Food is the highest of all things that can be swallowed.⁹ The *Satapatha Brāhmana* identifies food and breath, as the Arya Laws identify food and life.¹⁰ Food and breath are both gods, the 'two gods.'¹¹ Food is the deity of the *pratihāra* hymns, for all live when they partake of it.¹²

Payne suggests that, in the development of language,

'not long after emotional exclamations and demonstrative names came primitive adjectives signifying "good" and "evil," applied to animal and vegetable species with reference to the purpose of food, in the sense in which the African guide divides all plants into "bush" and "good for nyam" (the latter including the eatable ones, the former the residue). . . . The Bible (*Gn* 2^{19c}) represents the naming of food-animals as the first effort of speech; and the quest and choice of food is of the substance of all its early incidents (*Gn* 3 and 4) (cf. Herodotus, *Euterpe*, ii.). Though the Tupi can only count up to 3, Von Martius gives 1224 Tupi words for animals and their parts.'¹³

Celestial food, 'bread from heaven,' combines metaphor and ideas of transubstantiation.¹⁴ Bread as a type of Christ is an idea worked out elaborately in *Jn* 6 and *1 Co* 10. Food the material becomes food the spiritual.¹⁵

See also art. FEASTING.

LITERATURE.—This is fully given in the article.

A. E. CRAWLEY.

FOOD (Hindu).¹⁶—The question of food is considered highly important from a religious point of view in India, and is elaborately discussed in the canonical books of all religions. Indeed, the various and manifold rules of caste in India hinge in the first place on food, its preparation, and the persons with whom it may be eaten. Thus eating the numerous kinds of prohibited food, or eating for a considerable period with persons of low caste or with Muhammadans, is among the most ordinary causes of expulsion from caste, one of the most

¹ *GE*² ii. 321, 327.

² 'Food offered to idols' (*Ac* 15²⁹, *Ro* 14, *1 Co* 8). The gods, in most cults, civilized and uncivilized, are supposed to eat the 'essence' of the offered food.

³ Bancroft, iii. 424, 438. ⁴ *Manu*, ii. 54 f.

⁵ Bancroft, ii. 250.

⁶ *SDE* xv. [1900] 315, i. [1900] 99.

⁷ *ib.* xliiii. [1897] 341. ⁸ *ib.* xli. [1894] 270.

⁹ *ib.* xliiii. 95, viii. [1898] 353.

¹⁰ *ib.* xii. [1882] 304, xiv. 245.

¹¹ *ib.* xv. 142. ¹² *ib.* i. 20 f.

¹³ *Ps* 78²⁶. ¹⁴ *Jn* 6³⁷ 43², 34.

¹⁵ Payne, i. 279 f.

¹⁶ Cf. also preceding art., *passim*.

dreaded punishments in India, which involves in the first place an interdict against eating with the fellow-members of the caste. Though many educated Hindus eat and drink in the European fashion nowadays, there are still Brāhmins and other high-caste natives of India to be found who would rather starve than allow food prepared by a man of inferior caste to pass their lips. Thus in 1864, Sir W. W. Hunter saw a Brāhmin felon try to starve himself to death, and submit to a flogging rather than eat his food, on account of scruples as to whether the birthplace of the N.W. Brāhmin who had cooked it was equal in sanctity to his own native district. Food prepared by a person of inferior caste causes defilement, and a member of the higher castes therefore always employs a Brāhmin cook. Leather causes defilement, therefore no one should cook with his shoes on. Food cooked on board a ship causes defilement, therefore native passengers travelling in a boat will sometimes interrupt their journey to cook their food on shore. The kitchen should be the most retired room in the house, so that no Śūdras may look in and thus defile the earthen vessels. It is also considered highly improper to look at any one who is eating. The women, after preparing the dishes, wait on the men, and eat what is left by them; they never sit down to eat with the men. The orthodox fashion is to eat with the fingers, the use of spoons, forks, or knives being forbidden. Nothing must ever be touched with the left hand, which is used in the meanest offices, and therefore considered unclean. Before eating certain kinds of food, a person must wash his hands and feet, and remove part of his clothing. The rice and other dishes are served on a banana leaf or in small earthen vessels. Hindus take two meals a day, in the morning and evening; but widows, penitents, and ascetics must not eat anything in the evening. The remains of food are thrown to the crows and the dogs. The gods and the evil spirits are also to be given their share of each meal, with certain attendant ceremonies. The Brāhmin, his meal being over, washes his hands, rinses his mouth, and gargles his throat. Many of these rules are nowadays neglected, but social estimation can still be gauged by the degree to which the food and water touched by the various castes will be accepted by others. Thus the Commissioner for the Census of 1901 circulated for consideration a fivefold division of castes, resting largely on a distinction between those from whom Brāhmins can take water and those from whom they cannot. Water and *pakka* food, *i.e.* food prepared with *ghī* (clarified butter), generally go together, so that a man can take water or *pakka* food touched by a member of any sub-caste of his own caste, but he can eat *kachchha* food, *i.e.* food prepared without *ghī*, only when prepared by a member of the same endogamous subdivision or sub-caste as that to which he belongs. Most castes will take *kachchha* food prepared by Brāhmins, and many castes can take *pakka* food or water which has been touched by other castes; a Brāhmin, on the other hand, would drink water carried in a *lotā* by a low-caste man, if the *lotā* belonged to the Brāhmin, but would refuse to drink from the low-caste man's *lotā*. Difference of residence also operates as a bar to eating together, as in a recent case of two orderlies belonging to the same sub-caste, both of whom declined to eat even *pakka* food prepared by the other, because their homes were 50 miles apart. Brāhmins on the Bombay side will, as a rule, not take water from any but other Brāhmins, generally only from the members of the sub-caste to which they belong.

As regards the dietary, Brāhmins are not allowed to taste meat, fish, or eggs, the killing of animals, especially oxen, for food being considered an im-

pious act. This abstinence has gained ground among the inferior strata of society also, and the members of the Śākta sect, who sacrifice certain animals and eat their flesh afterwards, are held in low estimation. It is true that a Śākta cook is sometimes provided for those male members of a family who may feel disposed to eat mutton. The Bengal Rājputs, a landholding caste of high standing, eat the flesh of the goat, the deer, the hare, the pigeon, quail, and ortolan. But these animals, if not killed in hunting, must be slaughtered in a particular way by cutting the head off at a single stroke. Fish is also considered lawful food among the Rājputs, and among many richer families generally. Beef is greatly abhorred, and the flesh of the buffalo, pig, horse, camel, and other large animals is also viewed with disgust. In States ruled by Hindu princes it used to be on no account permitted to kill a cow; and even now the Society for the Protection of Cows is trying to prevent the slaughter of cows for food. The Muhammadan and European practice of killing oxen and cows has been the cause of many quarrels in India. Only the lowest castes, such as the filthy Chanārs (tanners) of N. India, eat beef, as well as pork and fowls, and all manner of unclean food; nor, like the gipsies of Europe, have they repugnance to cooking the flesh of animals which have died a natural death. The touch of these castes pollutes, and no Brāhmin barber or washerman will work for them. Vegetables and sweetmeats, which form the principal food of Brāhmins and Brāhminized castes, are also subject to exceptions. Thus they reject garlic, onions, mushrooms, and other vegetables whose root or stem grows in the shape of a head. Turmeric, pepper, cummin, coriander, mustard seeds, and other spices are used, and impart a strong flavour to the preparation. Alcoholic drinks are forbidden, and, as a rule, a respectable Hindu will not touch spirits such as toddy or arrack, or any other intoxicating drink, at least in public. Drunken habits would lead to prompt and ignominious expulsion from caste, and it is generally in privacy only that high-caste natives of India break the law of temperance. The drunken orgies of the Śāktas are confined to a particular set, and to particular days. Water is the ordinary beverage of Hindus; curdled milk diluted with water, butter-milk, and milk are also favourite drinks. Tobacco is considered objectionable, but chewing betel after dinner, according to ancient custom, is believed to be wholesome and is generally practised.

Most of these rules are ancient, and may be traced in the sacred books and historical records of the principal religions of India. The prohibition of animal food and the sanctity of animal life are particularly insisted upon in Buddhism and Jainism. Thus king Aśoka, who in early life had entertained no scruple about the killing of thousands of living creatures on the occasion of a royal banquet, stopped this regular slaughter as he became gradually imbued with the spirit of Buddhist teaching. He ruled that only two peacocks and one deer were to be killed each day, and afterwards prohibited even this limited slaughter; he abolished the royal hunt; and he published (in 243 B.C.) a stringent code of regulations applicable to all classes of the population regarding the slaying of animals for food in his empire. With Jain ascetics, the oath not to hurt is the first of the five great oaths which they are required to take; and this oath includes not merely the intentional killing or hurting of living beings or plants; it requires also a watchfulness over all functions of the body by which anything living might be injured. The Code of Manu is less severe, and its provisions on the subject of animal food were therefore attacked in

Jain writings. Though not approving generally of animal food, Manu allows a Brāhman to eat meat if hallowed by sacred texts and used in sacrificing to the gods or *manes*, or in showing honour to a guest (Manu, v. 31ff.). Again, in spite of the general prohibition to eat flesh or fish, certain kinds of fish and birds are declared to be lawful food; likewise, the porcupine, the hedgehog, the iguana, the rhinoceros, the tortoise, and the hare (Manu, v. 11-18). Animal-sacrifice was a recognized institution in ancient Brāhmanism, just as it is with the Śaktas of the present day. Under more recent Brāhmanical texts of law, however, the slaughter of animals at a sacrifice or at the reception of guests is forbidden in the present age of the world. In medical works, the Rohita fish (*Cyprinus Rohita*) is specially recommended to be eaten, as a remedy in various diseases. Of plants and vegetables, garlies, mushrooms, onions, and leeks are forbidden by Manu (v. 19). One of the ancient medical texts preserved in the Bower MS contains a legend, according to which Brāhmanas are not permitted to eat garlic, because it was generated from the drops of ambrosia which trickled from the demon Rāhu's head after it was cut off. The drinking of spirituous liquor is included among the five great sins, which are punishable by a penance ending in death (Manu, xi. 91 f.). Hermits in the wood and ascetics are subject to special restrictions with regard to their diet (Manu, vi. 13 ff.), and analogous rules exist for Buddhist monks. Thus a Buddhist canonical book mentions as delicacies which a monk must never taste unless sick: *ghī*, butter, oil, honey, sugar, fish, meat, milk, curds. The Brāhmanical lawbooks further show that a Brāhman took his food twice a day, eating moderately, taking nothing between meals, and offering part of his food to the gods and to his guests first of all. Some remnants of food were always to be left, and offered to dogs, crows, and low-caste persons. After a meal a little water had to be sipped. It was forbidden to eat in a ship, or sitting in the same row with unworthy people, or together with one's wife. It was considered the height of immodesty in a woman to eat before her husband; she had to be content with the remains of his meal. Long lists are given of those persons from whom a Brāhman must accept no food, as, e.g., from a madman, a spy, a eunuch, an unfaithful wife, etc. Special penances are ordained for eating the food of persons whose food may not be eaten, or forbidden food, or food blemished by the contact with impure men or things. The eating or chewing of betel-leaf (*tāmbūlabhākṣaṇam*) is recommended.

LITERATURE.—*Reports on the Census of India*, 1901; J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*, tr. Beauchamp, Oxf. 1899; R. C. Bose, *The Hindoos as they are*, Lond. 1881; *IGI*, new ed., Lond. 1908; M. Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, do. 1876; 'Sacred Laws of the Aryas,' tr. G. Bühler, in *SBB*, vols. ii. xiv.; 'Manu,' tr. G. Bühler, *ib.* vol. xxv.; 'Minor Lawbooks,' tr. J. Jolly, *ib.* vol. xxxiii.; H. Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, Strassburg, 1896 (in Bühler's *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*); A. F. R. Hoernle, *The Bower Manuscript*, Calcutta, 1893; G. Bühler, *On the Indian Sect of the Jainas*, tr. Burgess, Lond. 1903; V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, Oxf. 1908.

J. JOLLY.

FOOD FOR THE DEAD.—The custom of providing food for the dead, which appears in all ages and in most parts of the world, is based upon the animistic conception of the soul, which, on its departure from the body, is often regarded as a tiny, feeble entity, conscious of the same wants as those which it felt in life, and dependent, at least until it attains its final rest, upon the pious care of the survivors. The same belief appears in the provision of clothes, weapons, and even companions, for the spirit in the next world. The last usage is illustrated by the rite of *satī* (*q.v.*), and by the

VOL. VI.—5

massacre of slaves and dependents, whose spirits are believed to accompany the spirit of their master.

1. Objects of the rite.—The common explanation of such rites is that they are intended to make the departed soul so comfortable in death-land that it may have no inducement to return and annoy the survivors. But this is not the only reason that has been suggested for this and the kindred custom of burying his goods with the dead man. Crawley (*Mystic Rose*, London, 1902, p. 98) argues that the practice is generally based on the dread of contact with articles belonging to the dead, which have become infected with the tabu of the corpse; and that the idea of providing for the wants of the spirit, though often combined with the dread of tabu, is probably later in origin. Other explanations, less satisfactory, have been suggested. Thus the presence of flint implements in cinerary urns at the Romano-British cemetery of Seaford has been accounted for by some symbolic meaning attached to them; some suppose the sharp flints to be the knives with which the survivors lacerated themselves as a sign of grief; others believe that the intention was to lay the ghost of the dead, flints and other stones from which it is possible to extract fire being said to be efficacious in preventing the ghost from 'walking' (*JAI* vi. 308, quoting Douce, *Illustrations of Shakespere*, London, 1807, ii. 224; *Arch. Journ.* xxii. 117; *Archaeologia*, xlii. 423, xliii. 422). It is, however, impossible to dissociate flint weapons from the other arms and implements laid with the dead to enable them to provide for their wants in the other world.

Jevons (*Introd. to Hist. of Rel.* p. 194 f.) endeavours to establish a gradation in this class of custom. Comparing food offerings to the dead with those of hair and blood, he remarks:

'Originally, the dead were supposed to suffer from hunger and thirst as the living do, and to require food—for which they were dependent on the living. Eventually, the funeral feasts were interpreted on the analogy of those at which the gods feasted with their worshippers. . . . The food-offering is, however, more interesting in one way than the offerings of blood or hair: it enables us to date ancestor-worship relatively. It was not until agricultural times that the sacrificial rite became the cheerful feast at which the bonds of fellowship were renewed between the god and his worshippers. It could not therefore have been until agricultural times that the funeral feast came to be interpreted on the analogy of the sacrificial feast.'

This he believes to be corroborated by the fact that ancestor-worship dates from the rise of the family, 'a comparatively late institution in the history of society.'

It may be true that Palæolithic man in Europe had no conception of the existence of the spirit after death, and was, therefore, not under the necessity of preparing for its wants in the other world; but even so primitive a race as the Tasmanians, who had reached the Palæolithic stage of culture, though there is no evidence that they provided food for the dead, used to place a spear in the grave, 'to fight with when he is asleep' (Ling Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, Halifax, 1899, p. 119).

2. Prevalence of the custom.—Practices of this kind can be traced to a remote antiquity.

(1) *Ancient Britain, etc.*—Thus, pottery in the shape of what are known as 'food-vessels' has been found, in association with both burnt and unburnt bodies, in the round and long British barrows and in pre-historic Swedish interments (Windle, *Remains of Prehistoric Age*, London, 1904, p. 150 f.; Montelius, *Civilisation of Sweden*, Eng. tr. 1888, p. 35; cf. above, vol. i. p. 571^b). Details of articles of this kind found in British interments are described in *Brit. Mus. Guide to the Antiquities of the Early Iron Age*, 1905, p. 107 ff.

(2) *Greece.*—In the *Nekyia* of Homer, when Odysseus visits death-land, the spirits of the dead are too feeble to hold converse with him until they