



**CRITICAL  
RACE  
CONVERSATIONS**

A Folger Institute Fiftieth Anniversary Project  
Supported by the Mellon Initiative in Collaborative  
Research

[Watch the full series](#)

We are What You Eat: Conversations on Food and Race

DESCRIPTION: Dialogue with Jennifer Park, Gitanjali Shahani, and Amanda Herbert  
Thursday, October 22, 2020

**AMANDA HERBERT:** Hello, everyone. Welcome to Critical Race Conversations, a series hosted by the Folger Institute. Today's session is associated with BFT, the Institute's inaugural collaborative research project Before 'Farm to Table' Early Modern Foodways and Cultures, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. This series of conversations is also funded by that project as part of a wider exploration of important topics worthy of collaborative attention. I'm Amanda Herbert, Associate Director for Fellowships at the Folger Institute. We are delighted to gather so many friends old and new for these conversations.

**HERBERT:** I would like to take a moment to introduce the series for the series and our session leaders for today's event. This series of free online sessions features scholars who are offering new insights into the pre-history of modern racialized thinking and racism. Our speakers are acknowledging deeper and more complex roots to enduring social challenges and conducting more inclusive investigations of our contested pasts all with the goal of creating a more just and more inclusive academy and society. The institute is providing the framework and platform, but as is our practice, we turn to scholars across disciplines and career stages to lead discussions from the own experience and expertise.

**HERBERT:** We recognize that we should allow others who are more knowledgeable about the field of critical race studies to create the conversations. We have much to learn. In these critical race conversations, we are actively experimenting with new technologies and new ways to foster dialogue and present content just as so many of you are in your own classrooms and homes. In this session, our speakers welcome live tweeting with the #FolgerCRC as well as #beforefarmtotable. You may ask questions via Twitter or on the YouTube Live chat. I remind you that this session will be recorded and posted on the Folger's YouTube channel as soon as it is processed with closed captioning enabled, and a verified transcript will be uploaded next week. Please contact the Folger Institute with any questions or concerns.

**HERBERT:** Today our session leaders will trace the intersections between food and race. They will offer an important and timely discussion that explores the ways in which food studies, critical race studies and early modern studies inform and enrich each other. They look to modern and early modern foodways in order to examine different forms of what bell hooks has famously called, "Eating the Other, Interrogating the Blurred Criteria of What Marks Matter as Edible or Inedible, Digestible Or Indigestible."

**HERBERT:** Shahani and Park explore the range of substances as well as the bodies themselves that stand in for or comprise a culture's racial others in order to trouble the racialized assumptions complicit in the dietary common place that, "You are what you eat." Let me now briefly introduce our two presenters. Dr. Jennifer Park is Assistant Professor of English, specializing in early modern drama at the University of North Carolina at Greensborough. She was a 2019 research fellow with the Before 'Farm to Table' Project at the Folger Shakespeare Library.

**HERBERT:** Emerging from her work on the intersections of literature, science and medicine, race, gender and performance in early modern England, her most recent publications focus on early modern recipe culture including an article in *Studies in Philology* on Candying, Food Preservation Processes and Race in *Antony and Cleopatra*, an article in *Performance Matters* on Gender, Glass Bellies and Alchemical Performance and an essay in the *Volume Food and Literature* edited by Gitanjali Shahani on Blood Drinking of a Form of Strange Eating. Professor Park is currently working on a book length project on early modern recipes, science and medicine and race in the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

**HERBERT:** Dr. Gitanjali Shahani is a professor of English at San Francisco State University where she teaches courses on Shakespeare studies, post-colonial studies and food studies. She is the author of the phenomenal book *Tasting Difference, Food, Race and Cultural Encounters in Early Modern Literature*. She has edited two collections, *Food and Literature* and with Brenda Cherry, *Emissaries in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Her articles on race and colonialism in early modern literature have been published in numerous collections and journals including *Shakespeare, Shakespeare Studies* and the *Journal of Early Modern Cultural Studies*. Without further ado I give you, "We Are What you Eat, Conversations on Food and Race."

**GITANJALI SHAHANI:** Thank you so much, Amanda. And thank you to everyone at the Folger, who I know has been working so hard behind the scenes to facilitate this conversation. Uh, it really is a pleasure and a privilege to be a part of the Critical Race Conversation Series. Also, a big hello to everyone out there in our virtual audience, thank you all for joining us. We're really looking forward to hearing from you during the Q & A. Jennifer, it's good to see you. [LAUGH] We've been mapping our coordinates in food studies and critical race studies and early modern studies for what feels the better part of a decade now, so I'm really excited to be revisiting these conversations with you in this context here today.

**JENNIFER PARK:** Yeah, Gitanjali, it's been so lovely to get a chance to collaborate with you again and to continue these conversations and I want to echo your thanks to Amanda, Owen, Justine, Ben, the Before 'Farm to Table' team at the Folger, as well as everyone involved with organizing this incredibly important series, which we're so honored to be a part of. I'm excited to have this conversation on food and race with you Gitanjali and especially delighted that your book has just come out, with Cornell Press, I have it here, *Tasting Difference, Food, Race and Cultural Encounters in Early Modern Literature*, which, makes this conversation all the more timely.

**PARK:** So, to start, I was struck by your framing of the, "We," who are subjects who think and write on food and race, which was channeled in our discussion about what our title should be. We decided on, "We Are What You Eat," and I'll hand it over to you to say a little bit more about where that came from and how we might unpack that.

**SHAHANI:** [LAUGH] Thanks Jennifer. You are the best publicist. [LAUGH] But, thank you. Yeah, we should speak about our title. That's a good place to start. What we're referring to here is obviously a tongue and cheek version of a very popular maxim, "We Are What You Eat." It's such a cliché because you see it everywhere. You see it advertisements, you see it in popular diet books. I've even seen it in elementary school notice boards. But, what I find is that clichés, especially food clichés are really so ripe for exploration.

**PARK:** [As we do?] there. [LAUGH]

**SHAHANI:** Yeah. [LAUGH] Yeah, because they are ripe for exploration because they tell us a lot about how our language relies on food for different forms of expression. Elspeth Probyn, who is a scholar in food studies and queer theory, she says that food clichés are like sugar coated versions of complex ideas. They go down easily and then they become truisms. So, what are the complex ideas behind, "We Are What We Eat?" You know? What does the cliché really mean?

**PARK:** It bears clarification that the cliché itself is actually a misquotation of the 18<sup>th</sup> century gastronomy. Brillat-Savarin, who said, "Tell me what you eat and I will tell you what you are." And somehow a watered down version of that became, "We Are What We Eat." But, the misquotation aside, I think it is in the testing of the cliché that we see a starting point for so much work in food studies. You know, it's, are we what we eat or do we eat what we are? Do I eat curry because I am from India or is it in my eating, my serving, my cooking of curry that somehow my Indianness is authenticated?

**SHAHANI:** Equally we are the when we eat, the where we eat, the how eat. You know? Our local and global relations to food systems tell us so much about the where we eat, the geographical points. Our historical moment tells us so much about the when of the eating. You know, the pandemic is a really good example of

that, our commensal rituals how we eat. You know? Do we eat in front of the T.V.? Do we eat together? Do we eat with our hands? That tells us so much about the how of our eating. And these questions all complicate the simple truism, to become an important point of entry in food studies.

**PARK:** For me, the inversion was the starting point. I wanted to complicate the simple truism with, "We Are What You Eat," with the "We" being important there. It's a short and pithy phrase, I hope, [LAUGH] but, for me, it tells a very long and violent story of food and people and how they come together and that's what I explore throughout my work. I'm curious how that resonated with you, how you see the, "We Are What You Eat," and how you explore that in your work?

**PARK:** Right, absolutely. Well, I think I want to begin with how I love that you've identified that it's in the testing and the rewriting of the food cliché that creates these spaces for complicating what we might think of as more palatable food histories and narratives. And I'm struck by how thinking through the inversion, "We Are What You Eat," and that very trope of who or what gets eaten, who or what does the eating, engages in such visceral ways with phenomena related to racial dynamics and racial displacement.

**PARK:** So, I'm thinking about processes in terms like incorporation, assimilation, bringing into a cultural or political or social body. And I'm also thinking about the way that that violence that you mentioned that's inherent in the mantra and in its inversion, evokes the violence of erasures too. So, ingestion, digestion, disillusion, as these violent erasures in a certain sense. And this makes me think about what kinds of traces remain in the face of those ingestions that we can look to, to recuperate some of those histories.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, so many writers have sought to recuperate these erasures, you know, Stuart Hall comes to mind. He puts it beautifully when he reminds us, "I am the sugar at the bottom of the English cup of tea. I am the tea itself." The histories of sugar, of the tea, of the pepper, of the coffee that everyone's probably drinking right now, these are histories of migration, of plantation, of transplantation, of colonialism, essentially our histories. You know, the simple act of what in the U.K. is called going out for an Indian, is an act that involves a long and complicated history for every Indian or salvation more generally.

**SHAHANI:** And the question I was trying to ask in my work related to these histories were, you know, how do we as racial subjects become edible objects? How do we, conversely, how do edible objects come to bear the marks of race? And Jennifer, you and I know something about this, right? You know? How often are Asian and Asian American identities made palatable through food? People relate to us by telling us about their favorite Indian take out place.

**PARK:** Right, exactly, or, Korean barbeque, for example.

**SHAHANI:** Korean barbeque, exactly. People read our literature if it has food on the cover, frequently when it has nothing to do with food. There is much work in Asian American studies as well on how we ourselves are complicit in making our identities more palatable and assimilating via food and equally, how our food, how our tastes, how our smells come off as different. And in my work I was trying to look at how the sense of difference is experienced at an elementary level, how is racial and religious difference experienced as a gut response, if you will?

**SHAHANI:** And this is where our early modern sources are so fascinating because long before the average English household had encountered an Indian, and whether you take that to be the "We" now or the person, it had encountered nutmeg and pepper in pies and in posits and in contraceptives and in morning after treatments and in the sense, you know, what Shakespeare calls, "The spiced Indian air," had made its way into England's recipe collections and imaginative writing long before any large scale migrant movement.

**PARK:** Right. Exactly. And likewise, the English housewife, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century had no direct contact with the enslaved peoples of the Caribbean plantation, but she would sprinkle the products of their labor into her cordials and would taste their sugar in her sweetmeats and her confections.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, I think what we're saying here is that the culinary realm is one that registers encounters with difference on a non-precedented scale. So, having said that and having talked a lot about our title and the idea of tasting difference, I just wonder if we might say something about our methods because we've talked about the fact that we've so often and for so long in critical race studies and in early modern studies and in food studies, so maybe let's map those out.

**PARK:** Yeah, absolutely. I do want to get a start with how I love in your work how you've looked at how difference is experienced at an elementary level and how you've conceptualized this as the taste of difference. And so, the racialized subject or body as the edible object and vice versa has been integral to my thinking about food and race and it makes me think of how critical race studies and specifically pre-modern critical race studies offer such productive interventions for me in my approach to the work that I do with food and recipes.

**PARK:** So, I'm so grateful for example for Margo Hendricks and what she so powerfully termed, "Pre-modern critical race studies" in her talk at the Folger Shakespeare Library in fall of 2019 and bringing attention to how it must acknowledge the scholarly ancestry, or the genealogy that contributes inhabit or that, I'm sorry, that continues to inhabit and nurture the critical process for the study of pre-modern race. And for me, this is where I'm indebted to the incredibly generative work of scholars who are bringing attention to exactly to that, so thinking through the critical genealogy of the study of race and considering food studies and all of its inter-disciplinary reaches.

**PARK:** Particularly significant for me in this sphere has been Kyla Tompkins' work on racial indigestion and eating bodies in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and her attention to the ways that racially minoritized subjects and bodies are often portrayed of conceptualized as hyper-embodied when we consider the history of whiteness in eating culture. I'm also thinking about Kim Hall's foundational critical race work and her wonderful essays on gender and sugar and on Thomas Tryon and most recently, of course, I've been thrilled about your book.

**PARK:** I've also been interested in pursuing questions of embodiment and materiality in my work. So, you know, in thinking about how those processes of ingestion incorporation, assimilation might work, I've been inspired by other pre-modern critical race work like Patricia Akhimie's brilliant work on semantic markers and the cultivation of the body or self, which has generative resonances also with the idea of the cultivation of the land and so, both of those things are so integrally connected to foodways. And I'm, of course, indebted to her articulation of the structures that amplify race making, which has been so helpful for locating and interrogating how race is structurally imbedded in early modern food and recipe cultures.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, I think if I had to sum what you're saying, I'd put it in a way that I'd say that, we have to be necessarily omnivorous in our methods, in what we're doing. I mean, you know, you've clearly articulated how much our work is founded in pre-modern critical race studies. It's not without coincidence that we are having this conversation in the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary year of Kim Hall's *Things of Darkness*, as you pointed out, her work on sugar shapes so much of the work we do on food and race, in my case with spices, with your case also with sugar.

**SHAHANI:** I think we're also so indebted to early work in food studies. You know, so many of those scholars did the hard work of dispelling anxieties associated with putting together or putting something as seemingly superficial as food at the center of critical analysis. You know, Kyla Tompkins, whom you already mentioned does a lot that, Anita Manyor does that. I think they facilitated for us a place at the table, especially in terms of looking at how otherness is consumed and produced in relation to works on food.

**SHAHANI:** I've found in addition that work on early modern cross-cultural encounters, you know, some of Ania Loomba's early works, Jodzna Sing's work on the global early modern, that has really shaped what throughout my work I call the culinary contact zone and it's been a productive way at looking at encounters during the period. It's also, you know, it's productive for me to draw on paradigms in post-colonial studies. So, especially work on encounters that are attuned to the elementary nature of these cross-cultural encounters.

**SHAHANI:** You know, I think of the process of procuring food, the process of transporting food, of consuming it, of cooking it, so much work in post-colonial studies that is ambled by food stuff, looks of this. And I'm also thinking Parama Roy's work in particular. And you have the show and tell ready. [LAUGH] Yes, perfect. It's a beautiful cover. So, yeah, Parama Roy's work where she says, "What if we take a Marxist image of vampire capitalism and harness it to a kind of cannibal colonialism?"

**SHAHANI:** You know? What if we were to think of colonialism as this greedy mouth that feeds off the teas, the coffees, the opium, the drugs, of our empire? What if we think of what she calls the psycho-pharmacopeia of empire? So, this work in post-colonial studies as well is useful to us. And these are all very useful points of convergence for us as we examine the literary and material texts about food. So, you know, having said that, maybe we can move on to some of the foods itself, if

**PARK:** Yeah, right, absolutely. So, and it's been so generative to think about, or think across the wonderful work of all of these scholars in our methods. And so, we'll be segueing into how we apply those methods to looking at particular foodstuffs. We'll be taking a look at some original sources in foods and ingredients to, again, think about how it is that we do work in food and race.

**SHAHANI:** Right. Looking at the actual ingredients, if you will. [LAUGH] I'm obviously partial to this beautiful engraving. There is a reason it made it to my cover, so it's a good place for me to start here. I think this image captures in a nutshell what we've been arguing about so many of the foods here.

**SHAHANI:** You see it appears in Sylvestre Dufour's late 17<sup>th</sup> century Treaties and Coffee, Tea and Chocolate. It circulated in numerous editions and translations throughout the period, really and it give us a good example of how foods get racialized in terms of their points of origin and how racialized bodies objects to be consumed as food. You can see when you look at it closely how it depicts each drink in the hands of the figure that supposedly best personifies it.

**SHAHANI:** So, we have a turbaned Turk figure holding a bowl of coffee, and Orientally dressed Asian man in the middle holds a vessel with tea. And then there's figure of a Native American in the feathered headdress holding a pot of chocolate. You can see each man is positioned near the appropriate container. There's a curved pot right beside the figure of the Turk. There's a spouted tea pot right beside the Asian man. And then there's a tall chocolate pot with a stirrer right by the Native American man.

**SHAHANI:** And when you think about, on display, on the men, rather than the beverages they drink. In fact, the beverages themselves seem indistinguishable but for the containers in which they're stored. All three men are depicted in an act of consumption but they're equally figures to be consumed by the reader. The coffee, the tea, the chocolate of the title are presented as incarnate forms even as their

presented as edible commodities. In a sense they are what you eat or drink, as the case might be.

**SHAHANI:** So, that felt like a good starting point for a lot of foods that we're going to be talking about.

**PARK:** Right, and going from the previous engraving that Gitanjali was just explaining to us, what we see here is how bodies that are marked a foreign from the previous engraving kind of continue, that trip continues to our present day. So, what viewers would mark here as racially diverse bodies that have been drenched in honey, that are culinarized and preserved here in these images by photographer Blake Little. And what this also brings up is, you know, the question of what it means for, in this case, a white cis male artist to depict other figures as potentially edible in this way.

**PARK:** And I wanted to use this image to talk a little bit about my first moment in thinking about food and race by way of food preservation. It's interesting to see the ways that these foodstuffs are being worked with both literally and metaphorically. And so my, you know, kind of key moment goes back to Shakespeare and his description in *Antony and Cleopatra* of salt Cleopatra. And thinking about salt as a descriptor for his representation of the Egyptian queen, and having that refer to salted meat, which would have been preserved for longer, and according to some, more flavorful.

**PARK:** And that's when I noticed other descriptors popping out, so references to Cleopatra as an Egyptian dish, being fed upon by Cesar, with sexual implications. Of course, exactly what bell hooks outlines as the concept of eating the other. Shakespeare was also developing new terms inspired by food in the play. So, for example, both Cleopatra and Antony used the term discandied, which was Shakespeare's way of playing with the process of preserving fruits and flours with sugar, a process that was called candying.

**PARK:** And it's a fascinating problematic concept to think through sugar, how it's used, how it signifies in early modern England and Kim Hall notes that English women's uses of sugar in recipes for preserving was a way of contributing to England's colonial expansion in the period and how sugar is a product associated both with white women and with African slavery. And in light of this I'm thinking about the complex questions that it raises, what it means for early modern English women to use this imported foreign ingredient with a violent history to preserve, for example, local fruits and flours.

**PARK:** And then, alternatively, to think about what it also meant for Shakespeare to imagine Cleopatra as a preserved food item, how the early modern English are looking to preserve or to assimilate foreign ingredients as preservatives. And even to visualize, again in our present day, as we see here in these images, the body

candied over. These racialized bodies that are preserved by way of food stuff. And this idea of preservation is something that's interesting with regard to spices.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah. Yeah, you're so right in noting this point about preservation with spices because I think, you know, it's often been said that we've heard almost as a kind of received wisdom, the fact that spices were sought after because of their ability to preserve food, especially spoiling meat. But, historians like Peter Freedman have debunked myth. In fact, many historians have. They argue that spices do little in this regard compared with say salting or smoking or pickling. Rather spices are sought after precisely for their mysterious origins, their efficacy as medicines and cosmetics and their association with sophisticated cuisines.

**SHAHANI:** And I think it's interesting to note that it is these appetites rather than a simple necessity that propel European expansion in ways that fundamentally transformed world history. And going to our next slide, we can see examples of the many uses to which spices are put, none of them involving preservation, actually. This is just one of many thousands of possible examples I could have included here. It's from Mistress Sarah Long's receipt book, the manuscript is from the early 1600's and it is housed at the Folger, I believe.

**SHAHANI:** It really gives a range of household responsibilities that fell to the English housewife in the realm of the culinary and the curated. I've only included one image from the manuscript just so you can see her hand. But, you can see the others as they're transcribed, so you can see the spices referenced more clearly here. And it appears that Sarah Long uses spices for all kinds of things. She uses mace in her gooseberry fool. She uses cloves, mace and nutmeg in a posset. She also uses spices for very intimate bodily practices. If you look at the one that says, "Remedy for Such as a Subject to Miscarry."

**SHAHANI:** Here she sprinkles an ounce of nutmeg and a mix of cinnamon and sugar in another to treat women who are dealing with a miscarriage. And like Long, other 17<sup>th</sup> century women relied on a steady supply of spices from the east for the most intimate practices. One manual from the 1650's suggests that they used pepper in what they called, "The Natural Place," after they had known a man carnally, in order to hinder conception. Another recipe from Hannah Woolley's noted work looks at the use of pepper to what she calls, "Provoke the Terms" in order to bring on the menstrual cycle.

**SHAHANI:** Some scholars think that these are coded abortion recipes. So, spices could also, in addition to these very intimate uses, they could have also been used for various cosmetic purposes. Hannah Woolley made sure to include them in a potion that promised to make the hair fair, in a sweet water for the hands and in what she called, "The Queen's Perfume," the last of which required no less than 30 cloves. [LAUGH]

**PARK:** Wow. [LAUGH] Right, so given that spices were foreign ingredients, what do you make of the physiological proximity to these spices? Was there any backlash or response to using spices in this way?

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, it's interesting that you bring up backlash and the fact that it takes on such a strong racial dimension. One of the most vehement responses comes from a writer called Thomas Tryon and you can see it up here. Tryon liked some other ideas of domestic manuals and medical treatises. He's especially concerned with the English Housewives' proclivity to use spices from the east in what he calls, "Our domestic productions." He's preoccupied with the idea that these spices coming, as they do, from India or the east more generally, have the ability to transform the English physiognomy by mixing English staples with the products of what he calls Blackamoors and Bantamer.

**SHAHANI:** He's really referring to the Japanese islanders here. The English housewife, he feels, was in essence committing a grossly unnatural act. And if you look at the image here from his text, you can see how preoccupied he is with this idea of agreement or affinity or likeness. You know, that's what he sees being disrupted by the use of spices. I'll just read it out for its full effect. "What agreement or affinities there between our fruits, grains, herbs and seeds and those that come from the east and west Indies." And he's going to go on and answer that question himself.

**SHAHANI:** "Not so much as between the complexion of a fat-nosed, rubber-lipp'd Blackamoor, or a swarthy Bantamer, with a head like a sugar loaf, and our most Florid Beauties." He then goes on to conjure up an image of the monstrous hybrid creature that will be created from this mingling, what he called this monstrous mingling of English staples with foreign ingredients. Before we move on from spices I want to briefly note that what's so interesting about spices is their simultaneous appearance in works like this in the realm of the everyday in the mundane and the practical that we saw with Sarah Long.

**SHAHANI:** Even as they're so much a part of the imaginative literature on the east. It's not for nothing that Shakespeare's version of fairy land in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, takes place in the "spiced Indian air," right? The entire fairly subplot hinges on the figure of the Indian boy and the memory of the Indian votress, neither of whom necessarily appears in the play. They both exist in the spiced Indian air, where Titania recalls consuming trifles that the Indian votress brings home very lovingly.

**SHAHANI:** I like to think of the conflict in fairy land as something like the conflict we're seeing here. But when women like Sarah Long and their use of spices and men like Tryon's disapproval of these uses, and somehow the Indian boy could be seen as an embodiment of that discord and embodiment of that taste of difference that somehow comes about with regard to spices.

**PARK:** Right. And I love what you were saying about the spiced Indian air, right? And this idea that it becomes, that both the Indian boy and the Indian votress exist in that space and we've talked a little bit about sugar and spices in this regard as these foreign ingredients being used. But, there's also something to be said about how ideas about fluidity and foreign fluids also circulated during this time. And so, to begin with the early modern body was already thought to be porous and fluid, governed by fluids in the form of the four humors and is affected by and affecting both the environment as well as other bodies.

**PARK:** And I think here about how that fluid state was often perceived as a threat, as a danger. And I want to think about that alongside this meditation that post colonialists and decolonialist Julietta Singh offers here, that, and I quote, "In the end, we are not bounded, contained subjects, but ones filled up with foreign feelings and vibes that linger and circulate in space, that enter us as we move through our lives. We likewise leave traces of ourselves and our own affective states (which are never really just our own) behind us when we go."

**PARK:** And so, for me, in thinking about the fluid body in relation to food and race, it's interesting that that not only did these foreign ingredients have the potential to linger and transform the body, but the body's own fluids themselves, and I'm thinking here, specifically about blood and breast milk, where to be an infant's and a child's first nourishment. And they were also racially charged bodily fluids, prompting contention about the use of wet nurses, for example. And these were also fluids that were used as ingredients in recipes. You might see a recipe call for blood or call for a woman's breast milk, for example.

**PARK:** And the challenges that fluids present to thinking about food and race become further marked later in the 17<sup>th</sup> century when we start seeing the popularity of other foreign fluids like tea, chocolate and coffee that became the rage in early modern Europe.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, yeah. You know, I want to move to coffee, but I just wanted to add that blood, breast milk, I've also seen urine used. So, fluids really complicate the idea of food. But, as we transition from looking at foods to drinks and fluids we're also moving from the curative and the preservative to a stimulant, especially with regard to coffee. As with spices you can see how there's a clear exoticization of coffee as well. This was already apparent when we looked the Dufour revenge a few slides again. We saw the turbaned Turk consuming coffee.

**SHAHANI:** And, in fact, by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century some historians estimate that there were about 37 London coffee houses that were called the Turk's Head. It's a very specific number, but it should tell you that there were 37 coffee houses called the Turk's Head. And many used that same symbol as their identifying mark about their entrance and also on their trade tokens. By the end of the century we see how this takes on an even more exotic dimension and coffee becomes part of the visual of the coffee service.

**SHAHANI:** This is a much later image. It's from Carmen Luz, Portrait of Madame Pompadour from the 1750's. And you can see the exotic appeal of both the coffee service and the server herself here. But before we get to this point, there is the same anxiety about coffee's otherness and its racial difference and its fluidity within this difference, like we see with spices. In its earliest incarnations in 17<sup>th</sup> century England, it was variously described in ballads and broadsides as a moment in gruel, an ugly Turkish Enchantress, A bald Asian Brat, A Jew, An Infidel.

**SHAHANI:** And these are all affiliations that variously derived from coffee's supposed origins in Ethiopia, its popularity throughout Ottoman and Mogul territories and its supposed introduction into English social life by our Jewish purveyors. It's interesting to see how this racialization of coffee generally attaches itself to the Turk and the More, and in one instance quite specifically attaches itself to Othello. There's a 1672 broadside against coffee. It's also called The Marriage of a Turk, which claimed that coffee is like Shakespeare's more, contaminating the pure as water Desdemona.

**SHAHANI:** It then offers us a recipe for coffee where it follows the *Othello* plot closely. So, coffee and water, Othello and Desdemona are first brought together with a great stir. He's beaten into a union, and she's distilled into it. Of course, she's overcome and taken over by the moor, which refers to the process by which water fully takes on the flavor of coffee. And by the end of the Ballad, the Moor, who is now referred to as the Turk destroys here entirely. What I find so troubling is how this affiliation between coffee, tea, chocolate and Othello continues to live on in the present.

**SHAHANI:** These are just two images of that, but there were so many examples I came across that I, you know, couldn't possibly reproduce them here. There are brand name Othello Teas. There is a well known dessert cake or The Othello Layered Cake that you're seeing here. It's for special occasions. There are particular seasonal Othello coffees sold just in my neighborhood. I know the Castro used to have, I live in San Francisco, the Castro used to have an Othello cookie that was very famous for a long time. So, it seems like of all Shakespeare's tragic heroes, Othello appears to have the most persistent afterlife in food and drink, and it's not without coincidence that has to do with its racialized body.

**PARK:** Yeah, it's really striking to me, Gitanjali, what you've mentioned in terms of Othello's afterlives in food and drink, which speak so powerfully to that conflation of the racial subject as edible object. And it makes me think of how that concept was literalized in pre-modern and early modern Europe as well. And so, here we have, so the term "Mummy" that we often use to refer to anciently embalmed Egyptian bodies initially referred to a medicinal substance that was derived from corpses during this period.

**PARK:** You might find reference to mummy as an ingredient in various recipes for elixirs, balms, skin treatments, and it was sanctioned as a form of medicinal cannibalism in early modern Europe. But what's crucial to understand about mummy was that in the text of the period, mummy was specifically meant to be made from the embalmed bodies that were being taken from the Middle East and Africa and were imported into Europe in order to be made into medicine for European consumers.

**PARK:** And a big question for me has been, you know, what to make of the fact that these bodies that are being marked as foreign are literally being consumed, being reduced to a medicinal ingredient, even represented in catalogues of ingredients and herbals like that picture here. So, the presumably other body as mummy, and this is what we see in the middle, is being listed alongside ingredients and plants like mint on the left and the mandrake on the right as you can see here.

**PARK:** And so, it really does bring up this question of, you know, what did it mean to derive an ingredient from the foreign body itself?

**SHAHANI:** Wow. Your work on mummy, Jennifer, is so fascinating. There's just one final point I want to make about mummy before we move on, and I think this is just something that I want to put out here because it recalls our earlier discussion of the ways in which, you know, we're discussing here, it is such a violent history. We talked about this in our opening remarks, but I think this recipe for mummy really brings that out. And I reproduce it here, but I won't read it. It's anthologized in Samuel Purchas's "Purchas his Pilgrimage."

**SHAHANI:** But it tells us how the Moor is decapitated and how the fluids are extracted. Received wisdom regarding mummies suggests that its efficacy depended on the violence inherent in its procurement. Even if this is a form of exaggeration, its violence on the racialized body is apparent and the idea this was circulating as a recipe for procuring substances is just something I want us to keep in mind so that we remember that the process of getting these ingredients is just so violent and maybe we can turn away having kept that in mind.

**SHAHANI:** So, as, you know, we are drawing to a close I want us to think about some of the things we've seen along the way. We've seen so many forms of racialized body, whether in relation to coffee or tea or chocolate, you know, the fluids and the liquids, whether in relation to spices and sugar or in relation to mummy. We've also seen it in so many realms. We've seen it in the realm of the culinary, the curative and the cosmetic. And we've also seen it in so many genres.

**SHAHANI:** We've, you know, we see it in the imaginative literature of the period, in recipe collection, in dietaries, in household manuals, in ballads and broadsides. So, it's not just, you know, the many genres. It's the many realms. It's the many forms. There's such an affective range associated with this racialization as well. There's

fear and desire. There's appetite and aversion. There's sweetness and bitterness. And as we near the end of what we've been discussing I think we must also contemplate the afterlives of these taste tax. What lives on in our foodways is shaped profoundly by these encounters.

**SHAHANI:** How do we continue to consume difference? The Othello coffee lives on, as we just saw. But, what are the other more subtle ways in which we continue to consume the other in daily routine and more mundane acts of consumption, really?

**PARK:** Right. Absolutely. And, so what we've tried to do here is to share but a fraction of the wide range of critical approaches to thinking across food and race. And I'm also really excited about the potential and the future directions for the field. I think there's so much space to think about these intersections of food and race in ongoing recipe studies, in science studies, environmental and eco studies. And I think one of the most important of these is thinking about the intersections of critical indigenous studies and in food studies. So, you know, with people like Liz Hoover who has been working on reclaiming food sovereignty in native communities and what she has called the "Indigenizing of the local food movement."

**PARK:** And Sean Sherman, who is working with indigenous education and developing indigenous kitchens, which is such necessary and important work.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, I think, yeah, I mean, these are all valid points and I think we should close here so that we have some time for questions. I can imagine there will be question about particular foods that we've discussed. There might be questions about the methods we've used or there might be questions about, you know, the title that we spent so much time explicating. But before we wrap up I wanted to say one quick thing by way of reflection of this discussion that we've had. I'm being only partly factious when I say that, you know what we've given our audience here is really like a recipe.

**SHAHANI:** We've offered ingredients we work with and we've offered methods for how you can bring them together. But, as with any recipe, I can speak for both you and me, Jennifer, that in what the audience takes away from here and what you take away from here, you will likely improvise. You will adapt. You will season to taste. And what both of us are really looking forward to are the many new incarnations that we hope will come from what you take away from here. So, thank you so much and we now look forward to questions.

**PARK:** Yes. Thank you so much. So, it does look like we have some questions coming in and our first question is sort of speaking to recipe adaptation, interpretation in cooking as popular activities in many early modern food studies classrooms today. Is that activity problematized in a critical race studies or food studies classroom?

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, yeah. That is interesting. And I think that, you know, there's so, in pedagogical terms, there's so much to be gained from the process of looking at recipes, you know, situating recipes as a narrative, revisiting those and looking at the narrative arguments that are at work in a recipe. I think some of, it was maybe, I want to say now, 30 years ago, that Susan Lenardy started, you know, this article by giving us a recipe. It was an article in PMLA.

**PARK:** And then what she did was in her process of sharing, what she looked at is how she had legitimized the recipe as a genre as well. So, there is a lot that is productive in looking at that recipe. In our looking at in that form, what I am conscious of in, you know, in critical race studies and what we do in the classroom, is that that effort cannot just simply be, you know, and antiquarian effort to sort of play Betty Crocker in the classroom.

**PARK:** There is a way in which we need to have the very conversations we had about these foods, about the products, about the violence of their procurement. I think Robert Applebaum has an interesting phrase where he says, "We need not to be time traveling tourists in looking at the foodways of the past." You know, that's not all that we're doing and that's why connecting them to the present and looking at their racial histories, I think is also valuable in the classroom.

**PARK:** Right. Yeah, I absolutely agree and, you know, particularly because these, you know, some of these food narratives or histories that we might have inherited are much more problematic than we might have been told. And so, I do think that, you know, that actually things like maybe recipe adaptation, interpretation in cooking, you know, as sort of popular activities in a food studies classroom can actually be really rich sites for kind of recovering some of the problematic ideas there, right?

**PARK:** So, you know, whether it's looking at particular ingredients and their histories and, you know, the histories of violence that are kind of involved in procuring those ingredients. Or, even, you know, if we think about, you know, recipe transmission and the kinds of erasures that also occur. You know, so often recipes were kind of seen as these, you know, communal documents, these communal texts. And so, recipes kind of complicate the idea of authorship.

**PARK:** But, in doing so, I think there are ways that other kinds of, you know, citational practices sort of fall in the cracks. And, you know, there are some examples of that, you know, Hugh Platt in one of the recipes that he kind of gives to the reader, you know, mentions that it came from, you know, some outlandish woman. And so, this idea of the foreign woman that, you know, that he got this recipe from, but of course, she's not named and, you know, it's in passing and in the middle of the recipe before he goes on to say what you kind of need to do.

**PARK:** And so, I think, absolutely, these activities are problematized in a critical race studies, food studies classroom, but, in ways that are really generative and I think kind of bring up a lot of different things.

**SHAHANI:** Absolutely. We can't pass those moments by. I see there's another question here about bodily fluids. Do you want to read it, or...?

**PARK:** Sure, sure, yeah. So, you know, this particular questioner would like to know about the recipes that call for bodily fluids. So, what were they for? Would they be more or less accessible or efficacious if you couldn't use your own body to supply the ingredients? That's actually, that's a good question. [LAUGH]

**SHAHANI:** Yeah. I think the recipes are so specific in this regard. You know? There's one that come to mind where I, you know, they're used for a range of things. They're used for, you know, children prone to bedwetting. There's one that calls for urine and the urine of a boy child. I think it's a Hannah Woolley recipe, where it calls for the urine of a boy child in order to be put on a feather, which when put on the eyes can apparently cure blindness. So, there is cures for blindness. There is cures, in fact, for bedwetting. You know, they're very medicinal in the way that they're used. But, they're also quite specific.

**SHAHANI:** You know? One of them says that if you need to cure something in a boy child, then use the urine of a girl. If you need to cure something in, you know, the girl, use the urine of a boy. So, it, you know, it's quite particular about those sources. There's another one that asks us to powder the skulls, you know, that are taken from graves. It even suggests preferably, I think criminal or Irish skull that, if bounded up can be used in... that's not a fluid. But, it's, what I'm trying to say is it's very specific in what it's asking you to get as the source for that matter.

**PARK:** Right, absolutely. Yeah, because I think that the idea of bodily fluids as an ingredient in these recipes is very much in line with this kind of idea of sanctioned medicinal cannibalism, right? So, the body, the human body as a source for ingredients, and you're absolutely right. I feel like in the recipes that I've seen for this, you know, it does seem to, or a lot of recipes that call for maybe, you know, blood or urine or, you know, milk or, so many of them are very specific about the kind of body, right? Whether it, you know, whether it has to do with something like age.

**PARK:** So, you know, I've seen a recipe that called specifically for the blood of a child. You know, or, I think, you know, I believe, Gitanjali, you and I have talked about this, you know, a recipe where, you know, the ingredient is mummy, but specifically from somebody who has, maybe, you know, died a violent death or something. You know, or kind of a young healthy man. So, this idea that the body and, you know, its specific virtues are being harnessed for, you know, those ingredients.

**PARK:** And so, you know, it is kind of interesting to look at that question about, you know, are they more or less efficacious if you couldn't use your own body. And in fact, it is kind of strange to think about how specific some of these, you know, some of these asks are and where you would even go to get it. Right? So, it wasn't actually, I don't know that I necessarily saw, you know, many recipes that called for you to kind of take it from yourself, but rather, it's almost like you had to kind of procure it from a particular body or a particular source.

**PARK:** And that seems to indicate that in order for the recipe to be efficacious you almost had to kind of go to the source of where to get that particular product.

**SHAHANI:** I see there's another pedagogical question. Jen, can you read that?

**PARK:** Yes. Yes, yeah. So, it looks like, you know, Gitanjali, you had mentioned the need for race and foodways scholars to be omnivorous and I think that's when we were talking about our methods. So, if you were designing a graduate or undergraduate studies program on race and foodways from scratch which disciplines would you draw on? That's kind of exciting. [LAUGH]

**SHAHANI:** The question, I haven't had the opportunity to think of this as a program, but I have decided undergraduate and grad courses on food and lit more generally and they've been informed by critical race studies perspectives and, you know, all of the disciplines we spoke of in an effort to be omnivorous in precisely the ways that we discussed, I think it's also in, you know, in the classroom, rather than, you know, sort of have a trajectory of my books laid out there, what I like for is different points of entry.

**SHAHANI:** So, what I've tried to organize these around is the same troubling of the cliché where I go from the, you know, the where we eat, the what we eat, the how we eat, the who eats who and its' those "W" questions that really organize my thinking and then that allows me to bring in work in Asian American studies or from food and children's literature. You know, work on the environmental humanities that is now concerned with foodways. You know? It allows me to bring a lot of well known works, you know, sort of Michael Curran's work and some of that more popular writing on food.

**SHAHANI:** So, that allows me to draw on many disciplines when I'm not narrowing down to a course on one or the other. And what's been interesting for me to see is that how the final projects that come from courses like that, many of them go on to become, you know, masterpieces. They really take it in directions and in texts that I'm not familiar with. I've learned so much about primary text from the work that students bring into the classroom as a result of it. So, we're just dealing with a theoretical approach with food studies and critical races studies because colonial studies and all of these other approaches I mentioned and then you, you know, you let it brew and interesting things happen.

**PARK:** Right, absolutely. And yeah, in terms of the, you know, the kind of range of disciplines to draw on, which, you know, it is always really fun to think about that. You know, Gitanjali, you and I had talked a little bit about how food studies is already so interdisciplinary, right? And kind of all the different ways that there are these different kind of disciplinary access points to kind of think about food and how that interdisciplinary nature kind of enriches, you know, the kinds of discussions that are done. And, you know, when I've developed, you know, like, a grad or undergrad or graduate class, you know, I've not developed a program either. [LAUGH]

**PARK:** But, you know, in terms of thinking pedagogically, you know, I've also drawn on, yeah, the history of medicine, the history of science, that I think are just, you know, really rich kind of sites for thinking about, you know, how the body was conceptualized, you know, so studies on the body as well and embodiment. As well as, you know, you were kind of saying environmental studies, eco studies, precisely because, you know, so much of, you know, of actually the work on food as well as sort of, you know, early ideas about race that were kind of budding in the period, were very much kind of integrated with ideas about nature and the natural order of things, of flora and fauna as well as kind of human species.

**PARK:** And so, you know, I find that, you know, in kind of thinking about race and foodways together, kind of pedagogically, whether it's for a course or for a program, you know, there are all of these disciplines that really kind of help to bring up new questions and kind of make new connections between them. So, it looks like we have another question and the question is could you talk about what is food distinctive in your methods or arguments. Do other imports from long distance trade do comparable racializing work? And so, this person here is thinking of, Gitanjali, your essay on Indian textiles, for example.

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, they do. And, you know, there's a good reason why we see patterns. There's a good reason why we move from spices to textiles as well. It has to do with the [vagaries of the Eastern Trading Company and their competition with the Dutch Eastern Trading Company and they couldn't have a stronghold on the subcontinent and as a result, the spice trades took a backseat for a while and we see the trade in fabrics. So, yes, those responses are also raised. But, I think what we see food distinctive here, with regard to, you know, spices and things like that, is what I call the gut response.

**SHAHANI:** You know, it's just so messy. It's so visceral. It has so much to do with the sense of taste, where clothing, I think, you know, it's often used as, you know, looking at markers of appearance, looking at markers of difference in those terms. Here it's the physiological changes that foods can be seen as affecting. And so, we see both desire for that and then we see both discussed at that. And that contact zone, you know, that food is able to affect takes, you know, see it forming in faraway lands, when you see travelers, you know, going along the Cape of Good Hope or in

the [mother court?] and they're actually tasting things and they're ingesting things and their response to that.

**PARK:** And then equally, when these commodities come home, whereas with items like, you know, cloth, we don't see as much of a discussion of, you know, that messy and bodily response and that fear of ingestion that we see here. Or the clothes can be seen as affecting many other markers. I think it's the gut response that would answer that for me.

**PARK:** I guess I'll just speak really briefly to kind of maybe what's food distinctive in methods and arguments. And I think, for me, food has been a really kind of rich site to just to sort of constellate out of in a way. And so, I think, for me, what's been kind of central is this idea of kind of the constitution of the body and, you know, a more kind of recent, you know, theory of metabolism as, you know, as a way of thinking about the body as constantly changing and constantly needing replenishment. And so, you know, at any given point, you know, everything that's sort of making up your body is not what it was at a particular time in the past. You know? Which is a little bit mind blowing. LAUGH]

**PARK:** And so, I think that, you know, food plays such a big role in that precisely because that is sort of the arena of, you know, or sort of a source of what replenishes the body. And so, because of that it has such, you know, such a transformative kind of weight, right, A transformative kind of power. And for me, I think that taps into a lot of questions about, you know, not just constitution, but also about agency. And so, you know, to what extent does one have kind of control over certain substances over your body and to what extent does food as sort of this circulating kind of thing trouble all of those attempts to control in both kind of restrictive and also kind of libratory ways?

**PARK:** It looks like we have a question about hunger. This particular asker is saying, "I'm curious about how both scholars think about hunger as in food insecurity in relation to this topic?"

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, we would enough in times do think that we would have addressed hunger. I write about it a lot in the context of Jamestown and, you know, particular episodes when apparently the Virginia Company ran out of food and very extreme and drastic measures that we know they had to take as a result. What I find so interesting is that in those, in the language of hunger or in the language that's used to describe hunger, hunger is also described as a taste.

**SHAHANI:** You know? Or the absence of food there is, you know, it's the taste of food that would have been. And then it's the taste in the mouth and, you know, the belly that just, you know, that long for what used to be food. So, there's really an effort in those narratives to describe what it means to taste what is not there. And they start off by, of course, reminiscing, I mean, we see this in imaginative literature as well. We see it in a play like *The Tempest*. We see it in a reworking or the remix

version of *The Tempest*. You know? *The Sea Voyage*, where they start out with talking about things that they could have had, or, you know, meals that were tasted before voyages began.

**SHAHANI:** And then they go to speak about that absence, you know, my belly, you know, my mouth feels like, you know, it's craving it. My belly feels like an empty satchel. And then they go on to contemplate the taste of things that they could eat that could be food substitutes. You know, in some of the narratives it's like, you know, what would vermin taste like right now? What would animals taste like right now? And of course you can see where this is going because it ends up being like what would another human being taste like right?

**SHAHANI:** And there's a long narrative there about supposedly a myth about a man in the colony who then powdered and ate his wife out of hunger. [LAUGH] And, you know, the taste of that, like what does it mean that he powdered here meaning seasoning, like, what does it mean that he, you know, is the act less cannibalistic because you just, you know, you thought to season her? Is the seasoning itself, you know, somehow contemplating of that, does that make it more cannibalistic? Some of the rationale, oh, well, he ran out of food, so it wasn't cannibalism, it was, you know, extreme.

**SHAHANI:** But, in all of that, I think what I find so interesting is how hunger has a taste in relation to things.

**PARK:** Yeah. That's actually really fascinating. [LAUGH] And I think, and definitely, hunger is something that's a really kind of powerful concept. And it was something that I've been learning a little bit more about, especially, you know, with some really wonderful speakers and scholars at, you know, their recent Food in the Book conference, you know, with the Newberry Library and also with the Before 'Farm to Table' project at the Folger. And you know, it's definitely been making me think about, you know, the ways that I need to kind of address that more in my work, right?

**PARK:** So, you know, what does it mean to kind of think about hunger and food insecurity in relation to food and race? And I think right now as I'm kind of thinking, you know, a really kind of generative site for me, is kind of thinking about, also, this was a session, you know, for the Food in the Book Conference on Indigenous foodways. And, you know, it was just so kind of striking to learn about the ways that, you know, the kind of study of kind of critical indigenous studies and food studies, you know, converging to kind of not just recover certain histories that have been erased or overlooked, but applying that knowledge.

**PARK:** And, you know, what the speakers were also, you know, talking about in terms of indigenous knowledge, bringing that into the present in order to think about contemporary issues of hunger and food insecurity. And so, I think that's sort of, you know, where I'm thinking about that question right now as again, a really

kind of powerful and urgent site and something I'm kind of hoping to learn from as well, to kind of, you know, move into the future with this kind of work.

**PARK:** So, it looks like we have a question that's actually maybe related to what you said about the powdered wife. Basically, how is mummy related to or connected to discourses on new world cannibalism?

**SHAHANI:** I have, and you know more about mummy than I do, but I haven't see...

**PARK:** I don't know about that. [LAUGH]

**SHAHANI:** [LAUGH] I haven't seen those bodies being, you know, or those acts of cannibalism, you know, taking that substance and putting it to other uses. We do see mummy, you know, being procured from other places, you know, as salts, as balms. Here we don't see that. We just don't see that in the new world context. And I'm really not sure why that is. I think it has to do with transportation as well. But, I don't know if you have any insights on that.

**PARK:** Right, no, yeah. And I think, you know, I think I've always, not always, but ever since I, you know, I've been kind of researching mummy and, you know, some of this kind of sanctioned medicinal cannibalism, I think what's been striking to me about looking at that is, or what resonates for me, is the sort of implicit hypocrisy, right of the early modern Europeans consuming, you know, kind of partaking in cannibalism in these ways while, you know, also kind of producing these ideologies and texts that are condemning new world cannibalism as something that, you know, that they're distant from.

**PARK:** And so, I think that's, you know, that's where, for me, there's been some kind of, you know, interest in what those ideological kind of differences are, how the early modern Europeans or the early modern English are kind of thinking through what those differences are. And I feel like I read somewhere, you know, one theory of why mummy was okay. I don't remember what the reference was, so also, if anybody in the audience does know this.

**PARK:** But, it was a theory that because the bodies that were, you know, again, constituting mummy, were from pagan bodies and so, kind of non-Christian bodies, that this sort of made it okay for the Europeans to consume. And I wonder, you know, how that might also be kind of, in dialogue with, or it certainly kind of complexifies, you know, ideas of food and race in relation to eating your fellow humans, right? And to what extent your kind of considering them humans.

**PARK:** And so, you know, I wonder if there's something there in trying parse out, you know, the mummy practice and then kind of new world cannibalism and the kind of condemning practices there.

**SHAHANI:** It looks like we have time for one last question here, so...

**PARK:** Okay, yes. And it looks like we have one. So, would you share any reflections on dietary choices and/or restrictions? So, for example, vegetable based eating, religious dictates about unhealthy or forbidden foods, et cetera and their resonances in the period?

**SHAHANI:** Yeah, I think, you know, one of the figures that sticks out, is interestingly Thomas Tryon. And the word vegetarian is almost an anachronism for what, you know, to describe eating ways or foodways of someone during this time. But, that is, essentially what he lives on in so much work for, for not eating anything procured through a kind of violence.

**SHAHANI:** In fact, it is supposedly Tryon's writing on not eating meat and not eating anything through violence is supposed to have influenced, I believe, Benjamin Franklin and Aphra Behn and via them some people say even the Mahatma Gandhi. So, I'm not sure about that last bit, but, I think what we're seeing here is that, you know, his objection to spice, to sugar, especially, is in many ways coming from that idea that when you are eating something that is premised on an entire system of exploiting the body of enslaved peoples then you are eating and consuming something that is inherently violent.

**SHAHANI:** So, we see restrictions on diet there. But, I think he, you know, he did try to proselytize these ways, but I know that at least in his biography it says that he, oh, at least he says at some point that he did not have any success in convincing his wife Suzanna to jump to his ways. So, but, you know, he was starting to think in terms of asking others to convert to what we know call vegetarianism.

**PARK:** Right, and I'm kind of curious about the, or kind of thinking with regard to this question about the unhealthy or forbidden foods. And I think, you know, I'm thinking of things like, and I feel like I learned so much even, again, kind of with other scholars working on, you know, religious foods and, you know, forbidden foods, in terms of, you know, religious ideology and religious practices. As well as sort of, you know, certain ideas about, you know, things like, you know, fruits being, you know, something that you shouldn't consume too much.

**PARK:** So, these ideas about what's kind of unhealthy. And I'm also thinking with regard to, you know, what we've been talking about with food and race, right? And just, you know, how so much of the kind of fear of say foreign foods, you know, has to do with this kind of idea of foreign contamination, right? This idea that kind of bringing in foreign substances is not actually conducive to, you know, the healthy early modern English or early modern European body precisely because those foods are not native.

**PARK:** And then, obviously, there are a lot of contradictions there. You know, we're seeing [LAUGH] you know we're seeing so many ingredients that are being used and

I think that's sort of a really kind of interesting area to kind of think about. You know, what are the kind of guidelines and criteria that are determining certain foods as being forbidden, being unhealthy?

**PARK:** And just to kind of toss in mummy one last time, you know, that was kind of an interesting thing because it, from some of the texts that I've looked at, it seems like, you know, there was a distinction being made between true mummy and false mummy with this idea that the true mummy was coming from, you know, embalmed bodies from these, from abroad versus, a kind of false or counterfeit mummy being processed from local graves, right, or executed criminals.

**PARK:** And so, that seems to indicate that this idea, that the foreign body being used for mummy was actually more efficacious and that kind of goes, seems to go against that idea of the foreign being kind of poisonous or contaminating.

**HERBERT:** Hello. I'm back. Okay. So, to draw things to a close I'd like to thank our scholars for their insights during this incredibly rich, wonderful conversation, which will help researchers and teachers at all levels and in all kinds of spaces trace the intersections between food and race. A special thanks also goes to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for their support of this series. And I would like to thank our audience and the lively Twitter and chat feeds to which they've contributed. We hope that many of you will be able to join us on November 19<sup>th</sup> when we will be joined by Urvashi Chakravarty at the University of Toronto and Marissa Fuentes of Rutgers University for a session on race and the archive.

**HERBERT:** Further details on this and other upcoming critical race conversations may be found on the Folger Institute's webpage soon. We at the Folger Shakespeare Library also ask for your continuing support of our work with so many audiences from K-12 educators and their students who are served by the Folger Education Division to fellowships in advanced programming, for graduate students and faculty run by the Folger Institute to the award winning productions at the Folger Theater. If you are in a position to contribute, we will be grateful.

**HERBERT:** Our institution is founded on philanthropy, and your philanthropy will help us to continue to support groundbreaking research and to share it with a wider and more inclusive audience just as we did today. And now back to Jennifer and Gitanjali for the final word.

**SHAHANI:** Thank you so much. Just to say that we look forward to continuing the conversation in whatever forms, and if there were questions that didn't get answered, you know where to find us to continue this conversation.

**PARK:** Right. Absolutely. We're so grateful for these really generative questions, and, you know, I think what's really exciting about it as we come to a close here is to think about, again, how these can be prompts for future directions in studies across

food and race. And so, we look forward to continuing these conversations with you all. So, thank you.