

*Introduction*  
*Writing on Food and Literature*  
 Gitanjali G. Shahani

**Books to Taste and Books to Chew**

Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested.

Francis Bacon, “Of Studies”

I begin here with a quotation from Francis Bacon, which gives this section its title, but the possibilities for food epigraphs are endless. Indeed, it has become something of a critical convention to start a volume on food with one of many food aphorisms available to scholars in the field. We might start, as Terry Eagleton does, with the Bacon quotation above, on the process of devouring a book. Or we might start with Eagleton himself, whose pithy maxims about food and literary interpretation inaugurate several works: “If there is one sure thing about food, it is that it is never just food . . . Like the post-structuralist text, food is endlessly interpretable, as gift, threat, poison, recompense, barter, seduction, solidarity, suffocation.”<sup>1</sup> We might turn to the structuralists with Levi-Strauss’ formulation that food is good to think with.<sup>2</sup> Or to Roland Barthes on the semiotics of food: “For what is food? It is not only a collection of products . . . It is also, and at the same time, a system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of usages, situations, and behavior.”<sup>3</sup> We might begin with authors like Ben Jonson, whose character of the Cook in turn asks us to begin all thought and understanding in the kitchen, for “The art of poetry was learned and

<sup>1</sup> Terry Eagleton, “Edible Ecriture,” *Times Higher Education*, October 24, 1997, [www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/edible-ecriture/104281.article](http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/edible-ecriture/104281.article).

<sup>2</sup> Claude Lévi-Strauss, “The Culinary Triangle,” *Partisan Review* 33.4 (1966): 586–95. Elspeth Probyn and Sandra Gilbert have pointed out that the origin of the quote is vexed and was probably made in connection with taboos on eating totem animals, rather than eating and thinking generally. Elspeth Probyn, *Carnal Appetites: FoodSexIdentities* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Sandra M. Gilbert, *The Culinary Imagination: From Myth to Modernity* (New York: Norton, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> Roland Barthes, “Toward a Psychosociology of Contemporary Food Consumption,” in *Food and Culture: A Reader*, edited by Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik (New York: Routledge, 2008), 29.

found out ... the same day with the art of cookery.”<sup>4</sup> We could pay homage to the eighteenth-century gastronome, Brillat-Savarin, whose oft-quoted truism on food and identity – “tell me what you eat: I will tell you what you are” – is now what one scholar calls “a chestnut of food studies scholarship.”<sup>5</sup> Or we might turn to more recent writers like Hemingway, as Sandra Gilbert does, in order to understand “why and how we read, write, work and play with food in the gastronomically obsessed twenty-first century.”<sup>6</sup> Hemingway, who reminisces about eating Chinese sea slugs and hundred-year-old eggs, might offer us a reason for our food studies endeavors: “there is romance in food when romance has disappeared from everywhere else.”<sup>7</sup>

I offer these quotations not simply to continue the tradition of the food epigraph, but to suggest that the tradition itself speaks to an important relationship between food and word that literary scholars have identified in a range of recent works. These epigraphs point to an intricate relationship between eating and writing and the writing on eating. Their persistent appearance in volumes, whether in work on food and children’s literature, food and Asian American literature, or food and early modern literature, might be treated as a call for an overarching method for thinking about food in relation to the literary text. Implicit in each maxim at the outset of each work is a method. Thus, for instance, Bacon’s quotation in Eagleton’s work compels us to think about the process of consuming the book and the process of consuming in the book. It articulates ways in which we take in a book. And Eagleton, extrapolating on Bacon’s aphorism, in turn asks us to think of the process of creating the book as a process of cooking it up: “writing is a processing of raw speech just as cooking is a transformation of raw materials.”<sup>8</sup> This volume examines such moments of culinary transformation in literature. It turns to food as subject, as form, as landscape, as polemic, as political movement, as aesthetic statement, and as key ingredient in literature. It looks at food in the literary text, food text as literature, and literature as food for thought. It asks: what if we think of the tasting, chewing, and digesting of Bacon’s maxim as a kind of theme and method? Or even as a mandate – some books *are to be* tasted, others *are to*

<sup>4</sup> Ben Jonson, “Neptune’s Triumph,” in *The Works of Ben Jonson with a Biographical Memoir*, edited by William Gifford (New York: D. Appleton: 1879), 758.

<sup>5</sup> Anthelme Brillat-Savarin, *The Physiology of Taste; or, Meditations on Transcendental Gastronomy*, translated by M. F. K. Fisher (New York: Heritage Press, 1949), 1; Kyla Wazana Tompkins, *Racial Indigestion: Eating Bodies in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 3.

<sup>6</sup> Gilbert, *Culinary Imagination*, xv.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Eagleton, “Edible Ecriture.”

*be* chewed? How does eating work in the text and how do we, as readers and critics, consume the process of eating in the text?

After all, as Mervyn Nicholson noted in an early article on food and writing, literary characters do not need to eat to stay “alive.”<sup>9</sup> Food in the literary text is not what Barthes has called a “first need.”<sup>10</sup> And yet, characters do eat. Some of their most memorable words and scenes are gastronomic. Proust begins *Remembrance of Things Past* with a recollection of tea and cakes, a meditation on the “petites madeleines” of memory. Swift’s satire is most biting in his recommendation that his countrymen eat their babies. Titus Andronicus’ revenge is most gruesome when he serves Tamora her sons in a pie. Prufrock’s visions and revisions are most painful when he dares to eat a peach. Salman Rushdie’s historiographic metafiction rests on Saleem’s cooked up chutneys and his “chutnification of history,” with each chapter lined up as a label on a pickle jar at the end of *Midnight’s Children*. Food is memory, food is irony, food is drama, food is symbol, food is form. It is “endlessly interpretable.” It is good to think with. We return again to the food maxims.

But to ponder these maxims more carefully, we might ask if food is good to think with (and not simply good to eat), as Levi-Strauss suggests, how should we think of food in the literary text? What do food words and food scenes do for the literary text? How does food function as a formal device? Can we think in terms of a food ekphrasis in which we pause to read descriptions of feasts, banquets, kitchen scenes, and fictional dishes? What are characters really saying when they say things about food – food that they don’t need to eat and food that the reader cannot really share? In *Midnight’s Children*, for instance, Rushdie’s ever-digressing Tristram Shandy-like narrator interrupts his tale at a critical juncture in the final chapter to contemplate the process of pickling. “What is required for chutnification? Raw materials, obviously – fruit, vegetables, fish, vinegar, spices. Daily visits from Koli women with their saris hitched up between their legs. Cucumbers aubergines mint,” Saleem tells us.<sup>11</sup> While expounding at length on chutneys, Saleem is also, of course, contemplating the form of the novel itself. His narrative, and by extension, Rushdie’s, is a pickling and preserving of history, with adequate masala thrown in for good measure. (And as subcontinental readers are well aware, “masala” is also exaggeration – spice that is arguably superfluous in any dish or tale,

<sup>9</sup> Mervyn Nicholson, “Food and Power: Homer, Carroll, Atwood and Others,” *Mosaic* 20.3 (1987): 107.

<sup>10</sup> Barthes, “Psychosociology of Contemporary Food Consumption,” 30.

<sup>11</sup> Salman Rushdie, *Midnight’s Children* (New York: Random House, 2006), 530.

yet neither would be quite palatable without it.) As we approach the end, he is careful to leave one jar empty, “for the process of revision should be constant and endless,” as history will continue to seep into it long after his story ends. What we have here is food as form. As one of the earliest post-colonial novels to emerge from the Indian subcontinent, it is fitting that Rushdie turns to the trope of “chutnification” to elucidate his technique – a technique which Linda Hutcheon would later call historiographic metafiction.<sup>12</sup> Rushdie’s work was among the earliest in this form and his pickling metaphors were, in fact, integral to it. Pickling *was* the form.

Scholarship in literary food studies is attuned to these culinary moments in a text. They are often to be found in digressions and asides, seemingly incidental to the text. Yet they are critical to the writer’s form and imaginative landscape. In the wonderfully titled *Aguecheek’s Beef, Belch’s Hiccup and Other Gastronomic Interjections*, Robert Appelbaum argues that “The writer interjects something about food in order to score a point regarding something else, yet the interjection is, finally, about food too – about what we do with it, what we want from it, what it means.”<sup>13</sup> For Appelbaum, the interjection tells us something about the writer, the character, the writing, the culture, and ultimately about food in a given culture. To study the gastronomic interjection is then to study the literary, material, and cultural contexts in which it was uttered.

Hamlet’s wry remark to Horatio about his mother’s nuptials following so close at the heels of his father’s funeral, that “The funeral baked meats / Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables” is one such gastronomic interjection that has elicited interest from literary scholars and food historians alike (*Hamlet*, 1.2.179–80).<sup>14</sup> While Stephen Greenblatt notes the “economy of calculation and equivalence” in Hamlet’s jest, Ken Albala notes that the jest itself draws from the fact that the pastry shells used to preserve such baked meats were often referred to as “coffins.”<sup>15</sup> Encasing everything from dead bodies, to meat, to jewelry, coffins or cofferers were variously meant to protect the contents from decay, theft, and corruption. In the absence of our modern-day distinction between “coffin” and “coffer,”

<sup>12</sup> Linda Hutcheon, “Historiographic Metafiction Parody and the Intertextuality of History,” in *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*, edited by Patrick O’Donnell and Robert Con Davis (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 3–32.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Appelbaum, *Aguecheek’s Beef, Belch’s Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), xii.

<sup>14</sup> *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 2008).

<sup>15</sup> Greenblatt quoted in Appelbaum, *Aguecheek’s Beef*, 17; Ken Albala, “Shakespeare’s Culinary Metaphors,” *Shakespeare Studies* 42 (2014): 64.

Hamlet's bitter interjection about the marriage banquet takes on a more gruesome meaning.

Early modernists would, in fact, be quick to note that the word "bitter" itself as describing character comes from a physiognomic understanding of character as constituted in large part through diet. Lady Macbeth's liquid imagery in conceiving of her husband as "too full o'th' milk of human kindness" and soon after, calling on the spirits to come to her "woman's breast" and take her "milk for gall" is yet another macabre Shakespearean interjection that relies on an understanding of early modern humoral and dietary frameworks for its full effect (*Macbeth* 1.5.15, 45–46).<sup>16</sup> To parse these lines is to reckon with the systems of meaning that food holds, as much in the dramatist's imagination as in his audience's. Such readings, while hitherto confined to the footnotes of authoritative Shakespearean editions, take center stage in recent work that draws on the methods of food studies, bringing new perspectives to the writings of the early moderns as revealed in their "gastronomic interjections."

As a term, the "gastronomic interjection" also adds to what is part of a growing critical vocabulary that allows us to think with food. In her recent work, *The Culinary Imagination*, Sandra Gilbert offers us yet another term, what she calls the "eating words of novelists and memoirists, poets and polemicists."<sup>17</sup> Eating words emerge from a range of food texts and contexts. If we learn to think with food, we see that eating words pepper all kinds of works, even works that are not, strictly speaking, about food. As descriptors, eating words give us a way to trace the processes by which ingredients work together to create the literary text. Gilbert is especially interested in the imperative – "Add food and *stir*" – that informs so many works in which "We stir readers when we add food because we remind them of their place at the complicated buffet of self, family, culture."<sup>18</sup> (Perhaps another maxim to add to our list?)

Thus, for instance, in the opening pages of *The Namesake*, Jhumpa Lahiri's homesick protagonist cobbles together a favorite Indian street snack in the kitchen of her Boston apartment, longing for the foods and flavors of the home she left behind in Calcutta.

On a sticky August evening two weeks before her due date, Ashima Ganguly stands in the kitchen of her Central Square apartment, combining Rice Krispies and Planter peanuts and chopped red onion in a bowl. She adds

<sup>16</sup> Norton Shakespeare.

<sup>17</sup> Gilbert, *Culinary Imagination*, xv.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

salt, lemon juice, thin slices of green chili pepper, wishing there were mustard oil to pour into the mix. Ashima has been consuming this concoction throughout her pregnancy, a humble approximation of the snack sold for pennies on Calcutta sidewalks and railway platforms throughout India, spilling from newspaper cones ... Tasting from cupped palms, she frowns; as usual, there's something missing.<sup>19</sup>

The food scene of Lahiri's novel invites readers to participate in the preparation of the snack, the partaking of it, and in the sense of cultural longing and loneliness associated with it. The synesthetic effect of the passage is evident. As Carolyn Daniel argues in her work *Voracious Children*, "Food descriptions in fiction, like menus in restaurants and television cookery programs, produce visceral pleasure, a pleasure which notably involves both intellect and material body working in synaesthetic communion."<sup>20</sup> In crucial ways, this synesthetic function of food description accounts not only for the continuing preoccupation with food in the literary text but also with the food text – by which we might mean recipes, menus, foodoirs, food blogs – as literature. The food text, the food scene in the literary text, the "eating words" – all function in similar ways. They ask us, as Lynne Vallone puts it, to "taste the words with our eyes."<sup>21</sup> In Lahiri's introductory passage too, we taste with our eyes, but interestingly we do so at two levels. We see Ashima cooking the first of many snacks in the novel, but we also scan her recipe for the snack. We note the food context in the literary text, but we also note the food text in the literary context. In reading about the preparation of *bhelpuri*, we follow a recipe of sorts – an itemized list of heuristic instructions that straddle the realm of the culinary and the literary. The narrative offers a recipe, but the recipe is also in and of itself a narrative.

Perhaps this point is most poignantly brought home in the collection of recipes that a group of women compiled from the constraints of the Czechoslovakian concentration camp of Terezin in the mid-twentieth century. As they neared their death, they fantasized about food, shared recipes from their bunks late at night, on occasion, even broke into arguments about the appropriate way to prepare dishes they would never eat again. "We called it 'cooking with the mouth,'" writes one woman who survived Terezin and Auschwitz, "Everybody did it. And people got very upset if they thought you made a dish the wrong way or had the wrong recipe for

<sup>19</sup> Jhumpa Lahiri, *The Namesake* (New York: First Mariner Books, 2003), 1.

<sup>20</sup> Carolyn Daniel, *Voracious Children: Who Eats Whom in Children's Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 2.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted in Daniel, *Voracious Children*, 2.

it.”<sup>22</sup> With paper hard to come by, they put down their recipes on whatever scraps were available, including propaganda leaflets and photographs of Hitler. The recipes give instructions for making beloved dishes in the Czech tradition. But to whom were these instructions directed? What could these recipes mean to women who were dying of starvation and had little hope of entering a kitchen or partaking of the offerings they had dreamed up? Perhaps the cookbook, even in the absence of an audience that would benefit from its heuristic instructions, was a way of preserving traditions that they knew were soon to disappear. Perhaps the recipes therein constitute a collective narrative from what has been called “the darkest kitchen of the twentieth century.”<sup>23</sup> As Cara De Silva observes in her edition of the Terezin recipes, *In Memory’s Kitchen*, “whatever its explicit or implicit functions, Mina’s cookbook – and the others – make it clear that half a century after the Holocaust, when we thought we were familiar with all the creative ways in which human beings expressed themselves during the long years of the horror, at least one small genre, the making of cookbooks, has gone largely unnoticed.”<sup>24</sup> Whether as cookbook, memoir, or testimony, the manuscripts from Terezin defy the boundaries of conventional food genres. They create new vocabularies of hunger and new forms of expression to endure, even defy, it. If, as Primo Levi has argued, the Holocaust required a new language to signal “hunger,” “fear,” “pain” – these being mere words “created and used by free men who lived in comfort” – it might be in these memories of meals and recipes for them that we find such a language evolving.<sup>25</sup>

Early work on the food text, work that did not necessarily identify itself as part of a well-defined field called food studies, pointed to the narrative function within food genres such as the recipe book. Of course, the recipe has for some years been the subject of several scholarly volumes, especially in early modern literary studies, which has turned to seventeenth-century receipt collections, such as those by Hannah Woolley, to find important evidence of women’s textual production in the period. But over twenty years ago, when Susan Leonardi began her essay in *PMLA* by sharing a recipe, such work was in a fledgling stage.<sup>26</sup> In “Recipes for Reading: Summer

<sup>22</sup> Cara De Silva, ed. *In Memory’s Kitchen* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1996), xix.

<sup>23</sup> Gilbert, *Culinary Imagination*, 23.

<sup>24</sup> De Silva, *In Memory’s Kitchen*, xxxiii.

<sup>25</sup> See Michael Berenbaum’s Foreword in *ibid.*, xv.

<sup>26</sup> For work on the early modern receipt collections see Michelle DiMeo and Sara Pennell, eds., *Reading and Writing Recipe Books 1550–1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); Robert Appelbaum, “Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 3.2 (Fall/Winter 2003): 1–35; David Goldstein, “Woolley’s Mouse: Early

Pasta, Lobster à la Riseholme, and Key Lime Pie,” Leonardi started by offering her readers a recipe for summer pasta and in the remainder of the article invited them to explore this act as one that brings the reading and writing mind together in an active relationship. Leonardi went on to examine the narratives embedded in a range of recipe books, looking at the literary and culinary techniques by which they were shared with audiences. She ended with an interesting reflection on the dissemination and reception of the recipe as text:

I want to return for a moment to the summer pasta. It was this process of thinking about the meaning of recipes and recipe giving that made me want to begin this text with a recipe, to embed a recipe in a text that mediates on the recipe as embedded discourse. I wanted to begin with a recipe in hopes ... of creating a persona readers could identify and trust, in hopes of creating readers who would, therefore, willingly suspend for a few pages not so much disbelief as academic skepticism.<sup>27</sup>

What we see here are several foundational ideas for the field that we now call literary food studies. Leonardi gives us one of the earliest methods for thinking about food and text by sharing a method from a food text. She evokes a food scene, makes a case for the study of a food genre, and close reads the literary techniques at work in its dissemination. Importantly, Leonardi tests the limits and licenses of her method, even anticipating academic skepticism. Such skepticism would persist in the field for years to come.

In 1999 an op-ed piece in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* compared the trend for food studies to the new yuppie trend for humble kitchen fare: “Food studies is much like rice: once shunned as too ordinary, it’s now a hot commodity, available in countless varieties.” While the piece goes on to offer a balanced assessment of serious work in the field, along with some of the “half-baked” projects out there (the pun, we gather, is intentional), its lede sentence about food studies as “scholarship lite” has become something of a maxim in itself, plaguing the field much more than is warranted.<sup>28</sup> Anita Mannur, in her work *Culinary Fictions*, tackles such criticism head on, arguing that the ambivalence about food studies as a discipline “speaks more to the anxiety about placing something as seemingly superficial as food into the center of critical analysis ... than it does

Modern Recipe Books and the Uses of Nature,” in *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity* edited by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 105–28.

<sup>27</sup> Susan Leonardi, “Recipes for Reading: Summer Pasta, Lobster à la Riseholme, and Key Lime Pie,” *PMLA* 104.3 (1989): 347.

<sup>28</sup> Jennifer K. Ruark, “A Place at the Table,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 45.44 (1999): A17–A19.

to the seriousness of food per se.”<sup>29</sup> But rather than mounting an elaborate defense against accusations of “scholarship lite,” Mannur suggests that “we would do well to attend instead to the contradictory perplexities which animate the doubts leveled against ‘food studies.’”<sup>30</sup> To probe these anxieties is to reckon with long and mired disciplinary histories.

What accounts for these early reservations about food as a legitimate object of academic inquiry? Why have disciplines like anthropology and sociology been regarded as a more natural home for food studies than literature? What sort of assumptions have worked to implicitly apportion particular fields to particular genders, so that food studies is considered a natural fit with women’s studies? Perhaps, as one commentator in the *Chronicle* article suggests, it is the quotidian nature of food and its long association with women in the kitchen that results in the labeling of it as “scholarship lite.” “Real men don’t eat quiche, and real men certainly don’t write about quiche.”<sup>31</sup> The objection is, no doubt, intentionally facetious. But as Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik point out in their landmark collection *Food and Culture*, scholars in women’s studies have had to do much work in changing such attitudes, by “legitimizing a domain of human behavior so heavily associated with women over time.” Equally, the increased politicization of food and the expansion of social movements associated with food have created an increased awareness of food consumption and food production, contributing to the respectability of scholarly endeavors on food. According to Counihan and Van Esterik, having gained such legitimacy as a topic of scholarly research, “its novelty, richness, and scope provided limitless grist for the scholarly mill – as food links body and soul, self and other, the personal and the political, the material and the symbolic.”<sup>32</sup>

We might, of course, ask a different set of questions about this newfound legitimacy and popularity of the field. In recent years, why has the field gained such wide appeal? What are we to make of the ubiquity of food texts and food approaches and food discourses in general? Typical explanations tend to reiterate some version of the following: food is fundamental; we all have to eat it; we eat it together. More speculative explanations suggest that this popularity has something to do with what

<sup>29</sup> Anita Mannur, *Culinary Fictions: Food in South Asian Diasporic Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010), 10.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>31</sup> Ruark, “Place at the Table.”

<sup>32</sup> Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik, eds., *Food and Culture: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 1–2.

Michael Pollan has called “the decline and fall of home cooking,” while more existential explanations suggest that we have not much else left to speculate on.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps, as Elspeth Probyn argues, food is “the last bastion of authenticity in our lives.”<sup>34</sup> In the wake of postmodern tenets that our identities are fragmented and tenuous, food becomes the only remaining marker of selfhood. If we write about food on an unprecedented scale, it is to grapple with these changing identities and nostalgically hark back to lost ones. Thus it is that we have foodoirs, food wars, food flicks, food nets, food porn, food art, food for thought. Essentially, as Gilbert puts it, we have “food on the mind, everywhere.”<sup>35</sup>

British celebrity food chef Nigella Lawson has claimed that gastroporn is our last allowable excess, that we are all, in effect, “gastropornographers.”<sup>36</sup> The mingling of food and sex in literary and cultural forms such as the food show, the foodoir, and the coming of age food novel are all, in a sense, testament to Lawson’s claim. How might such an obsession look in terms of a larger historical perspective? How might it compare with the foodways and food words of other historical epochs? Certainly, our “*fin de siècle* craze for food,” as Probyn notes, seems to echo Foucault’s description of the Greeks for whom “the question of foods ... was a great deal more important than sexual activity.”<sup>37</sup> Perhaps we can take recourse to yet another pithy maxim, from a *New York Times* piece, which sums up this new trend by declaring, “Food Is the New Sex.” This nugget in the *Times* is part of a larger piece that looks at the “transvaluation” of rules and taboos typically associated with sex onto food that is unique to our own historical moment, so that the morality accruing around the former now derives from the latter.<sup>38</sup> But sensational headlines aside, it is worth asking how dietary regimes and sexual regimes intersect in literature and culture at large and how scholarly work in the field has mapped these intersections. “If much of cultural theory over the last decade has revolved around sex as that which secures identity,” writes Probyn in a work that is appropriately sub-titled *FoodSexIdentities*, “it seems to me that the sensual nature of eating now constitutes a privileged optic through which to consider how identities and the relations between sex, gender and power are being

<sup>33</sup> See Gilbert, *Culinary Imagination*, 5–6. The existential explanation is posed by Joe-Anne McLaughlin in her poem “Existentially Speaking,” which Gilbert discusses on page 5.

<sup>34</sup> Probyn, *Carnal Appetites*, 12.

<sup>35</sup> Gilbert, *Culinary Imagination*, 4.

<sup>36</sup> Probyn, *Carnal Appetites*, 59.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>38</sup> “Food Is the New Sex,” *New York Times*, February 10, 2009, [http://ideas.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/02/10/food-is-the-new-sex/?\\_r=0](http://ideas.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/02/10/food-is-the-new-sex/?_r=0).