

*Routledge Religion in Contemporary Asia Series*

# **ANIMAL SACRIFICE, RELIGION AND LAW IN SOUTH ASIA**

Edited by Daniela Berti and Anthony Good



# **Animal Sacrifice, Religion and Law in South Asia**

This book presents original research on the controversies surrounding animal sacrifice in South Asia through the lens of court cases. It focuses on the parties involved in these cases: on their discourses, motivations, and contrasting points of view. Through an examination of judicial files, court decisions and newspaper articles, and interviews with protagonists, the book explores how the question of animal sacrifice is dealt with through administrative, legislative, and judicial practice. It outlines how, although animal sacrifice has over the ages been contested by various religious reform movements, the practice has remained widespread at all levels of society, especially in certain regions. It reveals that far from merely being a religious and ritual question, animal sacrifice has become a focus of broader public debate, and it discusses how the controversies highlight the contrast between ‘traditional’ and ‘reformist’ understandings of Hinduism; the conflict between the core legal and moral principles of religious freedom and social progress; and the growing concern with environmental issues and animal rights.

**Daniela Berti** is a social anthropologist and research fellow at the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), Paris, France, and a member of the Centre for South Asian and Himalayan Studies (CESAH), Paris, France.

**Anthony Good** is Professor Emeritus of Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, and an associate member of CESAH.

## **Routledge Religion in Contemporary Asia Series**

Series Editor

*Bryan S. Turner, Professor at the City University of New York and Director of the Centre for Religion and Society at the University of Western Sydney*

### **5. Being Catholic in the Contemporary Philippines**

*Jayeel Serrano Cornelio*

### **6. Catholics and Everyday Life in Macau**

Changing Meanings of Religiosity, Morality and Civility

*Chen Hon Fai*

### **7. Sufi Political Thought**

*Milad Milani*

### **8. Modernist Reformers in Islam, Hinduism and Confucianism, 1865–1935**

Peripheral Geoculture in the Modern World-System

*Christian Lekon*

### **9. Religion and Religious Practices in Rural China**

*Mu Peng*

### **10. Christianity and Social Engagement in China**

*Francis Lim and Bee Bee Sng*

### **11. Ethnicity and Religion in Southwest China**

*He Ming and David C. Lewis*

### **12. The Nature of Sufism**

An Ontological Reading of the Mystical in Islam

*Milad Milani*

### **13. A History of Protestantism in Korea**

*Dae Young Ryu*

### **14. Animal Sacrifice, Religion and Law in South Asia**

*Edited by Daniela Berti and Anthony Good*

# **Animal Sacrifice, Religion and Law in South Asia**

**Edited by Daniela Berti and Anthony Good**



**ROUTLEDGE**

**Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2024  
by Routledge  
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge  
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2024 selection and editorial matter, Daniela Berti and Anthony Good;  
individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Daniela Berti and Anthony Good to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

With the exception of the Introduction, [Chapter 1](#), [Chapter 2](#), and [Chapter 7](#), no part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

The Introduction, [Chapter 1](#), [Chapter 2](#), and [Chapter 7](#) of this book are available for free in PDF format as Open Access from the individual product page at [www.taylorfrancis.com](http://www.taylorfrancis.com). It has been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International license. Funded by Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-032-25768-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-31813-4 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-28494-9 (ebk)

DOI: [10.4324/9781003284949](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003284949)

Typeset in Times New Roman  
by KnowledgeWorks Global Ltd.

# Contents

<i>List of figures and tables</i>	vii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<b>Introduction: The judicialisation and politicisation of sacrifice</b>	1
DANIELA BERTI AND ANTHONY GOOD	
<b>1 Animal sacrifice, politics and the law in Tamil Nadu, South India</b>	51
ANTHONY GOOD	
<b>2 Animal sacrifice on trial: Moral reforms and religious freedom in India</b>	79
DANIELA BERTI	
<b>3 Hidden meanings of buffalo sacrifice: Dalit defiance and the working of law and the state in South India</b>	131
AYA IKEGAME	
<b>4 On blood, power, and public interest: The concealment of Hindu sacrificial rites under Indian law</b>	150
DEONNIE MOODIE	
<b>5 ‘Who belled the cat?’: The magistrate, the king, the pandit and the abolition of animal sacrifice in a Bengali town</b>	172
RAPHAËL VOIX	

<b>6</b>	<b>The last straw on the camel’s back: Analysing judicial decisions and legal approaches on protection of camels in India</b>	194
	RITWICK DUTTA	
<b>7</b>	<b>‘Not in the name of <i>dharma</i>’: A judgment of the Supreme Court of Nepal on mass sacrifices at the Gaḍhī Māī Melā</b>	212
	CHIARA LETIZIA AND BLANDINE RIPERT	
	<b>Afterword</b>	264
	C.J. FULLER	
	<i>Index</i>	269

# List of figures and tables

## Figures

2.1	Maheshwar Singh, in his royal palanquin, is carried around the town during Kullu Dashera	82
2.2	Gods' palanquins brought to Kullu for the Dashera festival	83
2.3	Maheshwar Singh receiving the honours of village gods during Kullu Dashera	96
2.4	Preparing the animal before sacrificing it in order to get rid of a ghost, Kullu district	98
2.5	Maheshwar Singh (taller man on left, with back to camera) consults the mediums of two village goddesses during a <i>jagti puch</i> , Kullu	99
2.6	A meeting of <i>kardars</i> in Kullu district	101
2.7	The final procession of Kullu Dashera with Ragonath's rath at the centre	102
7.1	The temple of Gaḍhī Māī in Bariyarpur, November 2019	217
7.2	The goddess Gaḍhī Māī, March 2017	217
7.3	The main <i>pūjārī</i> , Mangal Chaudhary Tharu, March 2017	218
7.4	Dhāmī Dukhan Kachariya in his house in Simari village, November 2019	219
7.5	The <i>Brahmasthan</i> , place of Brahma/Baram Bābā, at the foot of a <i>ficus</i> tree, December 2019	220
7.6	The sacrificial pole Mahikāsur, December 2019	221
7.7	Sharpening the sacrificial swords and knives on the eve of the sacrifice, December 2019	221
7.8	The activist Bikesh Shrestha tries to convince devotees to give up sacrificing a goat, while they queue to worship the goddess. Dakshinkali Temple, June 2017	241
7.9	The Supreme Court judgment is presented in the banners used during the anti-sacrifice demonstrations. Pashupatinath Temple, July 2018	241
7.10	Posters from the Facebook public page of the campaign <i>Bloodless Gadhimai 2019</i>	243



**Tables**

7.1	Issues raised and laws invoked by the petitioners	226
7.2	The two perspectives of the judgment	238
7.3	Transposition of the sacrificial language into legal and reformist terms	247

# Contributors

**Daniela Berti** is a social anthropologist and researcher at the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), and a member of the Centre d'Études Sud-Asiatiques et Himalayennes (CESAH), Paris. Her current research focuses on the ethnographic study of litigation involving issues related to animal rights and wildlife conservation. Her publications include Daniela Berti, Anthony Good & Gilles Tarabout (eds.), *Of Doubt and Proof. Ritual and Legal Practices of Judgment* (2015); Daniela Berti & Devika Bordia (eds.), *Regimes of Legality: Ethnography of Criminal Cases in South Asia* (2015); and Daniela Berti, Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion: State, Hinduism and Courts of Law* (2016). She is coordinating (with Sandrine Revet and Vanessa Manceron) the ANR project 'Ruling on Nature. Animals and the Environment before the Court'.

**Ritwick Dutta** is an advocate working on environmental issues in cases before the Indian Supreme Court and the National Green Tribunal in Delhi. He is the managing trustee for the organisation 'Legal Initiative for Forest and Environment'. See Ritwick Dutta & Bhupender Yadav, *Supreme Court on Forest Conservation* (3rd edn.) (2011); and Ritwick Dutta & Sanjeet Purohit, *Commentary on the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010* (2015).

**C.J. Fuller** is Emeritus Professor of Anthropology at the London School of Economics. His publications include 'Hinduism and scriptural authority in modern Indian law'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30:225–248 (1988); *The Renewal of the Priesthood: Modernity and Traditionalism in a South Indian Temple* (2003); *The Camphor Flame: Popular Hinduism and Indian Society* (rev. edn.) (2004); and *Tamil Brahmins: The Making of a Middle-Class Caste* (2014).

**Anthony Good** is Professor Emeritus in Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh. He has carried out extensive fieldwork in Tamil Nadu, South India. His relevant publications include *Worship and the Ceremonial Economy of a Royal South Indian Temple* (2004); 'Cultural evidence in courts of law'. Pp. 44–57 in Matthew Engelke (ed.), *The Objects of Evidence: Anthropological Approaches to the Production of Knowledge* (2009); 'Folk models and the law'.

*The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* 47(3):423–437 (2015); and ‘Law and anthropology: legal pluralism and “lay” decision-making’. Pp. 211–238 in Dawn Watkins & Mandy Burton (eds.), *Research Methods in Law* (2nd edn.), London: Routledge (2017).

**Aya Ikegame** is Associate Professor at the University of Kyoto and a 2017 Visiting Professor at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociale in Paris. Publications include Aya Ikegame, *Princely India Re-imagined: A Historical Anthropology of Mysore from 1799 to the Present*, London: Routledge (2013); Aya Ikegame & Jacob Copeman (eds.), *The Guru in South Asia: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, London: Routledge (2012); and Aya Ikegame, ‘Overlapping sovereignties: gurus and citizenship’. Pp. 101–19 in E. Isin (ed.), *Citizenship after Orientalism* (2015).

**Chiara Letizia** is Professor of South Asian Religions at the University of Québec in Montréal. The part of her research devoted to the law concerns Hinduism and secularism studied through the medium of court cases. See ‘National gods at the court. Secularism and the judiciary in Nepal’, Pp. 34–68 in Daniela Berti, Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion: State, Hinduism, and Courts of Law* (2016); ‘The “secularism case”: prosecution of a Hindu activist before a quasi-judicial authority in the Nepal Tarai’, Pp. 129–170 in Daniela Berti & D. Bordia (eds.), *Regimes of Legality. Ethnography of Criminal Cases in South Asia* (2015); and ‘The goddess Kumari at the Supreme Court: Divine kinship and secularism in Nepal’, in Lucia Michelutti & Alice Forbess (eds.), *Divine Kinship and Politics, FOCAAL: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 67:32–46 (2013).

**Deonnie Moodie** is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Oklahoma. Her research centres on the production of novel religious forms in the modern era. Her chapter is based on her presentation at the workshop on *Animal sacrifice on trial: Conflict of values and political stakes in North India* organised by Daniela Berti in Paris in June 2015. It reflects research from her first book, *The Making of a Modern Temple and a Hindu City: Kalighat and Kolkata* (2018). She is currently writing a book about business schools in the United States and India that do the work of religion by producing ideas and practices around the concept of authenticity.

**Blandine Ripert** is a researcher at the Centre d’Études Sud-Asiatiques et Himalayennes (CESAH), CNRS, Paris, and Director of the French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP). Her research concerns local cultural and religious transformations in the context of globalisation, and the management and ownership of the natural environment in Nepal. See Blandine Ripert, Isabelle Sacareau, Thierry Boisseaux & Stéphanie Tawa Lama-Rewal, ‘Discourses and laws: resource management and environmental policies since 1950’. Pp. 379–420 in Joëlle Smadja (ed.), *Reading Himalayan Landscapes over Time. Environmental Perception, Knowledge and Practice in Nepal and Ladakh* (2009).

**Raphaël Voix** is a social anthropologist and research fellow at the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), and a member of the Centre d'Études Sud-Asiatiques et Himalayennes (CESAH). His research focuses on sectarian Hinduism through fieldwork done mainly in Bengali communities. He has published extensively on themes such as asceticism and violence, Hindu utopian and millennial movements, contemporary uses of Vedic texts, Hinduism and the courts, politics and contemporary yoga. His publications include Daniela Berti, Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion: State, Hinduism, and Courts of Law in India* (2016); and Borayin Larios & Raphaël Voix (eds.), 'Wayside Shrines: Everyday Religion in Urban India', *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal* 18 (2018).

# Acknowledgements

This book arises out of the project *Taking Nature to the Courtroom: Development Projects, Protected Areas and Religious Reform in South Asia*, a joint research programme of the CEH (Centre d'Études Himalayenne) and the CEIAS (Centre d'Études de l'Inde et de l'Asie du Sud)<sup>1</sup> focusing on how issues related to nature and the environment, which may also involve ritual practices or religious notions, are brought before South Asian courts and take on legal expression. Most of the chapters are based on presentations at two workshops: one in Paris in June 2015 supported by the 'Dynasie' programme (Dynamiques asiatiques. Échanges, réseaux, mobilités) of the French PRES Hésam (Pôle de Recherche et d'Enseignement Supérieur, Hautes Écoles Sorbonne Arts et Métiers Université) and the second in Edinburgh in June 2017, supported by the Wenner Gren Foundation (<https://wennergren.org/supported-grantees/>; accessed 10/11/2022). Publication of the volume has also been possible thanks to the support of the ANR's RULNAT programme (<https://rulnat.cnrs.fr>; accessed 10/11/2022) and the Centre d'Études Himalayennes, Paris.

A substantially similar version of Deonnie Moodie's chapter was previously published in 2019 as: 'On blood, power, and public interest: the concealment of Hindu sacrificial rites under Indian law'. *Journal of Law and Religion* 34(2):165–182. doi:10.1017/jlr.2019.24. We thank Cambridge University Press and the journal editor for their permission to reproduce it here.

We also thank the President of the Federation of Animal Welfare Nepal (FAWN) for permission to reproduce [Figure 7.10](#).

## Note

- 1 In January 2023, these two centres merged to form CESA (Centre d'Études Sud-Asiatiques et Himalayennes).

# Introduction

## The judicialisation and politicisation of sacrifice

*Daniela Berti and Anthony Good*

Animal sacrifice in South Asia has long been studied by Indologists, historians, and scholars of comparative religion using textual and inscriptional sources,<sup>1</sup> and by anthropologists employing ethnographic methods.<sup>2</sup> Although we briefly summarise some of the findings of such studies in this introduction, the present volume takes a different approach. It focuses on animal sacrifice as the object of legal controversy, in judicial settings that bring those wanting to perform such sacrifices into conflict with those wishing to ban them.

Courts of law have become battlegrounds for expressing conflicting views on ritual, religion, ethics and moral behaviour. In contrast to non-judicial settings, however, where ritual interactions are often directly entangled in social, political or economic disputes, the arguments presented in court must be framed within forms of juridical reasoning—invoking the law as an ‘external’ referent—whose distinctive logics and vocabulary are mastered by professionals who use their talent and oral eloquence to win the favour of the judge. While the issue of animal sacrifice has often been researched and analysed from a historical or religious perspective, it has seldom been studied in this specific, formal context. The present volume aims to do this through the presentation and analysis of judicial cases and legal disputes involving South Asian governmental institutions and law courts at various levels, right up to the Supreme Courts of India and Nepal.

To set these cases into context, this introduction focuses on some issues that the debate on animal sacrifice has raised over the centuries in both South Asia and the West. This comparative approach is necessary for two reasons. One is that the current Indian judicial system and tradition have evolved from the British colonial legacy. To understand how animal sacrifice came to be banned by an Indian court, one must grasp this Indo-British legal entanglement. The second, broader reason is that many of the current moral and legal arguments concerning the protection of animals generally, and animal sacrifice in particular, draw upon Indian religious and philosophical traditions as well as Western concepts and values. Controversies surrounding particular animal sacrifice practices often involve broader issues, such as the problems entailed by ritual violence or perceived cruelty, in light of notions of animal suffering. As shown below, the recent judicialisation of these debates and their international dimension has led to the emergence of new questions concerning public policy as regards the legal status of animals.

DOI: [10.4324/9781003284949-1](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003284949-1)

This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

In this respect, the history of sacrifice in the ancient Western world is of particular interest as it has been the object of extended scholarly investigation that helps to formulate key interrogations. In the Roman Empire, for instance, Rives (2012) shows how the practice of animal sacrifice was not only constantly subject to public regulation but also helped define the role of the emperor and could become instrumental in exercising political power.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, several key issues were discussed over the centuries, not only by religious officials responsible for state cults, but also by lawyers and magistrates. Should sacrifice be performed using public funds? Should it be performed in the name of the people? Should it be performed for the sake of the people's or the emperor's well-being? In one Indian case studied here (*Ramesh Sharma vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & ors.* 2014; Berti, this volume), where a local raja opposed a ban on sacrifice by invoking tradition and the well-being of his (ritual) kingdom, we see that here too a court's decision on animal sacrifice had not only religious and ritual consequences, but also juridical and political effects.

The way a case is discussed in court by the parties and decided by the judge is generally only part of the story since the involvement of some actors may be triggered for reasons having very little to do with the arguments put before the court. These backstage stories can sometimes be evoked in or transpire from the court file and from documents of an extra-legal nature (affidavits, letters, reports) which, although deemed 'admissible' by the court, may not be considered relevant in deciding the case. In other situations, these parallel stories are totally absent from the court file although they may be familiar to the different actors involved in the litigation. It is thus necessary to conduct a full ethnographical inquiry into the case in order to bring to light motivations and dynamics largely masked by the language of the law and by the frequent oblique strategies that the protagonists use to adapt themselves to this legal framework.

As regards the cases discussed in this volume, therefore, the authors seek to introduce the actors involved, their discourses and the ways in which the case was brought to the court. Where possible they rely on conversations during fieldwork as well as documents such as court records, court decisions, or newspaper articles, and on electronic sources of various kinds, including social media.

In these case studies, the issue of animal sacrifice is addressed as an 'object of law', a controversy brought before the court which involves not only religious or ritual specialists but also state bureaucrats, animal welfare activists, politicians and legal professionals. In this judicial battle, legal specialists are called upon to translate ritual procedures into juridical issues, or to separate what they consider to be 'essential' parts of religious practice (on which the secular court is not supposed to rule) from what is 'not essential' and can therefore be handled by the court. Just as lawyers are sometimes personally sympathetic or committed to the cause of their client, judges too can find themselves torn between their professional duty to address issues in a juridical way and their personal predispositions or world views which may end up influencing their decisions.

### Anthropological approaches to sacrifice

Animal sacrifice is very widespread in time and space and is or has been central to many religious forms, so it is not surprising that it has received a great deal of attention from historians, theologians and anthropologists, or that, in attempting to explain its nature and account for its importance, they have often sought to identify those features which seem universal, or at least very widespread. Much of this literature takes as its starting point the work of William Robertson Smith, for whom sacrifice was central not only to his understanding of ritual and religion, but of kinship too. He assumed that all ancient societies contained patrilineal clans, and that sacrifice originated in the ceremonial killing of the clan's totemic animal, representing the form of divinity related most directly to one's own lineage. Eating the totemic animal was then an act of communion, whereby 'the god and his worshippers unite by partaking together of the flesh and blood of a sacred victim' (Robertson Smith 1889:209).

The sociological aspects of Robertson Smith's approach had a strong influence on Émile Durkheim, except that whereas Robertson Smith was a committed Christian (albeit too unorthodox for the Free Church of Scotland, from which he was ultimately expelled) who saw the Eucharist as the highest and most spiritual development of sacrifice, Durkheim's more radical teleology sought to explain religion away, as a means of conceptualising the power of society:

to its members it [society] is what a god is to his worshippers. [...] It requires that, forgetful of our own interests, we make ourselves its servitors, and it submits us to every sort of inconvenience, privation and sacrifice, without which social life would be impossible.

(Durkheim 1915 [1912]:206; gloss added)

In a sacrifice, the sponsors give up a portion of their individual or collective wealth in order to achieve a collectively desired aim; in return, they receive spiritual or material benefits from the propitiated deity. Thus, according to Hubert and Mauss's definition:

Sacrifice is a religious act which, through the consecration of a victim, modifies the condition of the moral person who accomplishes it or that of certain objects with which he is concerned.

(Hubert & Mauss 1964:13)

The act of sacrifice seems at first sight to involve three roles: the person or group offering the sacrifice; the recipient (perhaps a particular god or spirit); and finally, assuming blood sacrifice to be the paradigmatic form, the sacrificial animal itself. Yet in fact there are commonly four roles, not three. The 'patron' of the sacrifice—the *sacrifiant*, in Hubert and Mauss's terms (1899:37, 48)—who provides the animal and other materials used, or otherwise meets the expenses, is not generally the person who performs the sacrificial act itself (the priest or *sacrificateur*)



(ibid.:52–56).<sup>4</sup> There is usually only one *sacrificateur*, except at very large-scale rituals, but the *sacrifiant* may be a group—a family, a local community, or even an entire socio-political entity—rather than a single individual. This functional separation, whereby a priest is needed to interpose between patron and deity, arises because of the other feature central to Durkheimian conceptions of religion, the distinction between, and separation of, sacred and profane. Hubert and Mauss saw sacrifice as a form of communication between these spheres, mediated by the sacrificial victim. As they saw it, there are two complementary processes:

the first, sacralization, leads from the profane to the sacred, while the other proceeds in the opposite direction, by desacralization. [S]acrifice is seen as essentially directed at establishing a relationship between the two separate domains.

(Detienne & Vernant 1989 [1979]:14)

Sacrifices are therefore structured in ways common to ritual transitions more generally (Bloch 1992). First, the various participants must undergo rites of separation, transforming them from their normal, everyday condition into whatever special state is deemed necessary for the proper performance of the ritual. Whoever approaches the sacred place of sacrifice or enters the sacred presence of the deity must be distanced from the ordinary, profane world to some extent. This applies above all to the *sacrificateur*; whatever the rules of priestly behaviour to which they are normally subject, these redouble in intensity as a major ritual approaches. *Sacrifiants* are by definition more firmly rooted in the profane material world, but even they, although not entering into direct relationship with sacred things, may need to undergo separation rituals of more limited scope. In the Tamil Nadu village festival studied by Good (this volume), for example, all villagers must observe a ban on sexual intercourse, liquor-drinking and meat-eating for two weeks beforehand.

After the rites of separation comes the sacrifice proper. The animal is killed in the appropriate manner and part of it—sometimes a physical part like the head or foreleg, sometimes a non-material spiritual part—passes to the deity. The remains of the offering are shared among the *sacrifiant(s)*, who usually also receive the lion's share of the benefits that accrue. Typically, in a blood sacrifice, they eat—or control the distribution of—those parts of the offering not consumed by the divine recipient; but this is not true of all sacrifices, and physical consumption is only one means of expressing the deeper, spiritual benefits accruing to the worshipper.<sup>5</sup>

After the sacrifice, there are rites of reincorporation or reintegration, returning the participants to their normal, profane states, such as the water-pouring that 'cools' the ritually 'hot' village in the Tamil festival (Good, this volume). These are generally less elaborate than the earlier stages, since the emphasis in sacrifice is mainly on the initial establishment of contact with divinity, rather than the severance of that contact at the end.

However, while this model may be widely applicable, at least at the descriptive level, it is certainly not valid universally. Even the universality of the sacred/profane

distinction, the very foundation of Durkheimian theory, has been called into question. For example, Goody reported that Lo Daga had no concepts equivalent to this dichotomy (1961:151), and Evans-Pritchard saw the two poles as ‘intermingled’ rather than mutually exclusive among Nilotic peoples, and as defined situationally rather than absolutely (1965:65). There is also a problem linked to the ambiguity of the notion of ‘profane’ itself. Is it to be understood simply as a residual category, the ‘every-day’ or ‘not sacred’, or as an opposed category, the ‘irreligious’ or the ‘anti-sacred’ (Coleman & White 2006:72–73)? More generally still, Evans-Pritchard (1965:78) criticised all the sociological approaches discussed so far, on the grounds of their non-falsifiability and reductionism.

So although Robertson Smith’s analysis exerted ‘a powerful, and in some ways unfortunate’ influence on subsequent writers (Evans-Pritchard 1954:23), this whole approach, and indeed the entire enterprise of employing sacrifice as an analytical concept embodying universal features, has faced increasing criticism, on the grounds that it is ‘suspiciously redolent of a “Judeo-Christian” worldview’ and ‘a misplaced attempt to treat as unitary what are in fact a highly heterogeneous set of practices’ (Mayblin & Course 2014:308) that have, at most, only ‘family resemblances’ (Gibson 2010:625).

Sacrifices may indeed be performed for a variety of reasons. Hubert and Mauss themselves distinguished between ‘personal sacrifices’ where the *sacrifiant*’s moral personhood is directly affected, and ‘objective sacrifices’ where real or ideal objects (new houses, for example) receive the direct benefits of the sacrificial action, though even here there is likely to be at least an indirect effect on the *sacrifiants* themselves (1899:41). Evans-Pritchard identified two types of sacrifice in Nilotic societies, with different purposes and hence different *sacrifiants*. ‘Confirmatory sacrifices’ are ‘chiefly concerned with social relations’ (1954:21) and are sponsored by and performed on behalf of entire groups or communities. They have no specific instrumental aims and are meant to recognise and reaffirm the enduring link between sponsor and divine recipient. The regular worship of family, village or state deities falls into this category. By contrast, ‘piacular sacrifices’ are ‘concerned with the moral and physical welfare’ of individuals (ibid.). They may be intended to expiate sins, remove malign spiritual influences or honour the deity for granting favours; the aim is specific to particular persons or circumstances and the benefits are likewise more narrowly defined.<sup>6</sup> More comprehensively, Beattie (1980) distinguished four functional types of sacrifice. Their purpose may be to (1) set up or maintain closer contact with the deity, (2) achieve separation from spirits (exorcism), (3) obtain spiritual power for the *sacrifiant*, or (4) remove dangerous spiritual power from the *sacrifiant*, as in the scapegoat sacrifices analysed by Leach (1976), where the sins of the community are transferred to an animal which is driven out of the community and abandoned in the wilderness, taking those sins with it.

But should this final case be termed a ‘sacrifice’ at all, since the animal is not killed? For Hubert and Mauss, the destruction of the consecrated offering, be it animal or vegetable, is a defining feature of sacrifice (1899:39; see Allen 2013:151). Conversely, however, not all ritual killings can appropriately be termed ‘sacrifices’,

at least not without using that label in a looser and more general way. For ritual killings among the eastern Bantu, for example

it is not the life *of* the animal that is at issue, but rather the life *in* the animal. [...] The animal acts ... as a vehicle rather than a surrogate, and the ritual itself is concerned with broader, impersonal qualities of life and well-being rather than the personalised deities or spirits that are commonly addressed in sacrifice.

(Ruel 1990:23)

Moreover, the forms of ritual killing that have attracted recent legal attention in European countries, kosher and halal slaughtering as practised by Jewish and Muslim minorities, are not ‘sacrifices’ either, however the term is defined (Lerner & Rabello 2006). They are nonetheless relevant here, as discussed below, because they generate the same concerns regarding animal cruelty as have characterised debates on sacrifice itself.

As that example illustrates, animal sacrifice can be seen as just one of ‘a much more general set of practices relating to the classification, ritual manipulation and consumption of living creatures’ (Gibson 2010:626). Lévi-Strauss argued that animals were ‘good to think’ (1969:89) in two possible ways: there may be ‘logical equivalence between a society of natural species and a world of social groups’, or ‘between the parts making up an individual organism and the functional classes making up the society, [so that] society itself is thought of as an organism’ (Lévi-Strauss 1966:104). The former model provides a template for egalitarian societies displaying mechanical solidarity, while the latter corresponds to hierarchical societies displaying organic solidarity, like the Indian caste system. Lévi-Strauss looked only at wild animals however, whereas in the case of sacrifice, the animal mediators are almost always domesticated species.<sup>7</sup> As Gibson argues:

in pastoral and agricultural societies the consumption of the flesh of domesticated animals is subject to high degrees of ritual regulation and emotional taboo. They occupy a place on the boundary between the human and non-human worlds, and between ‘culture’ and ‘nature’, in a way that wild animals do not. [O]ne might almost say that animal sacrifice is to the husbandry of domesticated animals as animal totemism is to the hunting of wild animals’.

(2010:626)

Most of the analyses and discussions cited above derive from the study of oral traditions, mainly in sub-Saharan Africa, where—in the absence of written historical sources—historians and anthropologists were forced to speculate on the origins and interpretations of sacrificial practices. The situation in South Asia is quite different, however, because of the need to take account of the long written history of indigenous theology and scholarship. Above all, there are the Vedas, a corpus of hymns and ritual prescriptions, the oldest of which—perhaps dating

from the second millennium BCE onwards and initially transmitted orally—describe elaborate animal sacrifices aimed at preserving the cosmic order as well as soliciting worldly rewards. There is an extensive Indological literature on Vedic sacrifice in South Asia, as discussed below, and Hubert and Mauss themselves took this as one of their key examples. However, Veena Das draws a broad contrast between the dominant anthropological model outlined above, and the understanding of sacrifice within the Mimamsa school of philosophy (roughly, 500 BCE to 500 CE) which focused on the interpretation of Vedic texts dealing with ritual actions (Bartley 2001):

anthropological discourse on sacrifice assumes that the sacrificator (*sacrifiant*) is a bearer of pollution, sin or guilt and the sacrificial cult provides the means for cleansing the person or the social body of these moral stains. [...] In contrast ... the Mimamsa school elaborates a structure in which it is not the sin but the desire of the sacrificator which is taken as fundamental (Das 1982:445; gloss added; note the similarity with Dr Chatterjee's exegesis in Voix, this volume).

This discussion has shown why the notion of sacrifice no longer seems tenable as an analytic construct within comparative anthropology, yet it still has salience as 'a widespread feature of discourse, and indeed, social life more generally' (Mayblin & Course 2014:308–309). It is sacrifice in this sense that is most relevant here. As the following chapters clearly show, 'sacrifice' has political and legal aspects, not merely religious ones, and while legal usages, too, fail to impose any precise or universal definition on the phenomenon, there can be no doubting the power which the practice holds for the protagonists in the various cases discussed in this volume.

### **Doing or questioning ritual action**

In a volume with the evocative title *Quand faire c'est croire* (*When doing is believing*), John Scheid (2005) asked what meanings the practice of animal sacrifice could have had in the eyes of ancient Romans. Beyond a first objective—establishing a linked hierarchy between men and gods—that animal sacrifice implicitly conveyed, the detailed gestures and prayers accompanying the infinite variety of Roman sacrificial practices did not themselves, he argues, express any specific established religious truth. Echoing Humphrey and Laidlaw's (1994) comment that the Jaina devotional practices they observed in contemporary India appeared empty, almost meaningless, he notes how in Roman rituals:

the problem of meaning does not arise, or rather, the rites allow the various celebrants to engage in a search for meaning and their personal intention and reaction, which can be expressed in different ways: through emotional or physical involvement in the rites, through the simple acceptance of the rite as what is to be done, or even through outright rejection of the rites.

(Scheid 2005:280; our translation)

On the other hand, if the rules and sacrificial gestures (how to sacrifice an animal, how to distribute the meat, how to consume it), transmitted orally and regularly through the generations, are in themselves ‘silent’ as to their meaning, they can be interpreted differently and reinvented over time: ‘The rites remained’, Scheid concludes, ‘their interpretations changed’ (2005:282; our translation).

This conception of religion as orthopraxy came into conflict with the Christian emphasis on orthodoxy. Echoing Scheid’s arguments, Rives points out that the Roman authorities treated religion as a set of social practices, whereas Christians were more concerned with statements of belief. He suggests that this broad opposition is a ‘useful framework for understanding the mutual incomprehension that marked the clash over animal sacrifice between Roman authorities and devout Christians’ (Rives 2012:157). For Romans sacrifice was a mark of civilisation, while many Christian writers considered it ‘a practice established by evil demons’ (ibid.:156). Referring to this opposition, Salzman (2017:245) highlights the innovations in Roman law spawned by the advent of Christianity, especially the emergence of a new set of laws against ‘heresy’. These fundamentally differed from existing laws dealing with so-called *superstitio*, a term initially used by Romans to indicate excessive religious credulity, then ‘magic and illicit private divination’, and which became used by Christians to denote paganism (ibid.). As Salzman points out, while both sets of law prosecuted wrong religious behaviour, ‘laws on heresy criminalized not just behaviors, but the “wrong” religious beliefs that gave rise to such behaviors, an innovation in Roman law introduced only after Constantine had included Christianity in the legal framework of the empire’ (ibid.). Anti-superstition laws, though dealing with gods-related issues, were considered man-made and meant to protect public order and the state, whereas laws on heresy ‘were part of divine justice—God’s law’ (ibid.).

Around the issue of animal sacrifice, the conceptual and linguistic dichotomy between *religio* and *superstitio* took on special importance. Animal sacrifices were first defined as *religio*, while the Christian’s refusal to perform them was regarded as *superstitio*.<sup>8</sup> Christian rejection of what Romans considered to be *religio*, above all their refusal to perform animal sacrifice, was seen not just as offensive towards or inconvenient for Roman rule, but as a politically subversive act directed not only at the gods but towards Roman citizens and officials. When Roman emperors began to embrace Christianity, the practice of animal sacrifice started in turn to be viewed as *superstitio* and as disrupting public peace and order (Warrior 2006). For instance, Constantine, the first Roman Emperor to adopt Christianity, declared animal sacrifices repugnant, polluting, involving consorting with foul and detestable demons (Bradbury 1994); and as a matter of ‘disgusting blood and nauseating and repellant odors’ (Rives 2012:158). Not only was he personally unsympathetic to blood sacrifices, as he repeatedly stated in surviving epistles and orations, he also branded them as ‘contrary to the character of our times’ (Bradbury 1994:132)—an idea which, as we shall see, would often recur in the course of history.

The Christian refusal to practise animal sacrifice should not be understood as present from the outset, as widely believed, but as a post-facto legitimating discourse adopted by later authors; Ullucci (2012) shows that Christians did not have

a unified ‘Christian’ position on animal sacrifice until the mid-third century, contrary to the image later Christian authors wished to portray. And regarding a later period when anti-sacrifice laws became more rigid because of the pressure powerful bishops put on emperors, historians agree that the idea of an early Christian aversion to animal sacrifice needs to be nuanced. On one hand, the anti-sacrificial discourse of some patristic authors was influenced more by Neo-Platonic views on vegetarianism than by Christian theology (Ashby 1988, for example); on the other, what Christian authors condemned was not so much the sacrificial practice itself (its cruelty or futility) as the idea that sacrifices were offered to ‘demons’ and usually associated with oracular practices, which were also condemned. Origen, for example, refers to the battle between angels and demons which occurs

every time someone lends his adoration to the true god, and ... the demons will be angry against those who shun them with the smoke of the altars and with the blood of the victims.

(Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII.64, quoted in Grottanelli 1989: 179–180; our translation)

For patristic writers like Origen, demons not only exist but are powerful and ‘able to cause diseases or to invade the bodies’ and then withdraw ‘if they receive the sacrificial offering and can graze on blood and smoke’ (Grottanelli 1989:180). Moreover, particularly in the case of the eastern Christian world (Armenia, Greece and Syria), animal sacrifices which Christians believed were offered in the past to demons began to be performed for what they considered to be the ‘true God’ or to Christian saints (Grottanelli 1989:182).<sup>9</sup>

Returning to the question raised by Scheid, it is not only ritual acts that are ‘silent’ in terms of meaning—that is, their meaning depends on the intention of the actors as well as on the debate they constantly produce. Refusal to perform a ritual act may follow the same logic: its meaning may vary according to the person concerned and be subject to later speculation or interpretation. Historians, for example, cannot be certain why Constantine had such a negative opinion of animal sacrifice because his views are mostly made known through later authors who sometimes express their own personal views rather than Constantine’s.

Scheid’s opposition between doing and questioning ritual action is also to be found, *mutatis mutandis*, in Indian religious history. The notion of orthopraxy is frequently used in Indian religious studies, on the grounds that in India, unlike Christianity for example, there is no centralised Church or unifying authoritative book. Almost 15 years prior to Humphrey and Laidlaw’s work, Fritz Staal (1979) developed the idea, based on analysis of a large-scale horse sacrifice described in Vedic texts, that ritual action differs from other forms of action precisely because it has no meaning per se. Staal argued that not only are the elaborate ritual procedures ‘pure activity ... in accordance with rules’ (1996:131–132), but their meaninglessness explains the variety of meanings associated with them.<sup>10</sup>

However, the attitude of questioning ritual action in terms of its efficacy or, particularly as regards animal sacrifice, its morality is also found throughout India’s

religious history. Brahmanical ritual performances involving animal sacrifices (of horses or cows) began to be criticised both by the authors of the Upanishads and, even more consistently, by Buddhists and Jainas who began to condemn violence and promote ideals of renunciation of the worldly attachments on which Vedic rituals were based (Dalal & Taylor 2014).

In addition to being part of a wide-ranging philosophical and religious debate that had the effect of calling into question Brahmanical social and religious domination, the prohibition of animal sacrifice became a crucial political issue in India. In the third-century BCE, the Emperor Ashoka banned ‘horse sacrifice’, the main Vedic demonstration of imperial power, and chose instead the patronage of Buddhist dharma to be ‘the legitimating glory of his empire’ (Bose & Jalal 2004:13); he also prohibited the killing of other animals. By upholding the Buddhist dharma, which strongly opposed Vedic sacrifices on the grounds that they were both cruel and ineffective (Stewart 2014:629), Ashoka was not so much imposing a strict religious interdiction as infusing Buddhist values and promoting ethical conduct, as his inscriptions suggest:

For all beings, the Beloved of the Gods [=Ashoka] desires security, self-control, calm of mind, and gentleness. In the past kings sought to make the people progress in the Dharma, but they did not progress. And I asked myself how I might uplift them through progress in the Dharma. [...] I have enforced the law against killing certain animals and many others, but the greatest progress of ‘righteousness’ (Dharma) among men comes from exhortation in favour of noninjury to life and abstention from killing living beings.

(quoted in Hardy 1994:361; Hardy’s gloss)

Although historians are cautious about how to interpret such edicts, they agree that they correspond to a period of deep political transformations. Bose and Jalal (2004) note, for example, how the emergence of social and religious movements such as Buddhism and Jainism also corresponded to a period which saw the decline of the Brahman caste, whose superiority was sanctioned in the Vedas, and the affirmation of the power of the warrior/royal caste, to which both Buddha and Mahavira belonged.

Vedic sacrificial ceremonies were gradually abandoned from the fourth-century BCE onwards, and devotional movements developed, laying emphasis on the personal interaction between worshipper and deity. As Bowen notes, for instance, ‘within the collection of practices, teachings, and ideas called “Hinduism” a tension has persisted between a notion of religion as effective action, where an offering produces a result, and religion as obedience or devotion to transcendent deities’ (Bowen 2017:106). One of the prominent texts of the Gupta period, the *Bhagavad Gita*, for example, combines the legitimization of violence, aimed at accomplishing one’s duty, with an emphasis on a personal relationship with a god based on devotion rather than ritualism.

Although contested at an early stage, animal sacrifice remained widespread in India over the years, though no longer in keeping with Vedic ritualism. Hindu

kings played a major role in performing public sacrifices, especially of buffalo, in large-scale ceremonies aimed at protecting the kingdom and displaying the king's authority. These have survived to the present day in some regions, with some kings now being elected as politicians (Berti 2009; Peabody 1997)—as the case studied by Berti (this volume) illustrates.

The criticism of animal sacrifice by Indian sectarian and devotional movements continued over the centuries, however, and gained new impetus, with a different meaning, through European Christian missionaries present in parts of the country from the late fifteenth century onwards. Ideas of 'idolatry', 'superstition' or 'false gods' that the first Christian writers had used in rejecting animal sacrifices in ancient Rome were now projected by missionaries in India (and elsewhere) onto sacrificial practices observed among the people they wanted to convert. Israel (2011:100) notes how in the nineteenth century T.E. Slater from the London Missionary Society defined animal sacrifice in India as 'a slain offering, with the worship of demons or of the bloodthirsty Kali'. He compared Christ's sacrifice, which he defined as 'the highest and benignest revelation of Divine love' to animal sacrifice (*bali*) which conveyed 'simply enmity, terror, cruelty, pain and death ... being nothing but a bribe of blood offered to ward off a dreaded, evil influence ... feeding the hungry rakshas and bhutas in order to draw their attention away from their real god and his processions' (ibid.).

Dirks (1997) and others have compared missionary condemnation of animal sacrifice as bloody, barbaric and superstitious with British officials' disapproval of the practice of *sati* (widow burning). Mani (1987, 1998) notes how officials had an ambivalent attitude to handling the 'sati issue', partly due to their difficulty in assessing whether the widow's decision to jump on her husband's funeral pyre was 'religiously motivated'—in the sense of an 'unreflective obedience' to an unquestioned rule (Mani 1987:125)—in which case they were unwilling to interfere, or whether she had been pressurised by the family, by pandits, or under the effect of drugs, which would have warranted their intervention (Mani 1998:26ff.). Missionaries themselves tried to pressurise officials to ban these practices not for religious reasons but based on ideas of decency or public order that they knew would be more in line with British concerns (Dirks 1997). Though British officials eventually decided to intervene and ban the practices of *sati* and hook-swinging, perhaps because they endangered human life, they were more inclined, in the case of animal sacrifice, to follow the principle of non-interference in religious practices so as to avoid public discontent.

British debates on *sati* and animal sacrifice shared a common preoccupation with the use and ascribed ultimate authority of Sanskrit scriptures and the Brahmanic interpretation of them, so as to assess whether or not these practices were in keeping with 'Hindu' religion. In fact, British officials thought that most people in India, even among Brahmans, were ignorant of their 'true' religion as they did not know scriptural texts or did not interpret them correctly (Mani 1998).<sup>11</sup> However, as Tanaka (2000) argues regarding a similar debate in Sri Lanka, since the practice of animal sacrifice is also attested to in the Vedas, the problem was to establish



which scripture should be regarded as authoritative—an issue which also emerges in Berti's case-study (this volume).

The missionaries' insistence on opposing 'religion' and 'superstition', along with the 'civilising discourse' of British officials, had a profound impact on nineteenth-century Hindu reformist leaders who also took a stand against animal sacrifice. They wanted to 'purify' Hinduism of what they called evil practices. Some did this explicitly in the name of a British rational, modern attitude: for example, Ram-mohan Roy, the Brahman founder of the Brahmo Samaj, who was influenced by Sanskrit, Islamic, Christian, and Orientalist readings and British liberal thinking, rejected *sati* and caste rules, and considered animal sacrifice repugnant (Humes 2005:149; also Doctor 1997:18). Others, like Dayananda Saraswati, founder of the Arya Samaj, had the idea of going back to an ideal of Vedic purity as opposed to the 'superstitions' of contemporary Hinduism. He reacted to Christian missionaries' claims of superiority by provocatively quoting biblical passages and criticising the Christians' God for being brutal, constantly demanding animal sacrifice: 'Are not the parents, who cause one of their children to be killed in order to feed the other, considered most sinful? The same is true in this case since all living creatures are like children to God. The Christian God (in their case) is more like a butcher' (Saraswati 1906: XIII-15).

It was within this eclectic reformist milieu that categories such as 'religion' and 'superstition', inspired by Christian religious discourse and a Victorian vision of progress, oriented the religious debate around the issue of animal sacrifice, opposing not only Hindu reformists to Hindu traditionalists but also Hindus to Christians and Muslims. Bharati (1970) has shown how the notion of 'superstition' may be used in India in opposition to science and rationality or, particularly among non-English speaking people, as a synonym of *andhavisvas*, a vernacular term introduced by Dayananda Saraswati to denote 'blind faith' as opposed, in his view, to a reformist, more spiritually oriented religious approach.

This aspect of the debate has been taken up by Indian judges, some of whom have a personal interest in a spiritual approach to religion and are pushing for Hindu religious reforms. The term 'superstition' is often found in their rulings in the sense of practices that are too ritualistic, or considered to hamper spiritual thinking or engage with doubtful and demoniac entities. For instance, in the court ruling discussed by Berti (this volume), the judge used the term 'superstition' eleven times, as a personal comment or by quoting previous judgments. For example, animal sacrifice is defined as a 'social evil' reflecting 'cruelty, superstition, fear and barbarism' and having 'nothing to do with religion' (*Ramesh Sharma vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & ors.* 2014:§8). Here superstition is opposed to scientific and rational thinking and to the citizen's fundamental duty, mentioned in the 42nd Amendment to the Constitution of India (in 1976), 'to develop the scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform' (Art. 51A-h). It is also opposed to religion, defined by this particular judge as 'based upon spiritual values which the Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas were said to reveal to mankind, and which would be "love others, serve others, help ever, hurt never"' (*Ramesh Sharma vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & ors.* 2014:§51, quoting a 2004 decision).

Despite the similarities found in some rulings, between the religious speculations a judge may want to introduce in his decision and the writings of Hindu religious reformists—sometimes explicitly quoted in the judge’s decision along with religious texts—judges in India are an extremely eclectic grouping. While some have very spiritual or orthodox attitudes, others have very liberal and totally secular views. Therefore, the idea that animal sacrifice is a ‘superstition’ and is opposed to religion is not shared by all judges in India, and sometimes for very different reasons. For example, some judges in the region where Berti worked (or their families) may even occasionally offer sacrifices themselves to their local deity. Others may be reluctant to ban this practice according to a more relativistic and secular perspective, with the idea, as one judge told Berti, that ‘what is superstition for some is religion for others’ (Deepak Gupta, pers. com.).

It should also be noted that, as Indian courts are secular institutions, judges are not expected to base their decisions on their personal religious views. Even when they cannot help embellishing their discourse with religious speculations, they are expected to found their decisions on purely legal arguments. One legal framework that judges may call upon to discuss these kinds of issues is the distinction between beliefs and practices—recalling Scheid’s analysis of the contrast between acting and believing, mentioned earlier.

A religion undoubtedly has its basis in a system of belief or doctrines which are regarded by those who profess that religion as conducive to their spiritual well being, but it would not be correct to say that religion is nothing else but a doctrine or belief. A religion may not only lay down a code of ethical rules for its followers to accept, it might prescribe rituals and observances, ceremonies and modes of worship which are regarded as integral parts of religion, and these forms and observances might extend even to matters of food and dress.

*(The Commissioner of Hindu Religious Endowments,  
Madras vs. Sri Lakshmindra Tirtha Swamiar 1954)*

The idea that religion is based on practice as well as belief is often used as an argument in court to defend religious freedom. However, in determining which practices could be defined as ‘religion’, the Supreme Court in the so-called Shirur Mutt case just quoted above adopted the ‘essential practice doctrine’, whereby religious freedom only applies to the ‘essential and integral’ part of religion. In the words of Justice Gajendragadkar—‘the key architect of this doctrine’ (Mehta 2010:177) whose influential judgments established decisive precedents—the ‘non-essential part of religion’ is excluded from constitutional protection. This does not apply only to ‘secular matters disguised as religious ones’ but also extends to ‘superstitious’ beliefs and practices which are ‘extraneous and unessential accretions to religion itself’—which the court has the authority and duty to identify.<sup>12</sup>

This distinction between the essential and non-essential parts of religion is in fact not new, and before being used in this legal context, it was used for instance by the Catholic Church. In 1906, for example, the Rev. H.G. Hughes’ work *Essentials*

*and Non-essentials of the Catholic Religion* affirms from a soteriological perspective that ‘not all that the Church approves does she thereby impose as essentially necessary for salvation’ (Hughes 1906:8). Hindu religious reformists, probably influenced by Christian writings, also used the same kind of opposition. Swami Vivekananda, for example, despite criticising Christianity, constantly refers to this contrast in his writings and also seems to echo this idea when he refers to the Vedas: ‘The essentials are eternal; the non-essentials have value only for a certain time’ (quoted in Gayatriprana 2020:285)—a sentence often quoted by Indian judges in their rulings.

What is new in the use of the essential/non-essential distinction by the court is that instead of being a theological or philosophical (rhetorical) statement aimed at educating the followers of a particular religion about how to reach salvation or spiritual health, it becomes a legal category, a judicial tool by which the court, which has become the authority entitled to decide what is essential and what is not, may concretely enforce social and religious reform. Indeed, the logic of the ‘essential practices test’ has given the court broad authority to define, interpret and regulate the meaning and extent of religion. It may be used by judges in India—and in other countries like Pakistan, Malaysia and Singapore where this test has been adopted, explicitly or by implication (Neo 2018; Scotti 2016)—to decide in favour of or against the principle of religious freedom, while in the USA, as the discussion by Berti in this volume shows, such a reformist trend would clearly be unconstitutional, though a ‘centrality’ test could be applied until it was abandoned in 2000. But as De Roover (2019) points out, analysing the Indian Supreme Court’s recent use of the doctrine to decide that the exclusion of women of child-bearing age from the Aiyappan temple at Sabarimalai in Kerala was neither an ‘essential’ nor an ‘integral’ part of Hinduism (see also Dutta, this volume), framing issues in this way serves to constrain the range of possible answers to questions regarding tradition and religion.

The essential/non-essential principle has not however completely replaced the religion/superstition opposition which, as we saw, dominated the debate around animal sacrifice in earlier periods. At legislative level for example, so-called Anti-Superstition laws have been passed in many Indian states in recent years, attempting to draw (not without heated debate) a boundary between religious practices and ‘evil’ superstitious ones.

We now turn to another important issue that the debate on animal sacrifice has often addressed, the question of cruelty and animal sensitivity. It also has a long history, both in India and in the West, and has formed another element of the shared debate especially since the colonial period.

### **On cruelty and morality**

In the criticisms made of the practice of animal sacrifice at different times and in different regions of the world, two major arguments seem to prevail. One highlights the effects that the practice can have on humans in their present life or, in relation

to the idea of reincarnation, their future life. The other argument focuses on the animals themselves, on the respect they deserve and the suffering these practices inflict on them.

These two perspectives emerged in ancient times in the West with different implications. For instance, Pythagorean ideas about the condemnation of animal sacrifice considerably influenced the debate in Rome. Thus, Ovid (43 BCE–17/18 CE) in his *Metamorphoses* attributed to Pythagoras a speech in which he described animal sacrifice as ‘an impiety that grows out of a carnivorous lifestyle’; an ‘evil that is not sanctioned by the gods’; an ‘act of betrayal against our bestial colleagues/fellow-workers’; and the ‘equivalent of murder, given the theory of metempsychosis and the human-like sensibilities of the animal victims’ (Green 2008:44–45). The issue was taken up from a different perspective by Plutarch (ca. 45–125 CE), who addressed it not in relation to the practice of vegetarianism or the idea of reincarnation, as with Pythagorean conceptions centring on humans, but on the basis that animals themselves are intelligent, possess rationality, language and emotions, and thus need moral consideration (Steiner 2010:75).<sup>13</sup> In countering other widespread philosophical orientations of that period which considered animals as cognitively and morally inferior to humans, Plutarch argued (in *Moralia*) that animals differ from human beings only in degree not in kind and thus, as he argued towards the end of his life, deserve mercy and compassion (ibid.). Plutarch’s views are often cited by the animal protection movement in the modern period (cf. Newmyer 2006).

Although the idea of all living beings having a common nature was regarded as ridiculous by the authorities in Rome, it continued to attract intellectuals of the Late Roman Republic (Ovid, Lucretius, Virgil) who ‘were inviting debate on the morality and validity of animal sacrifice’ (Green 2008:42).<sup>14</sup> Rives argues for example, that Constantine’s attitudes ‘were in the first instance shaped more by the Neoplatonic than the Christian understanding of animal sacrifice’ (Rives 2012:160). The Church rather rejected these ideas, assimilating them to paganism and then to heresy (Baratay 2012:132). In fact, what seems to have generally prevailed among patristic and scholastic thinkers was the vision that opposes humans, with their spiritual immortal soul, and animals, with their limited, instinctive and sensitive faculties of a corporeal and mortal soul (ibid.). As Baratay notes, this position was almost unanimous until the sixteenth century, with few exceptions.

From the mid-sixteenth century onwards, however, some puritan groups in Britain, especially the Quakers, began to oppose blood sports against animals by emphasising their cruelty and the animals’ suffering (Watson 2014). The same puritan sects were to be at the root of early American movements against cruelty to animals. The developing debate drew attention in broader philosophical circles during the eighteenth century. Two kinds of argument were discussed: cruelty towards animals will increase humans’ cruelty towards humans (e.g. Locke); and humans have a moral duty towards animals (e.g. Kant). This moral duty was defended especially in relation to the capacity of animals to feel pain. For example,

Rousseau argued that humans had a moral duty towards animals not because of a common rationality (which he considered to be specific to humans) but because of animals' sensibility:

It seems, in fact, that if I am obliged to do no harm to my fellow man, it is less because he is a reasonable being than because he is a sensitive being; a quality which, as it is common to beast and man, should at least give the one the right not to be unnecessarily mistreated by the other.

(Rousseau 1755: Préface; our translation).

This was a century after Descartes had considered animals to be 'automata', arguing 'that they did not have minds capable of understanding or articulating pain, so their screams and writhing were just reactions to a stimulus, and it did not matter how they were treated' (Blosch 2012:12). Focusing on behaviour rather than physiology, Rousseau noted on the contrary how feeling pain gave animals a certain moral status:

Without speaking of the tenderness of mothers for their young, and of the perils which they brave to protect them, we observe every day the reluctance of horses to trample on a living body; an animal does not pass without anxiety near a dead animal of its kind; there are even some who give them a sort of burial; and the sad roaring of cattle entering a slaughterhouse proclaims the impression they receive from the horrible spectacle that confronts them.

(Rousseau 1755: Première partie; our translation)

This discourse on the ability of animals to feel pain was shared by other eighteenth-century authors, writing at a time when the political and intellectual debate on rights was in vogue on both sides of the Channel. From a theological perspective, for instance, the Anglican priest Humphry Primatt published in 1776 a dissertation on pain as the unifying characteristic of humans and animals:

Pain is pain, whether it is inflicted on man or on beast; and the creature that suffers it, whether man or beast, being sensible of the misery of it whilst it lasts, suffers Evil.

(Primatt 1776:7)

From a religious perspective, Primatt was concerned with animals' 'right to happiness', an idea that would emerge again later in legal battles against animal sacrifice. Along with defending humans' and animals' commonality of sentience, he compared animal cruelty to cruelty against children or women who were also deprived of rights:

Primatt ... allies children and animals as worthy co-claimants to rights as citizens of the world. He advocates for the 'innocent beast, who can neither

help himself nor avenge himself, and yet has as much right to happiness in this world as a child can have’.

(Morillo 2017:103)

In France too, during the revolutionary period, the issue of animal protection became part of public debate. As Baratay (2012) notes, it was organised in public places and took on a social and political character. Growing public condemnation of brutality was, he argued, also due to the increasing use of animals in agricultural work and harnessed transportation, leading to frequent scenes of abuse in public places. This led not only to a change in public sensitivity but also, Baratay claimed, a change in behaviour among animals themselves who reacted to the way they were treated by expressing their suffering in the public eye.

One figure regularly quoted in this debate is Jeremy Bentham, a British Utilitarian philosopher and jurist.<sup>15</sup> In the second edition (1823) of *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and of Legislation* he compared, as Primatt had a few years earlier, animal oppression to various forms of human oppression, such as slavery<sup>16</sup>:

The day may come, when the rest of the animal creation may acquire those rights which never could have been withholden from them but by the hand of tyranny. The French have already discovered that the blackness of the skin is no reason why a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor. It may come one day to be recognized, that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the *os sacrum*, are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason, or, perhaps, the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more conversable animal, than an infant of a day, or a week, or even a month, old. But suppose the case were otherwise, what would it avail? The question is not, Can they *reason*? Nor, Can they *talk*? But, Can they *suffer*?

(Bentham 1823, chap. XVII, para. 1–IV, note 122)

Bentham’s ideas had a major impact on the debate about the ethical treatment of animals (Ortiz-Robles 2016a:9), which led to the creation of the first animal welfare organisations, notably the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), founded in London on the initiative of clerics, politicians and lawyers (Boddice 2008). They also inspired demands that Parliament pass legislation to outlaw or restrict various practices implying animal maltreatment such as staged animal fights, vivisection and cruel sports.<sup>17</sup>

The issues of cruelty and animal suffering had in fact been raised since the first animal protection bills were proposed in Britain in the early nineteenth century, such as the Bull-Baiting Bill in 1800. While opponents in the House of Commons dismissed the discourse on animal cruelty as unimportant and stemming from a ‘petty, meddling spirit’, its supporters, many from an evangelical background, tried to convince the House by playing on their emotions (Blosh 2012:26).

The proponents of these legal reforms—activists, jurists, parliamentarians, social reformers and clergy—began to place the issue of animal suffering at the heart of the judicial debate. Sir Richard Hill, for instance, the first Evangelical Christian elected to Parliament, gave vivid descriptions of horrible scenes to illustrate the cruel ways in which animals were treated in a variety of situations.<sup>18</sup> Others stressed religious arguments, saying that ‘our responsibility to God, who created animals ... requires us to treat them with compassion’ (Lord Erskine, in Blosch 2012:30).

The first bill eventually passed was the so-called Martin’s Act of 1822 (*An Act to Prevent the Cruel and Improper treatment of Cattle*). Proposed by Richard Martin to prevent the abuse of horses, sheep, oxen and other cattle, the idea of animal suffering was presented as sufficient reason in itself to consider enacting a law. It drew considerable public support:

One factor was that by this time the public abuse of animals on city streets had resulted in overwhelming popular support for the cause of animal protection. Cruelty to cattle and sheep as they were being driven to slaughter, and to horses overloaded with cargo, was especially obvious. These animals were often starved and beaten until they literally fell down dead. Magistrates, clergymen, businessmen and concerned citizens submitted more than thirty petitions in support of Martin’s bill.

(Blosch 2012:33–34)

Soon after the passing of the bill, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded (1824), which quickly enjoyed Queen Victoria’s support and became the RSPCA in 1840. The Society began to handle the issue of cruelty with regard not only to cattle but also, for example, to dogs and other domestic animals, cock fighting and experiments on animals.

In addition to these committed positions, which often linked the issue of animal cruelty to other social battles, another contribution to the ethical debate on animals was the growing fashion among aristocracy and wealthier classes of keeping pets at home. Pets, especially dogs but also birds and horses, were regularly included in family groups portrayed in paintings, anticipating the widespread nineteenth-century obsession with pets among upper and middle classes (Thomas 1983; also Mangum 2007).

Some within these circles were also involved in the modern vegetarian movement that began to form during this period around the Vegetarian Society, founded in Manchester in 1888. Henry Stephens Salt, for example, an English promoter of social reforms and animal rights, published in 1886 *A Plea for Vegetarianism*, which was to have a major influence on Gandhi, early in his life in England. Gandhi acknowledged in his autobiography that his adoption of vegetarianism, which he later associated with Indian ideas of nonviolence (*ahimsā*) in his anti-colonial fight, had been reinforced by reading Salt’s book (Salt 1886).<sup>19</sup>

The circulation of ideas between India and Europe intensified at the end of the nineteenth century and even more so in the twentieth century. Some of the battles

fought in the West by the nascent animal welfare movement would also be fought in India by British residents and Indian activists, and some legislation passed in the United Kingdom to prevent animal cruelty would be adapted to British India—though the history of legal transplants between Britain and India was, generally speaking, more complex and often reciprocal (Halpérin 2010).

Before examining how this change in the perception of animal treatment is addressed in court by activists and legal actors, we again turn briefly to pre-colonial and colonial Indian history to look at some of the main issues evoked by the debate around animal cruelty and, correlatively, the issue of animal sacrifice. This debate had been taking place in India since ancient times and had raised specific questions around the idea of violence and non-violence specifically related to sacrificial practices.

### **Preventing cruelty, and non-violence in India**

Animal sacrifice practices have been questioned in India by various philosophical or religious movements at different times and for different reasons, for example, ideals of non-violence, purity or reincarnation. These notions have been addressed by scholars in relation to a wide repertory of ancient texts about which, particularly for the earliest ones, little is known of the historical social context in which they were produced. Understanding and interpreting these texts must take into account the different purposes for which they were written (ritual or legal prescriptions, religious or philosophical speculations), as well as the fact that, having often been written by multiple authors over a period of time, they are far from proposing a uniform point of view. Here we do not enter fully into the animated debates among Indologists and historians of religion concerning these issues but only mention a few aspects of those discussions so as to highlight some specificities that the controversy on animal sacrifice took on during India's ancient history.

One central notion in the religious and philosophical debate around the practice of animal sacrifice in India is *ahimsā*, generally translated as 'non-violence' but whose meaning has undergone many changes. According to Heesterman (1984), developing H.-P. Schmidt's arguments, this idea was in fact already present in the Vedas. For instance, the ritual declaration in the Rig Veda, made by the sacrificer to the already dismembered sacrificial animal ('You do not really die here, nor are you hurt'), or the declaration in the *Satapatha Brahmana*, made when leading the victims to their immolation ('that which they lead to the sacrifice they do not lead to death'), are both interpreted as signs that there were already in these texts some tensions surrounding the act of killing animals (Heesterman 1983:6, quoted in Tull 1996:225ff).

Non-violence, according to this analysis, was thus already integrated within a ritualistic framework whose procedures focused on an act of killing. For instance, in Vedic sacrifice, the sacrificial animal has to be suffocated in an effort to obfuscate the violent nature of its death and to assert that the process 'is not really a killing, but a "quieting" of the animal' (Tull 1996:226). Similarly, another text, the *Manavadharmasastra*, strongly prohibits killing and meat eating while continuing



to ‘promote the sacrificial rite with its necessary meat-eating and violence’ (ibid.); as the text declares, ‘in the sacrifice, slaughter is not slaughter’ (ibid.; see also Houben 1999).

The same denial about killing during sacrifice was maintained in later texts, for instance the ‘Laws of Manu’ (*Manusmṛiti*), probably dating from the third century CE, which

maintains that since these animals are meant to be killed as part of their very ontological structure, their killing cannot properly be regarded as blameworthy: ‘Within the sacrifice killing is not killing’ (57:218). In fact, if a person of the right caste status, temperament, and knowledge sacrifices an animal in the correct ritually prescribed way, then that animal is actually better off dead than alive, since ‘[the ritualist] leads himself and those animals to the highest state’ (39:140). On the other hand, a killing not sanctioned in these ways is considered strictly immoral, is utterly prohibited, and can lead to various metaphysical and temporal harms.

(Stewart 2014:627)

Since at least the middle of the first millennium BCE, a discourse promoting non-violence with more ethical implications outside the world of sacrifice and particularly among ascetics began to emerge in religious and philosophical texts produced both within and outside Brahmanical circles, for example in Buddhist and Jain texts. In Brahmanic milieus, for instance, these texts defined common ideals for both Vedic scholars (during the period they study the Vedas) and world renouncers (dissociated from worldly attachments in an effort to escape the chain of rebirth): ‘Both are sworn to celibacy, both are mendicants, both recite the Veda, both carry a stick, neither offers sacrifices and both, above all, subscribe to the principle of non-violence’ (Oguibénine 2003:78).<sup>20</sup> The criticisms these movements made of the practice of animal sacrifice have often been taken as proof of a more favourable attitude towards animals.

One example of this can be found in Ashoka, presented by Buddhist sources as an ardent Buddhist who, after converting to Buddhism, would have had a ‘change of heart’ (Stewart 2015:16) and would have started to promote the principle of non-violence and (among other things) to ban (some) animal sacrifices. Stewart notes how various scholars have recently challenged this ‘romantic account’ by showing for example that Ashoka’s edicts seem to have been issued late in his life, well after his supposed conversion to Buddhism, and that they are probably independent of Buddhism and motivated by Ashoka’s political calculations (also Alsdorf 2010:53–56). Stewart (2015:4) also shows how this orientalist romanticism that idealised Buddhist views about animals led scholars or activists—such as Colonel Henry Steel Olcott, an American officer and writer and convert to Buddhism who, in 1875, co-founded the Theosophical Society—to view meat-eating among contemporary Sri Lankan Buddhists as a sign of degeneration compared to what he presumed had been an ‘original Buddhism’. According to Stewart (2015:117), previous discourses valorising vegetarianism in Sri Lanka had in fact less to do

with animal protection than with anti-British, anti-missionary sentiments and were used as ways to mark differences between Buddhists and British settlers. Olcott, by contrast, developed a kind of protestant-inspired view of Buddhism (Prothero 1995; also Schopen 1991), which would have an impact on the Indian debate about compassion and animal welfare through campaigns launched by the Theosophical Society (Tarabout 2019:389).

From another perspective, Ohnuma (2017) also challenges idealised images of Buddhism, showing how, while in some texts animal sacrifices are condemned because of their consequences for the sacrificer's rebirth (the merit or demerit of an action being linked to the cycle of reincarnation), other texts of the same period emphasise the suffering that sacrifice may cause to the animal itself. For example, she cites the Jataka story of an ascetic who, forced to sacrifice an elephant in order to marry the woman he loved, was deeply moved by the cries of the elephant upon seeing the sword raised over its neck and began to realise the cruelty of his act. Though such stories show a shift from the sacrificer to the sacrificial animal, she argues that it would be wrong to interpret them as proof that Buddhism seeks to establish continuity between human beings and animals. Although other authors have taken this stand, in the texts on which she focuses she consistently finds an effort to keep humans distinct from (and superior to) animals—in terms of intellectual capacity, morality, karmic retributions, and capacity to reach deliverance:

Merciless, cruel, and lacking any compassion, 'animals think only of harming one another,' they 'never stop practicing evil,' they 'live in the darkness of ignorance,' they 'commit acts that will lead them to hell,' they 'produce thoughts of anger,' and they 'do not take pleasure in virtue' (according to the *Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra* preserved in Chinese, T. 397).

(Ohnuma 2017:9)

Scholars have also questioned the orientalist view of Hinduism (and India in general) as fundamentally animal-friendly. One aspect is the connection established in modern India between non-violence (*ahiṃsā*) and vegetarianism. As argued by Schmidt among others, vegetarianism developed only gradually and partially, even among Brahmins. In ancient times, 'neither the Buddha nor the Jina were vegetarians though they propagated *ahiṃsā*' (Schmidt 1968:625). In the early centuries of our era, the *Manusmṛiti* (5, 31–44) 'teaches [Brahmins] the duty of eating meat in the sacrifice, but prohibits it on all other occasions' (Schmidt 1968:630), and it was only the renouncer, at that time, who had to strictly abstain from violence and from meat consumption.

Similarly for Stewart (2015), the idea that Hindus are vegetarians has been historically overstated in the West. Vegetarianism is very inconsistently practised in different regions of India, even among Brahmins. The emergence of theistic movements, such as Vaishnava schools, prompted the spread of vegetarianism, as well as 'non-violent' sacrificial methods using vegetal substitutes for the animal victim, a possibility already mentioned in Vedic texts and widely practised in India today (see Good and Voix, this volume). However, the gradual incorporation and

adaptation of ideals of vegetarianism and non-violence into Brahmins' world view was not necessarily motivated by a concern for animal suffering but focused more on ideas of purity and separation from other castes. As Fuller notes:

one vital marker of Brahman culture in south India is and long has been strict vegetarianism ... vegetarianism is persistently identified as a Brahmanical caste custom, and non-Brahmins who are vegetarian claim higher status partly because they are following the Brahmins' superior dietary code.  
(Fuller 2004:93)

Even the issue of cow protection, often presented today as an emblem of spiritualised non-violent Hinduism, has been shown to be a comparatively late and politicised development. The shift from considering cow sacrifice one of the most meritorious ritual acts—as in the Vedic and post-Vedic period—to regarding it as one of the most deleterious acts, did not happen instantaneously. Even texts often quoted today as references of a reformed Hinduism, such as the *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*, include descriptions of cow sacrifice and beef consumption (Jha 2009). Only in the seventeenth century did cow protection begin to be politicised in terms of an opposition between Hindus and Muslims:

Cow protection among the upper castes first gained significant popularity in the 1600s, when the Maratha ruler Shivaji sought to mobilize Hindus against Mughal rule. His campaign brought cow protection to the forefront of the upper caste Hindu identity in western India. Thus, despite its ambivalent place in Hindu texts and histories, the cow was to become the modern symbol of a political community of Hindus, distinct from and in tension with Indian Muslims. But it would still be over 200 years before cow protection would gain widespread currency among upper caste Hindus across the country, during the Indian nationalist movement.

(Sarkar & Sarkar 2016:341)

During British rule the cow protection movement, while assuming anti-colonial overtones, began to echo British orientalist assumptions (resembling Olcott's aforementioned discourse on Buddhism) about a 'true' spiritualised Hinduism, according to which cow sacrifice and beef consumption should be condemned. The cow protection movement's targets, which also included the British as beef-eaters and some low castes as skin traders, particularly focused on the Muslim practice of cow sacrifice during the Bakr-Id festival. This practice became even more controversial with the rise of the Hindu nationalist movement that used the cow as a symbol of Hindu religious and political unification rooted in political anti-Muslim and anti-colonial feelings (Freitag 1980; Gundimeda & Ashwin 2018; Hancock 1995; Sarkar & Sarkar 2016).

Other nineteenth-century religious movements, less focused on cow protection, were also critical of animal sacrifice though from different points of view. The Ramakrishna Mission, for example, founded by Vivekananda, promoted the

idea of an ontological unity of the universe where Hindu or Buddhist ideas of reincarnation, of compassion to living beings, were adapted and reinterpreted in the light of Western theories of human evolution and of social justice principles (Gosling 2001:38ff; Tarabout 2019:388). Vivekananda wrote: ‘from the lowest worm that crawls under our feet to the highest beings that ever lived—all have various bodies, but one soul’ (quoted in Gosling 2001:39). The concepts of *seva*, intended by Vivekananda to mean a personal and collective service for those in need (Beckerlegge 2007; Gosling 2001), and of *karma yoga* (yoga of selfless action), were at the forefront of philanthropic programmes run by the Ramakrishna Mission, including animal hospitals. Both concepts have been adopted today by animal welfare organisations in India and abroad,<sup>21</sup> but Gosling (2001:39) urges us to be wary of viewing this as a ‘primitive form of animal rights’. Organisations such as the Ramakrishna Mission were deeply influenced by Western encounters and mainly driven by a search for personal spiritual progress in this life or the afterlife, whereby the discourse of unity between animals and humans, though now framed around evolutionary principles, is still linked to a discourse of reincarnation.

In fact, the creation of an animal welfare movement in India, at least in the modern sense of the term, was initiated in the nineteenth century by British residents. Chakrabarti (2010) shows the complex and at times contradictory values introduced into India by the colonial state regarding its relationship with animals. The dilemma caused by the animal protection issue in the West—seeing animals both as resources for human consumption and as ‘objects of compassion’—was further amplified in India because of the complex political and socio-religious dynamics of the colonial situation.

Along with adopting animals as subjects of science, British residents in India had expressed strong compassion for Indian animals. The British residents and the colonial government cared for and adopted the wretched draught and street animals of India.

(Chakrabarti 2010:130)

Some British residents in India expressed strong opposition to animal cruelty and various practices that had been introduced into India—vivisection, the destruction of vermin for the development of agriculture, and hunting sports. One example was Colesworthey Grant, a British painter residing in Calcutta, who established the first Indian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) in 1861 (Mittra 1881). Grant (1872) published a pamphlet entitled *On Cruelty* in which, after moral condemnation of the recent history of slavery, he delved into the issue of cruelty to animals, giving numerous gruesome descriptions of how animals are threatened, so as to incite people to join the organisation.

Although Grant’s discourse did include Christian religious references, his main message was the idea, already well-established among Western philosophers, that animals are sentient beings, that even if they are unable to speak they can suffer and that their very inability to speak is the ‘reason we should speak for them’ (Grant 1872:13). His discourse about communality between humans and animals makes

no reference to the idea of reincarnation, as was the case in Buddhist texts and for Hindu religious reformists, but evokes the scientific theory of evolution. He also gives an Utilitarian reading of the Christian message, asking people not to be cruel to animals on the grounds that ‘the real way to be happy yourself is to make others happy’ and that God himself intended that ‘these little creatures should be happy’ (ibid.:27). His book directly echoes the battles that had already begun in England a few decades earlier.

The Indian SPCA branch in Calcutta took an active part in the campaign for legislation banning cruelty to animals, prompting the Bengal government to pass the first Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in India in 1869. This was extended to the whole of India in 1890–1891. As in Britain, those involved in the battle against animal cruelty were often accused of having a ‘class bias’ by targeting only lower class practices and overlooking the games of the elite (Kreilkamp 2012).

The first Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Acts passed in India under colonial rule reflected ‘British perceptions of Indian character and society’, with Indians being childlike and cruel, a stereotype that ‘shaped the paternalism of colonial legislation’ (Chakrabarti 2010:131ff). In Grant’s discourse however, at least in his 1872 pamphlet, cruelty is not presented as intrinsic to Indians’ nature but as being due to a lack of education, of having never been taught, ‘*when young, what things are cruel*’ (Grant 1872:26, original italics); people are not considered to be cruel to animals because ‘they love cruelty’ but because ‘they have got accustomed to it’ (ibid.:25).

The debate around the protection of animals, taken up by Indian activists, led to multiple discussions after Independence. For instance, there was a lengthy debate in the Constituent Assembly on 24 November 1948 on banning cow slaughter (Lok Sabha Secretariat 1999). This issue, which as we saw had been strongly promoted by orthodox Brahmans, Hindu reformists and nationalists, was completely intertwined with a communitarian battle, especially against Muslims and their practice of cow sacrifice during the Id festival. The Constitutional debate leading to Article 48, directing the prohibition and restrictions on the slaughter of cows, was ‘framed in terms of a scientific organisation of animal husbandry, rather than a religious belief in the sacredness of the cow’ (Chigateri 2011:138). Yet Chigateri also shows how in the many court battles challenging Article 48, religious feelings, which had been deliberately left out of the language of the article (seemingly at Ambedkar’s request), in fact came to the fore when Muslim butchers, tanners and cattle dealers demanded that restrictions be eased, and Hindu groups asked the court to address the religious basis for the cow slaughter ban.

A ban on animal sacrifice in particular was enacted by Madras Legislative Assembly in 1950, with arguments having less to do with the issue of animal cruelty per se than with the idea of making Hinduism appear more respectable (Smith 1963:235; Good, this volume). However, from 1953 onwards, discussions on the campaign against animal cruelty, including the fight against animal sacrifice, were taken to national level. *The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act* (Act 49 of 1960) was eventually passed after a first version had been put forward to the Rajya Sabha

(Upper House of Parliament) by one of its members, Rukmini Devi Arundale, an internationally famed Bharata Natyam dancer, friend of the Nehru family (Jawaharlal Nehru was Prime Minister at the time) and high-ranking official of the Theosophical Society.<sup>22</sup>

Rukmini Devi's battle focused on a wide range of issues: game hunting, vivisection, but also 'animal sacrifice in the name of religion', which she defined in one of her speeches to the assembly as 'one of the most barbarous things that exists in India' (Rajya Sabha Official Debates 1954:1794ff). Her speech was in line with the debate that had begun in Europe within both religious and philosophical circles on animals' ability to suffer. She focused particularly on the question of animal sacrifice, urging people to let their hearts 'go towards our young friends in compassion and in kindness' (ibid.:1803).

Perhaps people do not know what animal sacrifice is. They may think, 'After all, it is only a killing of animals, and what is the harm in killing animals?' But in reality in the name of religion, there is a great amount of cruelty which is connected with animal sacrifice besides the cruelty of the killing.

(ibid.:1796)

Rukmini Devi was not directly involved in the philosophical or juridical debates taking place in European intellectual circles, but she had certainly been influenced by the same kind of intellectual environment that had led to those legislative battles in Europe, probably through her training and membership in the Theosophical Society. She herself referred to this Western influence in her speech before the Indian Parliament:

I have known some interesting cases of kindness in Western countries. Though there are many cases of cruelty, there is a general idea of kindness in ordinary life which we do not find here. ... These are the things that we can learn from the West.

(ibid.:1793)

Although here Rukmini Devi opposed a supposed Western kindness towards animals to an Indian lack of kindness, in other passages of the same speech, she referred to Indian traditional kindness as expressed by 'the ideas of Ahimsa' and by 'the emblem of Asoka, which is in essence compassion, kindness, and justice to all' (ibid.:1787). Indeed, her commitment to the animal cause was shaped by a spiritualistic and reformist approach to religion. She often referred in her speeches to public morality, a notion which in her case was linked both to the ideal of a 'universal religion' that she most probably drew from the Theosophical society teachings (Dave 2014:437; Tarabout 2019:388ff) and to vegetarianism for which she also actively campaigned.

Following the adoption of an amended version of the Bill in 1960, the Animal Welfare Board of India (AWBI) was established in 1962 and Rukmini Devi became its first President until her demise in 1986. 'Compassion in action' is the motto of

this public board. Rukmini Devi's important role in the development of Indian legislation and institutions for the protection of animals has been underlined by Maneka Gandhi and Chinny Krishna, two leading personalities in animal welfare politics today: 'If animal welfare is accepted, even fashionable, today, it is solely her efforts and crusade in the early years of independence that have made it possible' (Krishna & Gandhi 2005:70).

What is striking is the constant circulation of ideas between Western and Indian traditions. We have seen how, among other things, British and Christian influences marked the development of nineteenth-century Hindu reformist movements, how British involvement coloured activism and legislation for the protection of animals, and how a 'protestant' ideal of religion was projected onto Buddhism and Hinduism by the Theosophical Society. Conversely, European thinking has been deeply influenced by what was known of India and the East. The idea of compassion as well as the notion of *ahimsā*, for instance, were used by Western thinkers who, through their reading of ancient Indian texts, portrayed an idealised orientalist view of India.<sup>23</sup> Besides the Theosophical Society, whose founding members were deeply influenced by (their perception of) Buddhism, many found a major source of inspiration in the different philosophical traditions of India. For example, Albert Schweitzer, a theologian, humanitarian and physician, was personally engaged in the animal welfare debate and was a passionate reader of Indian philosophy (as well as of authors of Indian religious reform). He has become one of the moral reference points for animal rights activists who, on their websites, often quote one of his famous sentences: 'Until we extend our circle of compassion to all living things, humanity will not find peace'.<sup>24</sup> This idea of compassion, associated with various ancient or modern Indian figures, is common to animal welfare movements throughout the world.<sup>25</sup> It has regularly been used in India in the multiple battles to ban practices involving animal cruelty—many of them taken up to legislative level by Maneka Gandhi, who has twice been a minister in recent governments. However, and particularly on the question of animal sacrifice, many of these battles, at national or state level, are now fought in court.

Before reviewing how this shift to the court has unfolded in India, we must turn again to the West—from where many changes in modern legal approaches to the issue originated (sometimes, as Le Bot [2007] argues, with India as a model)—and look at how the judicialisation of the issue of sacrifice came about.

### **Animal protection and the courts**

With the gradual adoption of anti-cruelty laws during the nineteenth century in various countries, in Europe and then in other parts of the world, cases concerning animal cruelty began to be taken to court. In the United States, for instance, developments in anti-cruelty legislation led to laws enabling the prosecution of unnecessary cruelty inflicted on animals as a criminal offence, with no regard, as was the case previously, to the civil issue of 'injury to property'. Courts were then called upon to decide not only on how to enforce the law but also how to define key words such as 'cruelty', which had been 'left undefined by the legislature'

## Introduction

Animal Welfare Board of India vs. A. Nagaraja & ors . Supreme Court of India, 7 May 2014. Civil Appeal No. 5387 of 2014. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/39696860/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

Association Oeuvre d'Assistance aux Betes Abattoirs . CAA de Versailles. Formation plénière, 16VE00801, 11 July 2019. (<https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/ceta/id/CETATEXT000039118043/>; accessed 24/06/2021).

Center for Social Justice Studies et al. vs. Presidency of the Republic et al. Constitutional Court of Colombia T-622/16, 10 November 2016. (<http://files.harmonywithnatureun.org/uploads/upload838.pdf>; accessed 4/07/2021).

Centraal Israëlitisch Consistorie van België & ors, Unie Moskeeën Antwerpen VZW, Islamitisch Offerfeest Antwerpen VZW, JG, KH, Executief van de Moslims van België & ors, Coördinatie Comité van Joodse Organisaties van van België e—S ection belge du Congrès juif mondial et Congrès juif européen VZW & ors vs Vlaamse Regering . European Court of Justice (Grand Chamber) C-336/19. 17 December 2020. English version (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62019CJ0336>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Cha'are Shalom Ve Tsedek vs. France . [2000] ECtHR (No. 27417/95, 27 June 2000) (<http://www.bailii.org/eu/cases/ECHR/2000/351.html>; accessed 20/06/2021).

Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. , et al. vs. City of Hialeah.. US Supreme Court, 11 June 1993. 508 U.S. 520 (1993). (<https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep508520/>; accessed 30/11/2021).

Karnail Singh & ors. vs. State of Haryana .. CRR-533-2013. Punjab & Haryana High Court, 31 May 2019. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/68914216/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

Lalit Miglani vs. State of Uttarakhand & ors . WP (PIL) No. 140 of 2015. High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital, 30 March 2017. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/92201770/>; accessed 4/07/2021).

Liga van Moskeeën en Islamitische Organisaties Provincie Antwerpen VZW & ors. vs. Vlaams Gewest . European Court of Justice (Grand Chamber) C-426/16. 29 May 2018. (<http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=202301&doclang=EN>; accessed 4/07/2021).

Lok Sabha Secretariat . 1999. *Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. 7: 4 November 1948 to 8 January 1949*. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat. ([https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/762996/1/cad\\_04-11-1948.pdf](https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/762996/1/cad_04-11-1948.pdf); accessed 30/07/2021).

Mohd. Salim vs. State of Uttarakhand & ors . WP (PIL) No. 126 of 2014. High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital, 20 March 2017. (<https://www.ielrc.org/content/e1704.pdf>; accessed 27/04/2022).

M. Siddiq (D) Thr Lrs vs. Mahant Suresh Das & ors . Civil Appeal Nos. 10866-10867 of 2010. Supreme Court of India, 9 November 2019. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/107745042/>; accessed 29/07/2021).

Narayan Dutt Bhatt vs. Union of India & ors . WP (PIL) 43 of 2014. High Court of Uttarakhand, 4 July 2018. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/157891019/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

Œuvre d'assistance aux bêtes d'abattoirs (OABA) vs Ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation, Bionoor SARL, Ecocert France SAS, & Institut national de l'origine et de la qualité (INAO) . European Court of Justice (Grand Chamber) C-497/17. 26 February 2019. (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62017CJ0497>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Prahlad Roy Goenka vs. Union of India & ors . W.P. 24928(W) of 2005, Calcutta High Court, Appellate Side, 15 September 2006.

Rajya Sabha Official Debates . 1954. 'Prevention of Cruelty to Animal Bill, 1953.' Pp. 1785–1809 in *Rajya Sabha Official Debates, Part 2 (Other Than Question and Answer), Session 06, 5 March 1954*. New Delhi: Rajya Sabha Official Debates. ([http://rsdebate.nic.in/rsdebate56/bitstream/123456789/585735/1/PD\\_06\\_05031954\\_15\\_p1785\\_p1809\\_3.pdf](http://rsdebate.nic.in/rsdebate56/bitstream/123456789/585735/1/PD_06_05031954_15_p1785_p1809_3.pdf); accessed 21/05/2019).

Ramesh Sharma vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & ors. (CWP. 9257 of 2011), along with *Mehar Singh & anor vs. State of H.P. & ors.* (CWP No. 4499 of 2012) and *Sonali Purewal vs. State of H.P. & ors.* (CWP No. 5076 of 2012), Himachal Pradesh High Court, 26 September, 2014. (<http://hpsja.nic.in/JAcaselawAS.pdf>; accessed 29/10/2020).

The Commissioner of Hindu Religious Endowments, Madras vs. Sri Lakshmindra Tirtha Swamiar , Supreme Court of India, 16 April 1954 (1954 AIR 282, 1954 SCR 1005).



(<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1430396/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

The Durgah Committee, Ajmer & anor vs. Syed Hussain Ali & ors , Supreme Court of India, 17 March 1961 (1961 AIR 1402, 1962 SCR (1) 383). (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1262157/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

The State of Uttarakhand & ors. vs. Mohd. Salim & ors . Supreme Court of India, Special Leave to Appeal (C) No: 016879/2017. Order dated 7 July 2017. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/169363537/>; accessed 7/07/2021).

T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad vs. Union of India & ors . I.A. Nos. 1433 and 1477 of 2005 in WP (C) No. 202 of 1995. Supreme Court of India, 13 February 2012. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/187293069/>; accessed 5/07/2021).

Union of India vs. Lalit Miglani . Supreme Court of India, Special Leave Petition (Civil) No(s). 34250/2017. Order dated 27 November 2017. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/164102753/>; accessed 7/07/2021).

Allen, Nicholas J. 2013. 'Using Hubert and Mauss to think about sacrifice.' Pp. 147–162 in Julia Meszaros & Johannes Zachhuber (eds.), *Sacrifice and Modern Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alley, Kelly D. 2019. 'River goddesses, personhood and rights of nature: implications for spiritual ecology.' *Religions* 10:502. doi:10.3390/rel10090502.

Alsdorf, Ludwig . 2010. *The History of Vegetarianism and Cow-Veneration in India*. Abingdon: Routledge (1st German ed. 1961).

Arumugam, Indira . 2015. "'The old gods are losing power!": theologies of power and rituals of productivity in a Tamil Nadu village.' *Modern Asian Studies* 49(3):753–786. doi:10.1017/S0026749X1400016X.

Ashby, Godfrey William . 1988. *Sacrifice. Its Nature and Purpose*. Norwich: SCM Press.

Baratay, Eric . 2012. 'La promotion de l'animal sensible. Une révolution dans la Révolution.' *Revue Historique* 661:131–153. (<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01569484/>).

Bartley, Chris . 2001. 'Purva Mimamsa.' Pp. 443–445 in Oliver Leaman (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Asian Philosophy*. London/New York: Routledge.

Beattie, John H.M. 1980. 'On understanding sacrifice.' Pp. 29–44 in M.F.C. Bourdillon & Meyer Fortes (eds.), *Sacrifice*. London: Academic Press.

Beckerlegge, Gwilym . 2007. 'Responding to conflict: a test of the limits of neo-vedāntic social activism in the Ramakrishna Math and mission?' *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 11(1):1–25. doi:10.1007/s11407-007-9041-9.

Bentham, Jeremy . 1823 [1789]. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (New edition, corrected by the author). London: W. Pickering & E. Wilson.

Benveniste, Émile . 1969. 'Religion et superstition.' Pp. 265–279 in *Le Vocabulaire des institutions européennes*, 2. Pouvoir, droit, religion. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Berti, Daniela . 2009. 'Kings, gods, and political leaders in Kullu (Himachal Pradesh).' Pp. 107–136 in Marie Lecomte-Tilouine (ed.), *Bards and Mediums in the Khas Kingdoms*. Almora/Delhi: Himalayan Book Depot.

Berti, Daniela . 2019. 'Animals in the public debate: welfare, rights, and conservationism in India.' Pp. 475–499 in Barbara Ambros & Reiko Ohnuma (eds.), *Buddhist Beasts: Reflections on Animals in Asian Religions and Cultures*. *Religions* 10(8):475-499. (<https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/10/8/475>; accessed 31/10/2020).

Berti, Daniela . in press. 'Ritual presence and legal persons. Deities and the law in India.' In Anne de Sales & Marie Lecomte-Tilouine (eds.), *Encounters with the Invisible. Revisiting Possession in the Himalayas in Its Material and Narrative Aspects*. (<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03090603>; accessed 29/07/2021).

Bharati, Agehananda . 1970. 'The use of "superstition" as an anti-traditional device in urban Hinduism.' *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 4:36–49. doi:10.1177/006996677000400103.

Biardeau, Madeleine & Charles Malamoud (eds.). 1976. *Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne*. Paris: Presse Universitaire de France.

Bloch, Maurice . 1992. *Prey into Hunter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blosh, Marie . 2012. *The History of Animal Welfare Law and the Future of Animal Rights*. L.L.M. dissertation. London, ON: University of Western Ontario.

Boddice, Rob . 2008. *A History of Attitudes and Behaviours toward Animals in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain: Anthropocentrism and the Emergence of Animals*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

- Bose, Sugata & Ayesha Jalal . 2004. *Modern South Asia: History, Culture, Political Economy*. New York/London: Routledge (2nd edition).
- Bouillier, Véronique . 2003. 'The violence of the non-violent, or ascetics in combat.' Pp. 27–63 in Denis Vidal , Gilles Tarabout & Eric Meyer (eds.), *Violence/Non-Violence: Some Hindu Perspectives*. Delhi: Manohar (1st French ed. 1994).
- Bowen, John R. 2017. *Religions in Practice. An Approach to the Anthropology of Religion*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bradbury, Scott . 1994. 'Constantine and the problem of anti-Pagan legislation in the fourth century.' *Classical Philology* 89(2):120–139. doi:10.1086/367402.
- Brisebarre, Anne-Marie . 2017. 'L'évolution de la pratique du sacrifice de l'aïd el-kebir en contexte urbain français.' *Ethnologie Française* 47(4):607–622. doi:10.3917/ethn.174.0607.
- Bruckerhoff, Joshua J. 2008. 'Giving nature constitutional protection: a less anthropocentric interpretation of environmental rights.' *Texas Law Review* 86(3):615–646.
- Brunet, Pierre . 2014. 'La citoyenneté animale: mirage ou solution miracle?' Pp. 112–124 in Eric de Mari & Dominique Taurisson-Mouret (eds.), *Ranger l'animal: l'impact environnemental de la norme en milieu contraint*. Paris: Victoires Editions.
- Brunet, Pierre . 2019. 'L'animal dans l'arène des jurists.' Pp. 73–88 in F. Carrié & C. Traïni (eds.), *S'engager pour les animaux*. Paris: PUF.
- Bryant, Taimie L. 2008. 'Sacrificing the sacrifice of animals: legal personhood for animals, the status of animals as property, and the presumed primacy of humans.' *Rutgers Law Journal* 39:247–330.
- Chakrabarti, Pratik . 2010. 'Beasts of burden: animals and laboratory research in colonial India.' *History of Science* 48:125–151. doi:10.1177/007327531004800201.
- Chigateri, Shraddha . 2011. 'Negotiating the "sacred" cow: cow slaughter and the regulation of difference in India.' Pp. 137–159 in Monica Mookherjee (ed.), *Democracy, Religious Pluralism, and the Liberal Dilemma of Accommodation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Clifton, Merritt . 2014. 'Jurist V.R. Krishna Iyer, 100, fought for captive elephants.' (<https://www.animals24-7.org/2014/12/06/jurist-v-r-krishna-iyer-100-fought-for-captive-elephants/>; accessed 28/10/2020).
- Coleman, Elizabeth Burns & Kevin White . 2006. 'Stretching the sacred.' Pp. 65–77 in Elizabeth Burns Coleman & Kevin White (eds.), *Negotiating the Sacred: Blasphemy and Sacrilege in a Multicultural Society*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Conybeare, Fred C. 1903. 'The survival of animal sacrifices inside the Christian church.' *The American Journal of Theology* 7(1):62–90. doi:10.1086/478287.
- Dalal, Neil & Chloë Taylor . 2014. *Asian Perspectives on Animal Ethics. Rethinking the Nonhuman*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dardenne, Emilie . 2010. 'From Jeremy Bentham to Peter Singer.' *Revue d'études bentamiennes*, 7 (<https://journals.openedition.org/etudes-bentamiennes/204>; accessed 24/10/2020).
- Das, Veena . 1982. 'Language of sacrifice.' *Man* (N.S.) 18:445–462. doi:10.2307/2801591.
- Dave, Naisargi N. 2014. 'Witness: humans, animals, and the politics of belonging.' *Cultural Anthropology* 29(2):433–456. doi:10.14506/ca29.3.01.
- de Heusch, Luc . 1985. *Sacrifice in Africa*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- De Roover, Jakob . 2019. 'Religious freedom and cultural asymmetry: some pitfalls of secularism.' *Sikh Formations: Religion, Culture, Theory* 15(3-4):476–490. doi:10.1080/17448727.2019.1703517.
- Detienne, Marcel & Jean-Pierre Vernant . 1989 [1979]. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas . 1997. 'The policing of tradition: colonialism and anthropology in Southern India.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 39(1):182–212. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/179243>).
- Doctor, Adi H. 1997. *Political Thinkers of Modern India*. Delhi: Mittal Publications.
- Donaldson, Sue & Will Kymlicka . 2011. *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, Émile . 1915 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Eckhardt, Benedikt . 2014. "'Bloodless sacrifice": a note on Greek cultic language in the imperial era.' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 54:255–273.

- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1954. 'The meaning of sacrifice among the Nuer.' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4:21–38. doi:10.2307/2843998.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. . 1965. *Theories of Primitive Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Favre, David S. 2010. 'Living property: a new status for animals within the legal system.' *Marquette Law Review* 93(3):1021–1070. doi:10.17613/p1cy-z105.
- Favre, David S. & Vivien Tsang . 1993. 'The development of anti-cruelty laws during the 1800s.' *Detroit College Law Review* 1993(1):1–35. doi:10.17613/y9hc-fw88.
- FIAPO . 2018. *Stop Slaughter Cruelty this Bakr-Eid*. (<https://www.fiapo.org/fiaporg/stop-slaughter-cruelty-this-bakr-eid/>; accessed 23/11/2020).
- Freitag, Sandria B. 1980. 'Sacred symbols as mobilizing ideology: the North Indian search for a "Hindu" community.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(4):597–625. doi:10.1017/S0010417500009567.
- Fuller, C.J. 2004. *The Camphor Flame: Popular Hinduism and Society in India* (rev. edn.). Princeton/Woodstock: Princeton University Press.
- Gayatriprana, Sister. 2020. *Swami Vivekananda's History of Universal Religion and Its Potential for Global Reconciliation*. Elgin, IL: Cook Communication.
- Gibson, Thomas . 2010. 'Sacrifice' Pp. 624–626 in Alan Barnard & Jonathan Spencer (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* (2nd edn.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Givre, Olivier . 2015. 'Tuer "humainement." L'animal rituel et sacrificiel, entre licite et légal.' Pp. 187–215 in Michel Cros , Julien Bondaz & Frédéric Laugrand (eds.), *Bêtes à pensées, visions des mondes animaux*. Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines.
- Gliszczyńska-Grabias, Aleksandra & Wojciech Sadurski . 2015. 'Freedom of religion versus humane treatment of animals: Polish constitutional Tribunal's judgment on permissibility of religious slaughter.' *European Constitutional Law Review* 11(3):596–608. doi:10.1017/S1574019615000280.
- Goody, Jack . 1961. 'Religion and ritual: the definitional problem.' *British Journal of Sociology* 12(2):142–164. doi:10.2307/586928.
- Gosling, David L. 2001. *Religion and Ecology in India and Southeast Asia*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Grant, Colesworthey . 1872. *On Cruelty*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.
- Green, Steven J. 2008. 'Save our cows? Augustan discourse and animal sacrifice in Ovid's "Fasti".' *Greece & Rome, Second Series*, 55(1):39–54. doi:10.1017/S0017383507000307.
- Grottanelli, Cristiano . 1989. 'Appunti sulla fine dei sacrifici.' *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 12:175–192.
- Gundimeda, Sambaiah & V.S. Ashwin . 2018. 'Cow protection in India: from secularising to legitimating debates.' *South Asia Research* 38(2):156–176. doi:10.1177/0262728018768961.
- Halpérin, Jean-Louis . 2010. 'Western legal transplants and India.' *Jindal Global Law Review* 2(1):14–40.
- Hancock, Mary . 1995. 'Hindu culture for an Indian nation: gender, politics, and elite identity in urban South India.' *American Ethnologist* 22(4):907–926. doi:10.1525/ae.1995.22.4.02a00130.
- Hardy, Friedhelm . 1994. *The Religious Culture of India: Power, Love and Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heesterman, Johannes C. 1983. 'The ritualist's problem'; photocopy of a paper delivered at the Association for Asian Studies, Annual Meeting (San Francisco) [quoted in Tull 1996].
- Heesterman, Johannes C. . 1984. 'Non-violence and sacrifice.' *Indologica Taurinensia* 12:119–127.
- Heesterman, Johannes C. . 1993. *The Broken World of Sacrifice: An Essay in Ancient Indian Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Herrenschmidt, Olivier . 1978. 'Les formes sacrificielles dans l'hindouisme populaire.' *Systèmes de pensée en Afrique noire* 3:115–133. Paris-Ivry: CNRS. (<http://journals.openedition.org/span/381>; accessed 16/07/2021).
- Houben, Jan E.M. 1999. 'To kill or not to kill the sacrificial animal (yajña-paśu)? Arguments and perspectives in Brahminical ethical philosophy.' Pp. 105–183 in Jan E.M. Houben & K.R. van Kooij (eds.), *Violence Denied: Violence, Non-Violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hubert, Henri & Marcel Mauss . 1899. 'Essai sur la nature et le fonction du sacrifice.' *L'Année sociologique* T2(1897/1898):29–138.

- Hubert, Henri & Marcel Mauss . 1964. *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rev. Hughes, H.G. 1906. *Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Catholic Religion*. Notre Dame (Ind.): The Ave Maria Press.
- Humes, Cynthia Ann . 2005. 'Wrestling with Kālī. South Asian and British constructions of the dark goddess.' Pp. 145–168 in Rachel Fell McDermott & Jeffrey John Kripal (eds.), *Encountering Kālī: In the Margins, at the Center, in the West* . Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Humphrey, Caroline & James Laidlaw . 1994. *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual. A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship*. New York/Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Inden, Ronald . 1986. 'Orientalist constructions of India.' *Modern Asian Studies* 20(3):401–446. doi:10.1017/S0026749X00007800.
- Israel, Hephzibah . 2011. *Religious Transactions in Colonial South India. Language, Translation, and the Making of Protestant Identity* . New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Iyer, V.R. Krishna . 2004. *Towards a Natural World: The Rights of Nature, Animal Citizens and Other Essays*. Gurgaon: Hope India Publications.
- Jha, D.N. 2009[2001]. *The Myth of the Holy Cow*. Delhi: Navayana Publishing.
- Kreilkamp, Ivan . 2012. *The Ass Got a Verdict: Martin's Act and the Founding of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 1822*. ([http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps\\_articles=ivan-kreilkamp-the-ass-got-a-verdict-martins-act-and-the-founding-of-the-society-for-the-prevention-of-cruelty-to-animals-1822](http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=ivan-kreilkamp-the-ass-got-a-verdict-martins-act-and-the-founding-of-the-society-for-the-prevention-of-cruelty-to-animals-1822); accessed 24/10/2020).
- Krishna, Chinny & Maneka Gandhi . 2005. 'Rukmini Devi and animal welfare.' Pp. 67–70 in Avanthi Meduri (ed.), *Rukmini Devi Arundale (1904–1986). A Visionary Architect of Indian Culture and Performing Arts*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Leach, Edmund R. 1976. *Culture and Communication: The Logic by Which Symbols Are Connected*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Bot, Olivier . 2007. 'La protection de l'animal en droit constitutionnel. Etude de droit compare.' *Lex Electronica* 12(2). ([https://www.lex-electronica.org/files/sites/103/12-2\\_lebot.pdf](https://www.lex-electronica.org/files/sites/103/12-2_lebot.pdf); accessed 28/10/2020).
- Lecomte-Tilouine, Marie . 2020. *Sacrifice et violence. Réflexions autour d'une ethnographie au Népal*. Éditions Mimésis Collection: Ethnologiques, no. 3.
- Lerner, Pablo & Alfredo Mordechai Rabello . 2006/2007. 'The prohibition of ritual slaughtering (kosher shechita and halal) and freedom of religion of minorities.' *Journal of Law and Religion* 22(1):1–62. doi:10.1017/S0748081400003210.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude . 1966 [1962]. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude . 1969 [1962]. *Totemism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mangum, Teresa . 2007. 'Animal angst: Victorians memorialize their pets.' Pp. 15–34 in Deborah Denenholz Morse & Martin A. Danahay (eds.), *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mani, Lata . 1987. 'Contentious traditions: the debate on sati in colonial India.' *Cultural Critique* 7:119–156. doi:10.2307/1354153.
- Mani, Lata . 1998. *Contentious Traditions. The Debate on Sati in Colonial India*. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Mayblin, Maya & Magnus Course . 2014. 'The other side of sacrifice; Introduction.' *Ethnos* 79(3):307–319. doi:10.1080/00141844.2013.841720.
- McCulloch, Steven P. 2013. 'A critique of FAWC's five freedoms as a framework for the analysis of animal welfare.' *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 26:959–975. doi:10.1007/s10806-012-9434-7.
- Mehta, Pratap Bhanu . 2010. 'India: The politics of religious reform and conflict.' Pp. 174–193 in John Malloy Owen & J. Judd Owen (eds.), *Religion, Enlightenment, and the New Global Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mitra, Peary Chand . 1881. *Life of Colesworthy Grant, Founder and Late Honorary Secretary of the Calcutta Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*. Calcutta: I.O. Bose & Co.
- Moffatt, Michael . 1979. 'Harijan religion: consensus at the bottom of caste.' *American Ethnologist* 6(2):244–260. doi:10.1525/ae.1979.6.2.02a00020.
- Morillo, John . 2017. *The Rise of Animals and Descent of Man, 1660–1800. Toward Posthumanism in British Literature between Descartes and Darwin*. Blue Ridge Summit: University of Delaware Press.

- Neo, Jaclyn L. 2018. 'Definitional imbroglgios: a critique of the definition of religion and essential practice tests in religious freedom adjudication.' *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 16(2):574–595. doi:10.1093/icon/moy055.
- Newmyer, Stephen Thomas . 2006. *Animals, Rights, and Reason in Plutarch and Modern Ethics*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Oguibénine, Boris . 2003. 'On the rhetoric of violence.' Pp. 65–83 in Denis Vidal , Gilles Tarabout & Eric Meyer (eds.), *Violence/Non-Violence: Some Hindu Perspectives*. Delhi: Manohar (1st French ed. 1994).
- Ohnuma, Reiko . 2017. *Unfortunate Destinies. Animals in the Indian Buddhist Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ortiz-Robles, Mario . 2016a. *Literature and Animal Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ortiz-Robles, Mario . 2016b. *Animal Acts: 1822, 1835, 1849, 1850, 1854, 1876, 1900*. ([https://www.branchcollective.org/?ps\\_articles=mario-ortiz-robles-animal-acts-1822-1835-1849-1850-1854-1876-1900](https://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=mario-ortiz-robles-animal-acts-1822-1835-1849-1850-1854-1876-1900); accessed 24/10/2020).
- Patton, Laurie L. 2005. *Bringing the Gods to Mind: Mantra and Ritual in Early Indian Sacrifice*. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Peabody, Norbert . 1997. 'Inchoate in Kota? Contesting authority through a North Indian Pageant-play.' *American Ethnologist* 24(3):559–584. doi:10.1525/ae.1997.24.3.559.
- Perrin, Marie . 2016. *Le statut pénal de l'animal*. Paris: L'Érès.
- Peters, Anne . 2019. 'Religious slaughter and animal welfare revisited: CJEU, Liga van Moskeeën en islamitische Organisaties Provincie Antwerpen (2018).' *Canadian Journal of Comparative and Contemporary Law* 5(1):269–298. doi:10.5565/rev/da.472.
- Planinc, Emma . 2014. 'Democracy, despots and wolves: on the dangers of "Zoopolis's" animal citizen.' *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 47(1):1–21. doi:10.1017/S0008423914000183.
- Potter, D.S. & D.J. Mattingly . 1999. *Life, Death and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Primatt, Humphry . 1776. *A Dissertation on the Duty of Mercy and Sin of Cruelty to Brute Animals*. London: R. Hett.
- Priya Sanal, Lekshmi . 2018. 'Personhood for animals? This collective is fighting to make this a reality!' *The Better India*, June 1. (<https://www.thebetterindia.com/143666/fiapo-personhood-for-animalsnonhuman-rights-stop-animal-cruelty-sentient-beings/>; accessed 15/10/2019).
- Prothero, Stephen . 1995. 'Henry Steel Olcott and "Protestant Buddhism"..' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63(2):281–302. doi:10.1093/jaarel/LXIII.2.281.
- Ramesh, Jairam . 2018. *Indira Gandhi: A Life in Nature*. Noida: Simon and Schuster India.
- Regan, Tom . 2004. *The Case for Animal Rights* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. First published 1983.
- Reiniche, Marie-Louise . 1979. *Les dieux et les hommes: étude des cultes d'un village du Tirunelveli, Inde du Sud*. Paris: Mouton.
- Rives, James B. 2012. 'Between orthopraxy and orthodoxy: Constantine and animal sacrifice.' Pp. 153–163 in Giorgio Bonamente , Noel Lenski & Rita Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Costantino prima e dopo Costantino/Constantine before and after Constantine*. Santo Spirito: Edipuglia.
- Robertson Smith, W. 1889. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. First Series: The Fundamental Institutions. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques . 1755. 'discours sur l'origine et les fondemens de l'inégalité parmi les hommes'. Amsterdam: chez Marc Michel Rey.
- Rovinsky, Jeremy A. 2020. 'Don't have a cow, Flanders: guidance for the European Court of Justice as it considers the Flemish Parliament's ban on ritual slaughter.' *University of Detroit Mercy Law Review* 97(2):353–372.
- Ruel, Malcolm . 1990. 'Non-sacrificial ritual killing.' *Man* (N.S.) 25(2):323–335. doi:10.2307/2804567.
- Salt, Henry S. 1886. *A Plea for Vegetarianism, and Other Essays*. Manchester: Vegetarian Society.
- Salt, Henry S. . 1894. *Animals' Rights, Considered in Relation to Social Progress*. New York, NY: MacMillan & Co.
- Salzman, Michele Renee . 2011. 'The end of public sacrifice: changing definitions of sacrifice in post-Constantinian Rome and Italy.' Pp. 167–183 in Jennifer Wright Knust & Zsuzsanna Varhelyi (eds.), *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Salzman, Michele Renee . 2017. 'From *superstitio* to heresy: law and divine justice (fourth–fifth centuries CE).' Pp. 245–256 in Mu-chou Poo , Harold Allen Drake & Lisa Ann Raphals (eds.), *Old Society, New Belief: Religious Transformation of China and Rome, ca. 1st–6th Centuries*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Saraswati, Dayananda . 1906. *Satyarth Prakash (Light of Truth)* ( Chiranjiva Bharadwaja , transl.). Allahabad: Star Press (1st Hindi edn. 1875).
- Sarkar, Radha & Amar Sarkar . 2016. 'Sacred slaughter: an analysis of historical, communal, and constitutional aspects of beef bans in India.' *Politics, Religion & Ideology* 17(4):329–351. doi:10.1080/21567689.2016.1259108.
- Scheid, John . 2005. *Quand faire, c'est croire. Les rites sacrificiels des Romains* . Paris: Aubier.
- Schmidt, Hanns-Peter . 1968. 'The origin of ahimsā.' Pp. 625–655 in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* . Paris: De Boccard; also at Pp. 94–127 in Alsdorf (2010) (q.v.).
- Schopen, Gregory . 1991. 'Archaeology and protestant presupposition in the study of Indian Buddhism.' *History of Religions* 31(1):1–23. doi:10.1515/9780824851224-004.
- Scotti, Valentina Rita . 2016. 'The "essential practice of religion" doctrine in India and its application in Pakistan and Malaysia.' *Stato, Chiese e pluralismo confessionale*. Rivista telematica ([www.statochiese.it](http://www.statochiese.it)) Vol. 5, 8 febbraio 2016. doi:10.13130/1971-8543/6783.
- Shulman, David Dean . 1980. *Tamil Temple Myths: Sacrifice and Divine Marriage in the South Indian Saiva Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Singer, Peter . 2002 [1975]. *Animal Liberation* (3rd edn.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Smith, Donald E. 1963. *India as a Secular State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Staal, Fritz . 1979. 'The meaninglessness of ritual.' *Numen* 26(1):2–22. doi:10.2307/3269623.
- Staal, Fritz . 1996 [1990]. *Ritual and Mantras: Rules without Meaning*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Steiner, Gary . 2010. 'Plutarch on the question of justice for animals.' *Ploutarchos* 7:73–82. doi:10.14195/0258-655X\_7\_6.
- Stewart, James . 2014. 'Violence and nonviolence in Buddhist animal ethics.' *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 21:623–655.
- Stewart, James . 2015. *Vegetarianism and Animal Ethics in Contemporary Buddhism*. London: Routledge.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. 2005. *La fin du sacrifice. Les mutations religieuses de l'Antiquité Tardive* . Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Tanaka, Masakazu . 2000. 'Sacrifice lost and found. Colonial India and postcolonial Lanka.' *ZINBUN* 34(1):127–146.
- Tarabout, Gilles . 1986. 'Sacrifier et donner a voir en pays Malabar. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Tarabout, Gilles . 2019. 'Compassion for living creatures in Indian law courts.' In Barbara Ambros & Reiko Ohnuma (eds.), *Buddhist Beasts: Reflections on Animals in Asian Religions and Cultures*. *Religions* 10(6):383–403. (<https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/10/6/383>; accessed 25/10/2020).
- Thomas, Keith . 1983. *Man and the Natural World. Changing Attitudes in England 1500–1800* . New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Tore, Anish . 2018. 'Decoding Uttarakhand HC's judgment on animal rights.' *DownToEarth*, 1 August 2018. (<https://www.downtoearth.org.in/blog/wildlife-biodiversity/decoding-uttarakhand-hc-s-judgment-on-animal-rights-61287>; accessed 23/11/2020).
- Tull, Herman W. 1996. 'The killing that is not killing: men, cattle, and the origins of non-violence ('ahimsā') in the Vedic sacrifice.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 39(3):223–244. doi:10.1163/000000096790085150.
- Ullucci, Daniel C. 2012. *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Van der Schyff, Garhard . 2014. 'Ritual slaughter and religious freedom in a multilevel Europe: the wider importance of the Dutch case.' *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion* 3(1):76–102. doi:10.1093/ojlr/rwt046.
- Vidal, Denis , Gilles Tarabout & Eric Meyer . 2003 [1994]. 'On the concepts of violence and non-violence in Hinduism and Indian society.' Pp. 11–26 in Denis Vidal, Gilles Tarabout & Eric Meyer (ed.), *Violence/Non-Violence. Some Hindu Perspectives*. Delhi: Manohar.
- Warrior, Valerie M. 2006. *Roman Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Watson, Robert W. 2014. 'Protestant animals: Puritan sects and animal-protection sentiment, 1550–1650.' *ELH* 81(4):1111–1148. doi:10.1353/elh.2014.0042.
- Wise, Steven . 2000. *Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal Rights for Animals*. New York, NY: Perseus Publishing.
- Xenophontos, Sophia & Katerina Oikonomopoulou . 2019. *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zoethout, Carla M. 2013. 'Ritual slaughter and the freedom of religion: some reflections on a stunning matter.' *Human Rights Quarterly* 35(3):651–672. doi:10.1353/hrq.2013.0040.

## **Animal sacrifice, politics and the law in Tamil Nadu, South India**

- Arumugam, Indira . 2015. "'The old gods are losing power!' Theologies of power and rituals of productivity in a Tamil Nadu village.' *Modern Asian Studies* 49(3):753–786. doi:10.1017/S0026749X1400016X.
- Babb, Lawrence A. 1975. *The Divine Hierarchy: Popular Hinduism in Central India*. London: Columbia University Press.
- Beck, Brenda E.F. 1969. 'Colour and heat in South Indian ritual.' *Man* (N.S.) 4:553–572. doi:10.2307/2798195.
- Casal, Paula . 2003. 'Is multiculturalism bad for animals?' *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 11(1):1–22. doi:10.1111/1467-9760.00164.
- Clothey, Fred W. 1978. *The Many Faces of Murugan*. Mouton: The Hague/Paris.
- Copeman, Jacob . 2008. 'Violence, non-violence and blood donation in India.' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 14:278–296. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9655.2008.00501.x.
- Cosman, Barbara & Ratna Kapur . 1999. *Secularism's Last Sigh? Hindutva and the (Mis)Rule of Law*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Derrett, J.D.M. 1968. *Religion, Law and the State in India*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Dhavan, Rajeev & Fali S. Nariman . 2000. 'The Supreme Court and group life: religious freedom, minority groups, and disadvantaged communities.' Pp. 256–287 in B.N. Kirpal (ed.), *Supreme but Not Infallible: Essays in Honour of the Supreme Court of India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Dumont, Louis . 1957. *Une sous-caste de l'Inde du sud: organisation sociale et religion des Pramalai Kallar*. Paris/The Hague: Mouton.
- Dumont, Louis . 1980[1970]. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications* (2nd edn.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuller, C.J. 1984. *Servants of the Goddess: The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuller, C.J. 1988. 'Hinduism and scriptural authority in modern Indian law.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30(2):225–248. doi:10.1017/S0010417500015176.
- Fuller, C.J. 1996. 'Brahmin temple priests and Hindu revivalism in contemporary Tamil Nadu.' *South Indian Studies* 1(1):1–34.
- Fuller, C.J. 2004. *The Camphor Flame: Popular Hinduism and Society in India* (rev. & expanded edn.). Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Gadbois, George H. Jr . 1969. 'Indian Supreme Court judges: a portrait.' *Law & Society Review* 3(2):317–336. doi:10.2307/3053006.
- Galanter, Marc . 1965. 'Secularism, east and west.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 7(2):133–159. doi:10.1017/S0010417500003558.
- Good, Anthony . 1983. 'A symbolic type and its transformations: the case of South Indian ponkal.' *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 17: 223–244.
- Good, Anthony . 1985. 'The annual goddess festival in a South Indian village.' *South Asian Social Scientist* 1:119–167.
- Good, Anthony . 2004. *Worship and the Ceremonial Economy of a Royal South Indian Temple*. Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Ikegame, Aya . 2013. *Princely India Re-Imagined: A Historical Anthropology of Mysore from 1799 to the Present*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kalaiyaran, A. 2017. 'Politics of *jallikattu* .' *Economic & Political Weekly* 52(6):10–13.

Kent, Eliza F. 2013. *Sacred Groves and Local Gods: Religion and Environmentalism in South India*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krishna, Nanditha . 2010. *Sacred Animals of India*. Delhi: Penguin Books.

Lingat, Robert . 1973. *The Classical Law of India* (trans. J.D.M. Derrett ). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Moffatt, Michael . 1979. 'Harijan religion: consensus at the bottom of caste.' *American Ethnologist* 6(2):244–260. doi:10.1525/ae.1979.6.2.02a00020.

O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger . 1975. *Hindu Myths*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Pandian, M.S.S. 2000. 'Tamil-friendly Hindutva.' *Economic & Political Weekly* 35(21–22):1805–1806. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4409318>.

Pandian, M.S.S. . 2005. 'Dilemmas of public reason: secularism and religious violence in contemporary India.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 40(22/23):2313–2320. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4416711>.

Pocock, David F. 1973. *Mind, Body and Wealth*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Radhakrishnan, S. 1957. *The Hindu Way of Life*. New York: Macmillan.

Reiniche, Marie-Louise . 1979. *Les dieux et les hommes: étude des cultes d'un village du Tirunelveli, Inde du sud*. Paris/The Hague: Mouton.

Sathiya Moorthy, N. 2018. *Jallikattu: New Symbol of Tamil Angst*. New Delhi: Vitasta Publishing Pvt. Ltd.

Savarkar, V.D. 1969. *Hindutva: Who Is a Hindu?* Bombay: Veer Savarkar Prakasha.

Sen, Ronojoy . 2007. *Legalizing Religion*. Washington, DC: East-West Center.

Sen, Ronojoy . 2010. *Articles of Faith: Religion, Secularism, and the Indian Supreme Court*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharma, Arvind . 2002. 'On Hindu, Hindustan, Hinduism and Hindutva.' *Numen* 49 (1):1–36. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3270470>; accessed 30/11/2021).

Shulman, David D. 1980. *Tamil Temple Myths: Sacrifice and Divine Marriage in the South Indian Saiva Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sivapriyananda, Swami . 1995. *Mysore Royal Dasara*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

Smith, Donald E. 1963. *India as a Secular State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Srinivasan, Krithika . 2010. 'The social science imagination in India: deconstructing boundaries and redefining limits.' *Sociological Bulletin* 59(1):22–45. doi:10.1177/0038022920100102.

Stein, Burton . 1983. 'Mahānavamī: medieval and modern kingly ritual in south India.' Pp. 67–90 in Bardwell L. Smith (ed.), *Essays on Gupta Culture*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Suresh, Lavanya 2018. 'Bovine nationalism: the story of patronage and populism in the state of Tamil Nadu, India.' Conference paper, *Authoritarian Populism and the Rural World*, International Institute of Social Studies, Den Haag. ([https://www.tni.org/files/article-downloads/erpi\\_cp\\_24\\_lavanya.pdf](https://www.tni.org/files/article-downloads/erpi_cp_24_lavanya.pdf); accessed 18/10/2019).

Tanaka, Masakazu . 2000. 'Sacrifice lost and found – colonial India and postcolonial Lanka.' *ZINBUN* 34(1):127–146. doi:10.14989/48772.

Vivekananda, Swami 1971–3. *The Collected Works of Swami Vivekananda*. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrana.

## Animal sacrifice on trial

Animal Welfare Board of India vs. A. Nagaraja & Ors . Supreme Court of India, on 7 May 2014. Civil Appeal No. 5387 of 2014.

Bhartiya Govansh Rakshan Sanveradhan Parishad, H.P. vs. The Union of India & Ors . High Court of Himachal Pradesh, on 29 July 2016. CWP 6631 of 2014.

Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc., et al. vs. City of Hialeah. Supreme Court of the U.S., on 11 June 1993. 508 U.S. 520 (1993).

*CWP No. 5076 of 2012* along with *CWP Nos. 9257 of 2011* and *CWP 4499 of 2012*. Himachal Pradesh High Court, on 1 September 2014 (interim order).

Employment Division vs. Smith . Supreme Court of the U.S., on 17 April 1990. 494 U.S. 872 (1990).



Lalit Miglani vs. State of Uttarakhand and Ors . High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital, on 30 March 2017. WP(PIL) 140 of 2015.

Madras Animals and Birds Sacrifices Prohibition Act of 1950 . Act 32 of 1950.

Mrs. Gauri Maulekhi vs. State of Uttarakhand & Ors . High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital, on 19 December 2011. WP(PIL) 77 of 2010, together with WP (PIL) 73 of 2010.

N. Adithayan vs. the Travancore Devaswom Board . Supreme Court of India, on 3 October 2002. (2002) 8 SCC 106.

Ramesh Sharma vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & others (CWP. No. 9257 of 2011), along with *Mehar Singh & another vs. State of H.P. & others* (CWP No. 4499 of 2012) and *Sonali Purewal vs. State of H.P. & Ors* (CWP No. 5076 of 2012). Himachal Pradesh High Court, on 26 September 2014. (<http://hpsja.nic.in/JAcaselawAS.pdf>; accessed 29/10/2020).

Shastri Yagnapurushadji & Ors vs Muldas Brudardas Vaishya & Ors . Supreme Court of India, on 14 January 1966. 1966 AIR 1119; 1966 SCR (3) 242.

State of Gujarat vs. Mirzapur Moti Kureshi Kassab Jamat & Ors . Supreme Court of India, on 26 October 2005. (2005) 8 SCC 534.

State of Karnataka and another vs. Dr. Praveen Bai Thogadia . Supreme Court of India, on 31 March 2004. (2004) 4 SCC 684.

The Commissioner of Hindu Religious Endowments, Madras vs. Sri Lakshmindra Tirtha Swamiar . Supreme Court of India, on 16 April 1954. 1954 AIR 282, 1954 SCR 1005.

The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act , Act 59 of 1960.

The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 . Act 33 of 1989.

Thomas vs. Review Bd. of Indiana Employment Security Div . Supreme Court of the U.S., on 7 October 1981. 450 U.S. 707 (1981).

Tilkayat Shri Govindlalji Maharaj etc. vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors . Supreme Court of India, on 23 January 1963. AIR 1963 SC 1638.

Abraham, Arvind Kurian . 2021. 'Essential religious practices test and the First Amendment: a comparative analysis of the free exercise of religion in India and the United States.' Pp. 279–301 in M. John et al. (eds.), *The Indian Yearbook of Comparative Law 2019*. Singapore: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-981-16-2175-8\_13.

Agarwal, Bina . 1994. 'Gender and command over property: a critical gap in economic analysis and policy in South Asia.' *World Development* 22(10):1455–1478. doi:10.1016/0305-750X(94)90031-0.

Argyriadis, Kali & Stefania Capone . 2004. 'Cubañía et santería. Les enjeux politiques de la transnationalisation religieuse (La Havane—Miami).' *Civilisations. Revue Internationale d'anthropologie et de Sciences Humaines* 51:81–137. doi:10.4000/civilisations.668.

Badhwar, Inderjit . 2014. 'Live and let live.' Letter from the editor, *India Legal*, October 31:3–7.

Berti, Daniela . 2001. *La Parole des dieux. Rituels de possession en Himalaya indien*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.

Berti, Daniela . 2004. 'Of metal and clothes: the location of distinctive features in divine iconography (Indian Himalayas).' Pp. 85–113 in Phyllis Granoff & Koichi Shinohara (eds.), *Images in Asian Religions. Texts and Contexts*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Berti, Daniela . 2006. 'The memory of gods: from a secret autobiography to a nationalistic project.' *Indian Folklife* 24:15–18.

Berti, Daniela . 2009. 'Kings, gods, and political leaders in Kullu (Himachal Pradesh).' Pp. 107–136 in Marie Lecomte-Tilouine (ed.), *Bards and Mediums in the Khas Kingdoms*. Almora/Delhi: Himalayan Book Depot.

Berti, Daniela . 2011. 'Political patronage and ritual competitions at the Dashera Festival in Northern India.' Pp. 126–148 in Christiane Brosius & Karin Polit (eds.), *Ritual, Heritage and Identity. The Politics of Culture and Performance in a Globalised World*. Delhi: Sage.

Berti, Daniela . 2015. 'Gods' rights vs. hydroelectric projects. Environmental conflicts and the judicialization of nature in India.' *Rivista di Studi Orientali, Supplement* 2:11–129.

Berti, Daniela . 2016. 'Plaintiff deities. Ritual honours as fundamental rights in India.' Pp. 71–100 in Daniela Berti , Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion. State, Hinduism and Courts of Law*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Berti, Daniela . 2019. 'Animals in the public debate: welfare, rights, and conservationism in India.' In Barbara Ambros & Reiko Ohnuma (eds.), *Buddhist Beasts: Reflections on Animals in*

- Asian Religions and Cultures*], *Religions* 10(8):475–499. (<https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/10/8/475>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Berti, Daniela , Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix . 2016. 'Introduction.' Pp. xv–xli in Daniela Berti , Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion. State, Hinduism and Courts of Law*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bodh, Anand . 2013. 'Kullu Dussehra ends with animal sacrifice.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 21 October. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Kullu-Dussehra-ends-with-animal-sacrifice/articleshow/24457432.cms>; accessed 02/11/2020).
- Bodh, Anand . 2014a. 'It's faith vs. law for Himachal devotees.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 3 September. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Its-faith-vs-law-for-Himachal-devotees/articleshow/41557582.cms>; accessed 01/11/2020).
- Bodh, Anand . 2014b. 'Deities to decide animal sacrifice at conclave.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 9 September. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/chandigarh/Deities-to-decide-animal-sacrifice-at-conclave/articleshow/42080658.cms>; accessed 01/11/2020).
- Bodh, Anand . 2014c. 'Animal sacrifice: Himachal deities representatives to move Supreme Court.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 28 September. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Animal-sacrifice-Himachal-deities-representatives-to-move-Supreme-Court/articleshow/43702932.cms>; accessed 01/11/2020).
- Bodh, Anand . 2014d. 'Kardar Sangh to move SC against ban on Dussehra animal sacrifice.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 30 September. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Kardar-Sangh-to-move-SC-against-ban-on-Dussehra-animal-sacrifice/articleshow/43853010.cms>; accessed 02/11/2020).
- Bodh, Anand . 2014e. 'After HC ban, Himachal Pradesh cops lodge first animal sacrifice case.' *The Times of India*, online edition, 19 October. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/After-HC-ban-Himachal-Pradesh-cops-lodge-first-animal-sacrifice-case/articleshow/44872198.cms>; accessed 08/11/2020).
- Bradbury, Scott . 1994. 'Constantine and the problem of anti-Pagan legislation in the Fourth Century.' *Classical Philology* 89(2):120–139. doi:10.1086/367402.
- Carter, Stephen L. 1993. 'The resurrection of religious freedom?' *Harvard Law Review* 107:118–142.
- Cassuto, David N. 2008. 'Animal sacrifice and the First Amendment: the case of Lukumi Babalu Aye.' Pp. 50–77 in Taimie Bryant , David N. Cassuto & Rebecca Huss (eds.), *Animal Law and the Courts: A Reader*. St. Paul, MN: West Academic Press.
- Chakrabarti, Anindita . 2009. 'Judicious succession and judicial religion: internal conflict and legal dispute in a religious reform movement in India.' Pp. 87–105 in Thomas G. Kirsch & Bertram Turner (eds.), *Permutations of Order. Religion and Law as Contested Sovereignities*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Charak, Ranjana . 2015. 'Animal NGO "Karma" comes to the rescue of stray dogs.' *Greater Kashmir*, 2 June. (<https://www.greaterkashmir.com/news/jammu/animal-ngo-karma-comes-to-rescue-of-stray-dogs/>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Chauhan, Kuldeep . 2011. 'Admn averts sacrifice of two buffaloes.' *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, 6 October. (<https://www.tribuneindia.com/2011/20111006/himachal.htm#9>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Chauhan, Kuldeep . 2014a. 'Animal sacrifice ban looms large over Kullu Dasehra. Dev Samaj, Dasher committee caught on the horns of dilemma.' *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, online edition 3 October. (<http://www.tribuneindia.com/2014/20141003/himachal.htm>; accessed 01/11/2020).
- Chauhan, Kuldeep . 2014b. 'Lahaul deity gives up yatra over ban on animal sacrifice. In place of lamb, devotees to offer coconuts to Raja Gegan.' *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, online edition, 13 October. (<https://www.tribuneindia.com/2014/20141013/himachal.htm#1>; accessed 30/10/2020).
- Copeman, Jacob . 2009. *Veins of Devotion: Blood Donation and Religious Experience in North India*. New Brunswick (NJ)/London: Rutgers University Press.
- Doheny, Shannon L. 2006. 'Free exercise does not protect animal sacrifice: the misconception of Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah and constitutional solutions for stopping animal sacrifice.' *Journal of Animal Law* 2:121–142.
- Emerson, Herbert W. n.d. Manuscript. London: Indian Office Library (MSS. EUR. E.321).
- Everett, Jana . 1989. 'Incorporation versus conflict: lower class women, collective action, and the state in India.' Pp. 152–186 in Sue Ellen M. Charlton , Jana Everett & Kathleen Staudt (eds.), *Women, the State, and Development*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Fuller, C.J. 1988. 'Hinduism and scriptural authority in modern Indian law.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30(2):225–248. doi:10.1017/S0010417500015176.
- Fuller, C.J. . 1992. *The Camphor Flame. Popular Hinduism and Society in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Galanter, Marc . 1971. 'Hinduism, secularism, and the Indian judiciary.' *Philosophy East and West* 21(4):467–487. doi:10.2307/1398174; reprinted at Pp. 237–258 in Galantar, Marc. 1989. *Law and Society in Modern India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Govindrajana, Radhika . 2018. *Animal Intimacies. Interspecies Relatedness in India's Central Himalayas*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Green, Steven J. 2008. 'Save our cows? Augustan discourse and animal sacrifice in Ovid's *Fasti*.' *Greece & Rome, Second Series* 55(1):39–54. doi:10.1017/S0017383507000307.
- Habermas, J. 1991. 'The public sphere.' Pp. 398–404 in C. Mukerji & M. Schudson (eds.), *Rethinking Popular Culture. Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Halperin, Ehud . 2012. *Hadimbā Becoming Herself: A Himalayan Goddess in Change*. Ph.D. Dissertation, New York, NY: Columbia University.
- Halperin, Ehud . 2019. *The Many Faces of a Himalayan Goddess: Hadimba, Her Devotees, and Religion in Rapid Change*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Himachal Watcher . 2017. 'No, SC hasn't lifted the ban on animal sacrifice in Kullu Dushera.' *Himachal Watcher*, 29 September. (<https://himachalwatcher.com/2017/09/29/no-sc-hasnt-lifted-ban-on-animal-sacrifice-in-kullu-dushera/>; accessed 05/11/2021).
- HT Correspondent . 2014. 'Animal sacrifice ban issue: Kullu MLA to represent Dev Samaj in court.' *Hindustan Times*, Shimla, 20 September. (<https://www.hindustantimes.com/chandigarh/animal-sacrifice-ban-issue-kullu-mla-to-represent-dev-samaj-in-court/story-Uv4m8BjJs4QxGsrLOh1pCI.html>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- IANS . 2014a. 'Himachal goddess "endorses" court ban on animal sacrifice.' *Business Standard* , 8 October. ([http://www.business-standard.com/article/news-ians/himachal-goddess-endorses-court-ban-on-animal-sacrifice-114100800369\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/news-ians/himachal-goddess-endorses-court-ban-on-animal-sacrifice-114100800369_1.html); accessed 31/10/2020).
- IANS . 2014b. 'SC refuses to lift ban on animal sacrifice in Kulu Dushara.' *News18.com* . (<https://www.news18.com/news/india/sc-refuses-to-lift-ban-on-animal-sacrifice-in-kulu-dushara-718984.html>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- India TV News Desk . 2015. 'Don't interfere in social reforms, Himachal CM tells courts.' *India TV*, 25 February. (<https://www.indiatvnews.com/news/india/himachal-cm-tell-court-dont-interfere-in-social-reforms-47972.html>; accessed 02/11/2020).
- Johnson, Philip . 2013. 'Mahatma Gandhi hoax quote Greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way that its animals are treated.' *Animals Matter to God. Animals in Theology, Ethics, History and Law: A Review*. (<https://animalsmattertogod.com/2013/09/13/mahatma-gandhi-hoax-quote-greatness-of-a-nationand-its-moral-progress-can-be-judged-by-the-way-that-its-animals-are-treated/>; accessed on 08/03/2018).
- Joshiyura, Poorva . 2014. 'Animal sacrifice has no place in space-age India.' *International Business Times*, updated 17 October 2014. (<https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/animal-sacrifice-has-no-place-space-age-india-1470505>; accessed 29/10/2020).
- Kabeer, Naila . 1994. *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. London/New York: Verso.
- Kaplan, Carol M. 2000. 'The devil is in the details: neutral, generally applicable laws and exceptions from Smith.' *New York University Law Review* 75:1045–1084.
- Krauskopf, Gisèle & Marie Lecomte-Tilouine (eds.). 1996. *Célébrer le pouvoir. Dasaī, une fête royale au Népal*. Paris: CNRS Éditions/Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Manta, Dipankar . 2017. 'Nod to animal sacrifice at Kullu Dasher.' *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, online edition, 5 September. (<https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/archive/himachal/nod-to-animal-sacrifice-at-kullu-dasehra-462141>; accessed 08/11/2020).
- Mehta, Pratap Bhanu . 2010. 'India: The politics of religious reform and conflict.' Pp. 174–193 in John Malloy Owen & J. Judd Owen (eds.), *Religion, Enlightenment, and the New Global Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Moodie, Deonnie . 2019. 'On blood, power, and public interest: the concealment of Hindu sacrificial rites under Indian law.' *Journal of Law and Religion* 34(2):165–182. doi:10.1017/jlr.2019.24.

- O'Brien, David M. 2004. *Animal Sacrifice & Religious Freedom: Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Ohri, Priyanka . 2014. 'How a woman is ending animal sacrifice in Himachal Pradesh.' *Women's Web*, 10 November. (<https://www.womensweb.in/2014/11/sonali-purewal-ban-on-animal-sacrifice/>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Peabody, Norbert . 1997. 'Inchoate in Kota? Contesting authority through a North Indian pageant- play.' *American Ethnologist* 24(3):559–584. doi:10.1525/ae.1997.24.3.559.
- Phull, Archana . 2017. "'Animal sacrifice" tradition to be back in Himachal Pradesh.' *The Statesman*, Shimla, online edition, 14 April. (<https://www.thestatesman.com/cities/animal-sacrifice-tradition-to-be-back-in-himachal-pradesh-1492172385.html>; accessed 08/11/2020).
- Phull, Rajiv K. 2014. 'Himachal Excellence Awards 2014.' *Divyahimachal*, 22 November. (<http://www.divyahimachal.com/2014/11/himachal-excellence-awards-2014/>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Pundir, Dushyant Singh & Abhinav Vashisht . 2014. 'Deities against interferences in traditions. 270 representatives take part in Dev Sansad to review ban on animal sacrifice.' *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, 27 September. (<https://www.tribuneindia.com/2014/20140927/himachal.htm#2>; accessed 31/10/2020).
- Rajagopal, Krishnadas . 2015. 'SC rejects plea to ban animal sacrifices in festivals.' *The Hindu*, online edition, 28 September. (<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/sc-rejects-plea-to-ban-animal-sacrifices-in-festivals/article7699034.ece>; accessed 08/11/2020).
- Rao, Ursula . 2010. *News as Culture: Journalistic Practices and the Remaking of Indian Leadership Traditions*. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Rives, James B. 1999. 'The decree of Decius and the religion of empire.' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 89:135–154. doi:10.2307/300738.
- Rudolph, Lloyd I. & Susanne Hoeber Rudolph . 1965. 'Barristers and Brahmins in India: legal cultures and social change.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 8(1):23–49. doi:10.1017/S0010417500003881.
- Salzman, Michele Renee . 2011. 'The end of public sacrifice in post-Constantinian Rome and Italy.' Pp. 167–183 in Jennifer Wright Kunst & Zsuzsanna Varhelyi (eds.), *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salzman, Michele Renee . 2017. 'From *superstitio* to heresy: law and divine justice (fourth–fifth centuries CE).' Pp. 245–256 in Mu-Chou Poo , Harold Allen Drake & Lisa Ann Raphals (eds.), *Old Society, New Belief: Religious Transformation of China and Rome, Ca. 1st–6th Centuries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Savage, David G. 1992. 'Justices revisit unsettled issue in Santeria case: Law: Arguments about a city's ban of "ritualistic animal sacrifice" will weigh religious expression against animal rights.' *Los Angeles Times*, online edition, 1 November. (<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1992-11-01-mn-1856-story.html>; accessed 07/11/2020).
- Sedhuraman, R. 2015. 'Supreme Court rejects PIL on animal sacrifice at shrines.' *The Tribune*, online edition, 28 September. (<https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/archive/himachal/supreme-court-rejects-pil-on-animals-sacrifice-at-shrines-139023>; accessed 08/11/2020).
- Sen, Ronojoy . 2007. *Legalizing Religion: The Indian Supreme Court and Secularism*. Washington: East-West Center.
- Sen, Ronojoy . 2010. *Articles of Faith. Religion, Secularism and the Indian Supreme Court*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sharabi, Asaf . 2019. 'Is it God speaking? Agency of deities in the Western Himalaya.' *Anthropological Forum*. *Anthropological Forum: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Comparative Sociology*, 29(4):356–373.
- Sharma, Ashwani . 2014. 'Kullu religious body decides to continue with animal sacrifice despite HC ban.' *Indian Express*, 26 September 2014. (<https://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/kullu-religious-body-decides-to-continue-with-animal-sacrifice-despite-hc-ban/>; accessed 30/10/2020).
- Sundar, Nandini . 2001. 'Debating Dussehra and reinterpreting rebellion in Bastar district, Central India.' *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7(1):19–35. doi:10.1111/1467-9655.00048.
- Tanaka, Masakazu . 2000. 'Sacrifice lost and found. Colonial India and postcolonial Lanka.' *ZINBUN* 34(1):127–146. doi:10.14989/48772.

Tarabout, Gilles . 2016. 'Birth vs merit: Kerala's temple priests and the courts.' Pp. 3–33 in Daniela Berti , Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.), *Filing Religion. State, Hinduism and Courts of Law*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

TNN . 2014. 'More deities give up animal sacrifice in Himachal Pradesh.' *The Times of India*, 6 November 2014. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/More-deities-give-up-animal-sacrifice-in-Himachal-Pradesh/articleshow/45053391.cms>; accessed 30/10/2020).

TNN . 2015. 'Deities threaten to boycott Mandi Shivaratri over animal sacrifice.' *The Times of India*, 21 January 2015. (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Deities-threaten-to-boycott-Mandi-Shivaratri-over-animal-sacrifice/articleshow/45960943.cms>; accessed 30/10/2020).

Turner, Bertram & Thomas G. Kirsch . 2009. 'Law and religion in permutation of order: an introduction.' Pp. 1–24 in Thomas G. Kirsch & Bertram Turner (eds.), *Permutations of Order. Religion and Law as Contested Sovereignties*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Urban, Hugh B. 2001. 'The path of power: impurity, kingship, and sacrifice in Assamese Tantra.' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 69(4):777–816. doi:10.1093/jaarel/69.4.777.

Urban, Hugh B. . 2018. 'Death, nationalism, and sacrifice: ritual, violence, politics, and tourism in Northeast India.' Pp. 156–184 in Hugh B. Urban & Greg Johnson (eds.), *Irreverence and the Sacred: Critical Studies in the History of Religions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vidal, Denis . 1988. *Le culte des divinités locales dans une région de l'Himachal Pradesh*. Paris: Éditions de l'ORSTOM.

## Hidden meanings of buffalo sacrifice

Armstrong, Neil . 1998. 'Checks to integration: AKs of Mahepura.' Pp. 154–186 in Simon R. Charsley & G.K. Karanth (eds.), *Challenging Untouchability: Dalit Initiative and Experience from Karnataka*. New Delhi: Sage.

Baxi, Pratiksha . 2011. 'Justice is a secret: compromise in rape trials.' *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 44(3):207–233. doi:10.1177/006996671004400301.

Beck, Brenda E.F. 1981. 'The goddess and the demon: a local South Indian festival and its wider context.' *Puruṣārtha* 5:83–136.

Berg, Dag-Erik . 2020. *Dynamics of Caste and Law: Dalits, Oppression and Constitutional Democracy in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carswell, Grace & Geert De Neve . 2015. 'Litigation against political organization? The politics of Dalit mobilization in Tamil Nadu, India.' *Development and Change* 46(5):1106–1132. doi:10.1111/dech.12190.

Cohn, Bernard S. 1996. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Darapuri, S.R. 2020. 'The police in India is both casteist and communal.' *The Wire*, 9 September 2020. (<https://thewire.in/caste/police-casteist-communal>; accessed 09/12/2021).

Deliège, Robert . 1992. 'Replication and consensus: untouchability, caste and ideology in India.' *Man (NS)* 27(1):155–173. doi:10.2307/2803599.

Elmore, Wilbur Theodore . 1915. *Dravidian Gods in Modern Hinduism: A Study of the Local and Village Deities of Southern India*. Reprinted from the *University Studies of the University of Nebraska*, Vol. XV, No. I, 1915, published by the author, Hamilton, NY.

Fawcett, Fred . 1890. 'On some festivals to village goddesses.' *The Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay* II:261–282.

Gough, E. Kathleen . 1989. *Rural Social Change in Southeast India: 1950s to 1980s*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Govindrajan, Radhika . 2014. 'How to be Hindu in the Himalayas: conflicts over animal sacrifice in Uttarakhand.' Pp. 204–227 in Mahesh Rangarajan & K. Sivaramakrishnan (eds.), *Shifting Ground: People, Animals, and Mobility in India's Environmental History*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hardgrave, Robert L. 1969. *The Nadars of Tamilnad: The Political Culture of a Community in Change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Herrenschmidt, Olivier . 1981. 'Le sacrifice du buffle en Andhra côtier: Le "culte de village" confronté aux notions de sacrificant et d'unité de culte.' *Puruṣārtha* 5:137–177.

- Ikegame, Aya . 2013. *Princely India Re-Imagined: A Historical Anthropology of Mysore from 1799 to the Present*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ikegame, Aya . 2022. 'New Dalit assertion and the rejection of buffalo sacrifice in South India.' *SAMAJ* 28. doi: 10.4000/samaj.7944
- Kinsley, David R. 1986. *Hindu Goddesses: Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Tradition*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Malagatti, Aravind . 2007 (1994). *Government Brahmana*. (trans. from Kannada by Dharani Devi Malagatti , Janet Vucinich and N. Subramanya ). Chennai: Orient Longman.
- Moffatt, Michael . 1979a. *An Untouchable Community in South India: Structure and Consensus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moffatt, Michael . 1979b. 'Harijan religion: consensus at the bottom of caste.' *American Ethnologist* 6(2):244–260. doi:10.1525/ae.1979.6.2.02a00020.
- Raj, M.C. 2006. *Dalithink: An Adventure into Dalit Philosophy*. Tumkur: Ambedkar Resource Centre.
- Raj, M.C. . 2011. *Raachi: The Dalit Who Changed the Genes of Crow's Shit*. Kolkata: Power Publishers.
- Raj, M.C. . 2012 (2001). *Dalitology: The Book of the Dalit People for Humanity*. (2nd edn.). Tumkur: Ambedkar Resource Centre.
- Raj, M.C. & Jyothi . 2007. *Dalitocracy: The Theory and Practice of Dalit Politics*. Tumkur: Ambedkar Resource Centre.
- Raj, M.C. & Jyothi . 2008. *Dyche, the Dalit Psyche: The Science of Dalit Psychology, Reconstruction Indian Nationalism* . Tumkur: Ambedkar Resource Centre.
- Rao, Anupama . 2009. *The Caste Question: Dalits and the Politics of Modern India*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rawat, Vidya Bhushan . 2017. 'The dreamer begins his new journey: a tribute to MC Raj,' *CounterCurrents.org* , published online 6 June 2017. (<https://countercurrents.org/2017/06/the-dreamer-begins-his-new-journey-a-tribute-to-m-c-raj>; accessed 18/12/2018).
- REDS (Rural Education for Development Society ) . n.d. *A Decade with People: 1984–1994*. Tumkur: Ambedkar Resource Centre.
- Thurston, Edgar . 1909. *Castes and Tribes of Southern India (Volume IV)*. Madras: Government Press.
- Tripathi, Karan . 2021. 'Police reforms continue to fail Dalits, Muslims, Adivasis, why?' *The Quint*, 11 June. (<https://www.thequint.com/news/law/why-police-reforms-continue-to-fail-dalits-muslims-adivasis>; accessed 09/12/2021).
- Viswanath, Rupa . 2014. *The Pariah Problem: Caste, Religion, and the Social in Modern India*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Whitehead, Henry . 1907. 'The village deities of southern India.' *Madras Government Museum Bulletin* 5(3):106–190.
- Whitehead, Henry . 1921. *The Village Gods of South India (2nd edn.)*. Calcutta: Association Press.

## On blood, power, and public interest

- Adcock, Cassie S. 2010. 'Sacred cows and secular history: cow protection debates in colonial North India.' *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 30(2):297–311. doi:10.1215/1089201X-2010-014.
- Berti, Daniela , Gilles Tarabout & Raphaël Voix (eds.). 2015. *Filing Religion: State, Hinduism, and Courts of Law*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhuwania, Anuj . 2014. 'Courting the people: the rise of public interest litigation in post-emergency India.' *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34(2):314–335. doi:10.1215/1089201X-2773875.
- Bordeaux, Joel . 2014. 'Blood in the mainstream: Kālī pūjā and tantric orthodoxy in early modern Bengal.' Presentation, Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion, San Diego, 22 November.

- Bose, Shib Chunder . 1881. *The Hindoos as They Are: A Description of the Manners, Customs and Inner Life of Hindoo Society in Bengal*. Calcutta: W. Newman.
- Caṭṭopādhyāy, Sūrjyakumār . 1891. *Kālikṣetra Dīpikā* [A Commentary on the Land of Kālī]. Bhavānīpur: Pārthiva Jantra.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh . 1991. 'Open space/public place: garbage, modernity and India.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 14(1):15–31. doi:10.1080/00856409108723146.
- Chatterji, Bankim Chandra . 2003. 'Love for living creatures.' In Amiya P. Sen (ed.), *Dharmatattva* [Principles on Religion], trans. Apratim Ray . New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Chattopadhyay, Swati . 2005. *Representing Calcutta: Modernity, Nationalism, and the Colonial Uncanny*. London: Routledge.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. 1959. 'India.' *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 8(1):221–224. doi:10.1093/iclqaj/8.1.221.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. . 1999. *Religion, Law and the State in India*. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- Deva, Surya . 2010. 'Public interest litigation in India: a quest to achieve the impossible?' Pp. 57–79 in Po Jen Yap & Holnig Lau (eds.), *Public Interest Litigation in Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Doniger, Wendy . 2009. *The Hindus: An Alternative History*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Donner, Henrike . 2008. 'New vegetarianism: food, gender and neo-liberal regimes in Bengali middle-class families.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 31(1):143–169. doi:1080/00856400701874759.
- Douglas, Mary , 2002 [1966]. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Duff, Alexander . 1846. *A Description of the Durga and Kali Festivals, Celebrated in Calcutta, at an Expense of Three Millions of Dollars*. Troy: Caleb Wright.
- Dundas, Paul . 1992. *The Jains* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dutt, Govind Chunder . 2000. *The Dutt Family Album*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey.
- Fuller, C.J. 2003. *The Renewal of the Priesthood: Modernity and Traditionalism in a South Indian Temple*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Galanter, Marc . 1964. 'Temple-entry and the Untouchability (Offences) Act, 1955.' *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 6(2/3):185–195. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43949802>
- Gibson, Mary Ellis . 2011. *Indian Angles: English Verse in Colonial India from Jones to Tagore*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Gupta, Sanjukta . 2003. *The Domestication of a Goddess: Carāṇa-Tīrtha Kālīghāṭ, the Mahāpīṭha of Kālī*. Pp. 60–79 in Rachel Fell McDermott & Jeffrey J. Kripal (eds.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Halbfass, Wilhelm . 1991. *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Hindu Thought*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Heesterman, J.C. 1993. *The Broken World of Sacrifice: An Essay in Ancient Indian Ritual*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Houben, Jan E.M. 1999. 'To kill or not to kill the sacrificial animal (*yajna-pasu*): arguments and perspectives in Brahminical ethical philosophy.' Pp. 105–184 in Jan E.M. Houben & K.R. Kooij (eds.), *Violence Denied: Violence, Non-Violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History*. Boston: Brill.
- Jaffrelot, Christophe . 2017. 'India's Democracy at 70: Toward a Hindu state?' *Journal of Democracy* 28(3):52–63. doi:10.1353/jod.2017.0044.
- Jones, Kenneth W. 1976. *Arya Dharm: Hindu Consciousness in 19th-Century Punjab*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman . 1974. *History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. 2* (2nd ed.). Poona: Bhadarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kaviraj, Sudipta . 1997. 'Filth and the public sphere: concepts and practices about space in Calcutta.' *Public Culture* 10(1):83–113. doi:10.1215/08992363-10-1-83.
- Kinsley, David R. 2003. 'Kālī.' Pp. 23–38 in Rachel Fell McDermott & Jeffrey J. Kripal (eds.), *Encountering Kālī: In the Margins, at the Center, in the West* . Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Klawans, Jonathan . 2006. 'Sacrifice in ancient Israel: pure bodies, domesticated animals, and the divine shepherd.' Pp. 65–80 in Paul Waldau & Kimberley Patton (eds.), *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

- Knight, James Blackburn . 1875. Handbook to Calcutta. Calcutta: W. Newman.
- Lee, Paula Young . 2008. 'Siting the slaughterhouse: from shed to factory.' Pp. 46–70 in Paula Young Lee (ed.), *Meat, Modernity, and the Rise of the Slaughterhouse*. Durham: University of New Hampshire Press.
- Madhusudan, Saharay . 2000. *Public Interest Litigation and Human Rights in India*. Allahabad: Premier Publishing.
- Mayo, Katherine . 1927. *Mother India*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Mathew, P.D. 1996. *Public Interest Litigation*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.
- McDermott, Rachel . 2001. *Mother of My Heart, Daughter of My Dreams: Kālī and Umā in the Devotional Poetry of Bengal*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, Rachel Fell . 2011. *Revelry, Rivalry, and Longing for the Goddesses of Bengal: The Fortunes of Hindu Festivals*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Moodie, Deonnie . 2018. *The Making of a Modern Temple and a Hindu City: Kālīghāṭ and Kolkata*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Moodie, Deonnie . 2019. 'Kālīghāṭ and the fashioning of middle class modernities.' *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 23(1): 11–26, special issue: 'Where Class Meets Religion: Examining Middle-Class Religiosity in India.'
- Mukherjea, B.K. 2010 [1983]. *The Hindu Law of Religious and Charitable Trusts: Tagore Law Lectures* (5th ed.). A.C. Sen (ed.). Calcutta: Eastern Law House.
- Mukhopādhyāy, Upendranāth . 1890. *Kalikātā-Darśak* [Kolkata Visitor]. Kolikātā: Nūtan Kalikātā Jantra.
- Mukhopādhyāy, Upendranāth . 1925. *Kālīghāṭ Itivṛtta*. Bhāvanīpur: Hitaiṣī Jantra.
- Oman, John Campbell . 1907. *The Brahmans, Theists and Muslims of India* (2nd ed.). London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Padoux, Andre . 1986. 'Tantrism.' Pp. 272–276 in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vol. 14 (1st ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Pandian, M.S.S. 2005. 'Dilemmas of public reason: secularism and religious violence in contemporary India.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 40(22/23):2313–2320. doi:10.2307/4416711.
- Samanta, Samiparna . 2006. 'Calcutta slaughterhouse: colonial and postcolonial experiences.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 41(20):1999–2007. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4418242>.
- Samanta, Suchitra . 1994. 'The "self-animal" and divine digestion: goat sacrifice to the goddess Kali in Bengal.' *Journal of Asian Studies* 53(3):779–803. doi:10.2307/2059730.
- Sarkar, Radha & Amar Sarkar . 2016. 'Sacred slaughter: an analysis of historical, communal, and constitutional aspects of beef bans in India.' *Politics, Religion and Ideology* 17(4):329–351. doi:10.1080/21567689.2016.1259108.
- Sastri, S. Sambamurthy . 1991. *Paramacharya: Life of Sri Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi of Sri Kanchi Kamakoti Peetam*, P.G. Sundarajan (trans.). Madras: Jana Kalyan.
- Sathe, S.P. 2002. *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, J. Barton & Brannon D. Ingram . 2015. 'What is a public? Notes from South Asia.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 38(3):357–370. doi:10.1080/00856401.2015.1052896.
- Sharan, Awadhendra B. 2014. *The City, Out of Place: Nuisance, Pollution, and Dwelling in Delhi, c. 1850–2000*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Brian . 1990. 'Eaters, food, and social hierarchy in ancient India: a dietary guide to a revolution of values.' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 58(2):177–205. doi:10.1093/jaarel/LVIII.2.177.
- Smith, Frederick . 2011. 'A brief history of Indian religious ritual and resource consumption: was there an environmental ethic?' *Asian Ethnology* 70(2):163–179. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41407269>.
- Tagore, Rabindranath . 1961. 'Visarjan [sacrifice].' in Amiya Chandra Chakravarty (ed.). *A Tagore Reader*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Tull, Herman W. 1996. 'The killing that is not killing: men, cattle, and the origins of non-violence (*ahimsā*) in the Vedic sacrifice.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 39(3):223–244. doi:10.1163/00000096790085150.
- Ullucci, Daniel C. 2011. *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.



Urban, Hugh . 2001. *The Economics of Ecstasy: Tantra, Secrecy, and Power in Colonial Bengal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ward, William . 1822. *A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos*, vol. 3. London: Baptist Missionary Society.

White, David Gordon . 2003. *Kiss of the Yogini: 'Tantric Sex' in Its South Asian Contexts*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wise, Steven . 2006. 'Animal law and animal sacrifice: analysis of the U.S. Supreme Court ruling on Santería animal sacrifice in Hialeah.' Pp. 585–588 in Paul Waldau & Kimberley Patton (eds.), *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

## 'Who belled the cat?'

Benbabaali, Dalal . 2008. 'Questioning the role of the Indian Administrative Service in national integration.' *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*. doi:10.4000/samaj.633.

Bhattacharya, Tithi . 2007. 'Tracking the Goddess: religion, community, and identity in the Durga Puja ceremonies of nineteenth-century Calcutta.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 66(4):919–996. doi:10.1017/S0021911807001258.

Bordeaux, Joël . 2019. 'Blood in the mainstream: Kālī Pūjā and Tantric orthodoxy in early modern Bengal.' *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 23:151–164. doi:10.1007/s11407-019-09257-0.

Chakrabarti, Kunal . 2001. *Religious Processes: The Purānas and the Making of a Regional Tradition*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chakravarti, Chintaharan . 1957. 'Kālī worship in Bengal.' *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 21(3–4):296–303.

Chatterji, Saubhadra . 2011. 'Mamata says no to Pranab's officer choice.' *The Hindustan Times* , 16 September 2011; <https://www.hindustantimes.com/delhi/mamata-says-no-to-pranab-s-officer-choice/story-Sy2IEOHahfo5PcYLYYcfmO.html> (accessed 14/02/2022).

Coburn, Thomas B. 1984. *Devī Māhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Copeman, Jacob & John Hagström . 2022. 'Rationalist camera: non-religious techniques of vision in India.' in Jacob Copeman & Mascha Schulz (eds.), *Global Sceptical Publics: From Non-Religious Print Media to 'Digital Atheism'*. London: UCL Press.

Ferrari, Fabrizio M. 2010. *Guilty Males and Proud Females: Negotiating Genders in a Bengali Festival*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.

Fuller, C.J. 2004. *The Camphor Flame. Popular Hinduism and Society in India* (2nd edn.; first published 1992). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ghosh, Pika . 2005. *Temple to Love. Architecture and Devotion in Seventeenth-Century Bengal*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Ghosh, Prabir . 1990–1995. *Aloukik Noy, Laukika* . [*Nothing Is Supernatural*.] Calcutta: Dey's Publishing.

Ghosh, Prabir . 2006. *The Mystery of Mother Theresa and Saint Hood*. Calcutta: Dey's Publishing.

Ghosh, Prabir & Sumitra Padmanabhan . 2008. 'Know your Gurus', part 1 and 2. <http://nirmukta.com/2008/09/04/know-your-gurus/#more-207> and <http://nirmukta.com/2008/09/09/know-your-gurus-2/> (both accessed 29/03/2022).

Ghosha, Pratapachandra . 1871. *Durga Puja, With Notes and Illustrations*. Calcutta: Hindu Patriot Press.

Gupta, Sanjukta & Richard Gombrich . 1986. 'Kings, power and the goddess.' *South Asia Research* 6(2):123–138. doi:10.1177/026272808600600203.

McDermott, Rachel Fell . 2001. *Mother of My Heart, Daughter of My Dreams: Kali and Uma in the Devotional Poetry of Bengal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDermott, Rachel Fell . 2011. *Revelry, Rivalry, and Longing for the Goddesses of Bengal*. New York: Columbia University Press.

McLane, John R. 1993. *Land and Local Kingship in Eighteenth-Century Bengal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Michael, Axel . 2001. *The Paṇḍita*. Traditional Scholarship in India. New Delhi: Manohar.

Moodie, Deonnie . 2019a. *The Making of a Modern Temple and a Hindu City*. Kālīghāt and Kolkata. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moodie, Deonnie . 2019b. 'On blood, power, and public interest: the concealment of Hindu sacrificial rites under Indian law.' *Journal of Law and Religion* 34(2):165–182. doi:10.1017/jlr.2019.24.

Mukherjea, Bijan Kumar . 2003 [1952]. *The Hindu Law of Religious and Charitable Trust*. Calcutta: Eastern Law House Ltd.

Mukhopādhyāya, Debāśīśa . 2016. *Śrī Śrī Baḍamā (Bīrahātā Kalībaḍi)*. Bardhaman: A.B. Prakasani.

Nicholas, Ralph W. 2013. *Night of the Gods: Durga Puja and the Legitimation of Power in Rural Bengal*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Oldham, William B. 1894. *Some Historical and Ethnical Aspects of the Burdwan District*. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Press.

Peterson, J.C.K. 1910. *Bengal District Gazetteers. Burdwan*. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

Presler, Franklin A. 1983. 'The structure and consequences of temple policy in Tamil Nadu, 1967–81.' *Pacific Affairs* 56(2):232–246. doi:10.2307/2758652.

Rodrigues, Hillary P. 2003. *Ritual Worship of the Great Goddess: The Liturgy of the Durgā Pūjā with Interpretations*. New York: State University of New York.

Samanta, Suchitra . 1994. 'The 'self-animal' and divine digestion: goat sacrifice to the goddess Kali in Bengal.' *Journal of Asian Studies* 53(3):779–803. doi:10.2307/2059730.

Sarkar, Bihani . 2017. *Heroic Shāktism: The Cult of Durgā in Ancient Indian Kingship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarkar, Indranil . 2016. 'Burdwan royal Durga without an address. Scroll-painted Devi worshipped in temple corner to make way for girls' hostel.' *The Telegraph Online*, 11 October 2016. (<https://www.telegraphindia.com/west-bengal/burdwan-royal-durga-without-an-address/cid/1320116>; accessed 11/02/2022).

Sarkara, Niradbaran . 1999a. *Bardhamāna Rājītibṛtta [On the Bardhaman Rājas]*. Kolkata: B.K. Prakāśnī.

Sarkara, Niradbaran . 1999b. *Nagar Bardhamānera Devadevī [Bardhaman's City Gods and Goddesses]*. Bardhaman: S.S. Sarkar.

Speed News Desk . 2015. 'Break with tradition: No more animal sacrifice in two West Bengal temples.' *Catchnews*, 9 December 2015. (<https://www.catchnews.com/kolkata-news/?UNPUB=1449658372>; accessed 12/07/2022).

Telegraph . 2016. 'Animal slaughter then, blessings now.' *The Telegraph Online*. 11 October 2016. <https://www.telegraphindia.com/west-bengal/animal-slaughter-then-blessings-now/cid/1320112> (accessed 4/6/2022).

Times of India . 2021. 'PM Modi urged to ban animal sacrifice.' 2 July 2021. [http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/84063067.cms?utm\\_source=contentofinterest&utm\\_medium=text&utm\\_campaign=cppst](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/84063067.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst) (accessed 18/11/2022).

Trouillet, Pierre-Yves . 2017. 'Hindu temples and development of localities in Tamil Nadu (South India).' Pp. 311–334 in Eric Denis & Marie-Hélène Zérah (eds.), *Subaltern Urbanisation in India: An Introduction to the Dynamics of Ordinary Towns, Exploring Urban Change in South Asia*. New Delhi: Springer India.

Yogananda, Paramahansa . 1946. *Autobiography of a Yogi*. New York: The Philosophical Library.

## The last straw on the camel's back

Animal Welfare Board of India v. A. Nagaraja & Ors . Supreme Court of India, 7 May 2014. Civil Appeal No. 5387 of 2014. 7 SCC 547. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/39696860/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Centre for Environmental Law, WWF India v. Union of India & Ors . Supreme Court of India, 15 April 2013. WP (Civil) No. 337 of 1995. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/27900105/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying . 2012. *19th Livestock Census All India Report 2012*. (<https://dahd.nic.in/documents/statistics/livestock-census>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying . 2019. *Provisional Key Results of 20th Livestock Census*. (<https://dahd.nic.in/division/provisional-key-results-20th-livestock-census>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Dhyan Foundation v. The State of Bihar . Patna High Court, 27 April 2017. Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 263 of 2017. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/40984113/>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Indian Young Lawyers Association v. The State of Kerala . Supreme Court of India, 28 September 2018. WP (Civil) No. 373 of 2006. SCC Online SC 1690 (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/163639357/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Mohd. Hanif Quareshi & Others v. State of Bihar . Supreme Court of India, 23 April 1958. 1958 AIR 731, 1959 SCR 629 (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/93885/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Queen Empress v. Iman Ali & Anor . Allahabad High Court, 20 December 1887. (1888) ILR 10 All 150. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1480551/>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Raheem@ J. Abdul Raheem v. The Chief Secretary . W.P. No. 31476 of 2016. Madras High Court, 9 September 2016. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/197059204/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Siraj v. District Collector . Kerala High Court, 5 December 2005. 2006(1) KLT 47. (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1066491/>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Sri Subhas Bhattacharjee v. The State of Tripura . Tripura High Court, 27 September 2019. WP(C)(PIL) No. 2 of 2018 (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/58095629/>; accessed 01/12/2021).

State of West Bengal v. Ashutosh Lahiri . Supreme Court of India, 16 November 1994. 1995 AIR 464, 1995 SCC (1) 189 (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/105231/>; accessed 28/11/2021).

State of Gujarat v. Mirzapur Moti Kureshi Kassab Jamat & Ors . Supreme Court of India, 26 October 2005. Appeal (civil) 4937-4940 of 1998 (<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/101278772/>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Faye, Bernard . 2016. 'The camel, new challenges for a sustainable development.' *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 48(4):689–692. doi:10.1007/s11250-016-0995-8.

Faye, Bernard & P. Bonnet . 2012. 'Camel sciences and economy in the world: current situation and perspectives.' Pp. 2–15. Proc. 3rd ISOCARD conference. Keynote presentations. 29th January–1st February, 2012, Mascate (Sultanate of Oman).

Gupta, Rohan . 2019. 'Rajasthan talks of changing law that hit camel population.' *Down to Earth* , 6 November. (<https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/governance/rajasthan-talks-of-changing-law-that-hit-camel-population-67648>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Harari, Yuval Noah 2015. *Sapiens: A Brief History of Mankind*. New York: HarperCollins.

Köhler-Rollefson, Ilse . 2018. *Camel Cultures of India*. (<https://www.sahapedia.org/camel-cultures-of-india>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Köhler-Rollefson, Ilse . 2020. 'On World Milk Day (1 June), camel milk is set to make a splash!' [blog, dated 27 May 2020] (<http://www.ilse-koehler-rollefson.com>; accessed 01/12/2021).

Laudadio, Vito , Tufarelli V. Vincenzo , Marco Dario , Mohamed Hammadi , Mabrouk Mouldi Seddik , Giovanni Michele Lacalandra & Cataldo Dario . 2009. 'A survey of chemical and nutritional characteristics of halophytes plants used by camels in Southern Tunisia.' *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 41(2):209–215. doi:10.1007/s11250-008-9177-7.

Overdorf, Jason . 2015. 'The secret to saving India's plummeting camel population: legalize their slaughter.' *The World*, 28 August. (<https://theworld.org/stories/2015-08-28/secret-saving-indias-plummeting-camel-population-legalize-their-slaughter>; accessed 28/11/2021).

Times of India . 2019. *Animal Welfare Board Warns against Camel Slaughter*. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/chennai/animal-board-warns-against-camel-slaughter/articleshow/70638051.cms>

## 'Not in the name of dharma'

Adcock, Cassie & Radhika Govindrajana . 2019. 'Bovine politics in South Asia: rethinking religion, law and ethics.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 42(6):1095–1107. doi:10.1080/00856401.2019.1681726

- Adhikari, D. & L. de Vries . 2014. 'Overkill in Gadhimai. Two divergent perspectives on the mass sacrifice of animals at Gadhimai on 27 November.' *Nepali Times*, 14–20 November.
- Adhikari, Krishna P. & David N. Gellner . 2016a. 'Ancestor worship and sacrifice: Debates over Bahun-Chhetri Clan Rituals (Kul Puja) in Nepal'. Pp. 227–259 in David N. Gellner , Sondra L. Hausner & Chiara Letizia (eds.). *Religion, Secularism, and Ethnicity in Contemporary Nepal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Adhikari, Krishna P. & David N. Gellner . 2016b. 'New identity politics and the 2012 collapse of Nepal's Constituent Assembly: when the dominant becomes 'other'.' *Modern Asian Studies* 50(6):2009–2040. doi:10.1017/S0026749X15000438.
- Baird, Robert D. 2005. 'Religion and law in India: adjusting to the sacred as secular.' Pp. 7–34 in Robert D. Baird (ed.). *Religion and Law in Independent India* (2nd enlarged edn.). New Delhi: Manohar.
- Barali, S. 2019. 'Cruelty and compassion.' *Nepali Times*, 6 December.
- Berardi-Tadié, Barbara . 2017. *L'ère des droits. Vers une anthropologie des associations de la société civile au Népal*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Paris: EHESS.
- Berti, Daniela , Gilles Tarabout & Raphael Voix (eds.). 2016. *Filing Religion. State, Hinduism, and Courts of Law* . New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhagwati, P. N. 2005 [1993]. 'Religion and secularism under the Indian constitution.' Pp. 35–49 in Robert D. Baird (ed.). *Religion and Law in Independent India* (2nd enlarged edn.). New Delhi: Manohar.
- Bhattarai, S. 2019. 'Activists decry animal cruelty at Nepal temple.' *Nepali Times*, 19 November.
- Bhuwania, Anuj . 2014. 'Courting the people: the rise of public interest litigation in post-emergency India.' *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34(2):314–335. doi:10.1215/1089201X-2773875.
- Bhuwania, Anuj . 2016. *Courting the People: Public Interest Litigation in Post-Emergency India*. Delhi: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgat, Florence . 2017. *L Humanité carnivore*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Campbell, Ben . 1995. 'Dismembering the body politic: contestations of legitimacy in Tamang celebrations of *Dasain* .' *Kailash* 17(3–4):133–146.
- Cunningham, Clark D. 1987. 'Public interest litigation in Indian supreme court: a study in the light of American experience.' *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 29(4):494–523.
- Dave, N. N. 2014. 'Witness: humans, animals, and the politics of becoming.' *Cultural Anthropology* 29(3):433–456. doi:10.14506/ca29.3.01.
- de Sales, Anne . 2011. 'Time, identity and historical change in the hills of Nepal.' *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research* 39:106–126.
- Dulal, K. 2016. 'Ode to goat.' *Nepali Times*, 13 October.
- Fuller, C. J. 1988. 'Hinduism and scriptural authority in modern Indian law.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30(2):225–248. doi:10.1017/S0010417500015176.
- Gaige, Frederick H. 1975. *Regionalism and National Unity in Nepal*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Galanter, Marc . 1971. 'Hinduism, secularism, and the Indian judiciary.' *Philosophy East and West* 21(4):467–487. doi:10.2307/1398174.
- Gellner, David N. 2001. 'Religion, politics, and ritual: remarks on Geertz and Bloch.' Pp. 61–82 in David N. Gellner (ed.). *The Anthropology of Buddhism and Hinduism: Weberian Themes*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gellner David, N. , Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka & John Whelpton (eds.). 2008. *Nationalism and Ethnicity in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Vajra.
- Gellner, David N. , Sondra L. Hausner & Chiara Letizia (eds.). 2016. *Religion, Secularism and Ethnicity in Contemporary Nepal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Govindrajan, Radhika . 2014. 'How to be Hindu in the Himalayas: conflicts over animal sacrifice in Uttarakhand.' Pp. 204–227 in Mahesh Rangarajan & K. Sivaramakrishnan (eds.). *Shifting Ground: People, Animals, and Mobility in India's Environmental History*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Govindrajan, Radhika . 2015. "'The goat that died for family": animal sacrifice and interspecies kinship in India's Central Himalayas.' *American Ethnologist* 42(3):504–519. doi:10.1111/amet.12144.
- Govindrajan, Radhika . 2018. *Animal Intimacies. Interspecies Relatedness in India's Central Himalayas* . Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Grandin, Temple & Catherine Johnson . 2004. *Animals in Translation: Using the Mysteries of Autism to Decode Animal Behaviour*. London: Harvest.
- Hangen, Susan I. 2005. 'Boycotting Dasain: history, memory, and ethnic politics in Nepal.' *SINHAS* 10:105–133.
- Hangen, Susan I. . 2010. *The Rise of Ethnic Politics in Nepal: Democracy in the Margins*. London: Routledge.
- Hardy, Kathryn C. 2019. 'Provincialising the cow: buffalo–human relationships.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 42(6):1156–1172. doi:10.1080/00856401.2019.1680484.
- Holmberg, D. 2016. Tamang Lhochhar and the New Nepal. Pp. 302–325 in David N. Gellner , Sondra L. Hausner & Chiara Letizia (eds.). *Religion, Secularism, and Ethnicity in Contemporary Nepal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Jha, Dwijendra Narayan . 2002. *The Myth of the Holy Cow*. London: Verso.
- Krauskopf, Gisele & Marie Lecomte-Tilouine . 1996. *Célébrer le pouvoir. Dasaī, une fête royale au Népal*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Lecomte-Tilouine, Marie . 2013. 'Does sacrifice avert violence? Reflections from Nepal and the People's war.' *Antropologia* 13(16):37–56. <https://doi.org/10.14672/ada2013197%25p>.
- Lecomte-Tilouine, Marie . 2020. *Sacrifice et violence. Réflexions autour d'une ethnographie au Népal*. Sesto San Giovanni: Mimésis.
- Letizia, Chiara . 2011. 'Shaping secularism in Nepal.' *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research* 39:66–104.
- Letizia, Chiara . 2013. 'The goddess Kumari at the Supreme Court: divine kinship and secularism in Nepal.' *FOCAAL-Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 67:32–46.
- Letizia, Chiara . 2014. 'Buddhist activism, new sanghas, and the politics of belonging among some Tharu and Magar communities of Southern Nepal.' Pp. 286–322 in Gérard Toffin & Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka (eds.), *Facing Globalisation in the Himalayas. Belonging and the Politics of the Self*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Letizia, Chiara . 2016. National gods at the court. Secularism and the judiciary in Nepal. Pp. 34–68 in Daniela Berti , Gilles Tarabout & Raphael Voix (eds.). *Filing Religion. State, Hinduism, and Courts of Law*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Leve, Lauren . 2017. *The Buddhist Art of Living in Nepal: Ethical Practice and Religious Reform*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- LeVine, Sarah & David N. Gellner . 2005. *Rebuilding Buddhism: The Theravada Movement in Twentieth Century Nepal*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Levy, Robert I. 1990. *Mesocosm: Hinduism and the Organization of a Traditional Newar City in Nepal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Michaels, Axel . 2004. *Hinduism: Past and Present*. Translated by B. Harshaw . Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Michaels, Axel . 2016. Blood sacrifice in Nepal. Transformations and criticism Pp. 192–225 in David N. Gellner , Sondra L. Hausner , & Chiara Letizia (eds.). *Religion, Secularism, and Ethnicity in Contemporary Nepal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Mishra, A. 2018. 'The sacrifice of animal sacrifices.' *Nepali Times*, 12 October.
- Mumford, Stan R. 1989. *Himalayan Dialogue, Tibetan Lamas and Gurung Shamans in Nepal*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ortner, S. 1998. 'The case of the disappearing shamans, or: no individualism, no relationalism.' Pp. 239–267 in Debra Skinner , Alfred Pach & Dorothy Holland (eds.). *Selves in Time and Place: Identities, Experience, and History in Nepal*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Owens, Bruce McCoy . 1993. 'Blood and Bodhisattvas: sacrifice among the Newar Buddhists of Nepal.' Pp. 258–269 in Charles Ramble & Martin Brauen (eds.). *Anthropology of Tibet and the Himalaya*. Zurich: Ethnological Museum of the University of Zurich.
- Patton, Kimberley . 2009. 'Animal sacrifice: metaphysics of the sublimated victim.' Pp. 391–403 in Paul Waldau & Kimberley Patton (eds.). *A Communion of Subjects Animals in Religion, Science, and Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pfaff-Czarnecka, Joanna . 1996. 'A battle of meanings: commemorating the goddess Durga's victory over the demon Mahisa as a political act.' *Kailash* 18(3–4):57–92.
- Ramirez, Philippe . 1993. 'Drama, devotion and politics: the Dasain festival in Argha Kingdom.' Pp. 47–59 in Gérard Toffin (ed.). *Nepal, Past and Present*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.
- Ripert, Blandine . 2004. 'Le lama pasteurisé'. Vers de nouvelles figures d'autorité religieuse chez les Tamang de l'Ouest.' Pp. 453–467 in Véronique Bouillier & Catherine Servan-Schreiber

- (eds.). *De l'Arabie à l'Himalaya, Hommages à Marc Gaborieau*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Ripert, Blandine . 2014. 'Improbable globalization: individualization and Christianization among the Tamangs of Central Nepal.' Pp. 45–62 in Gérard Toffin & Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka (eds.). *Facing Globalisation in the Himalayas. Belonging and the Politics of the Self*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Sen, Ronojoy . 2010. *Articles of Faith: Religion, Secularism, and the Indian Supreme Court*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sethi, Aarti . 2019. 'Mahadev's gift: men, bullocks and the community of cultivation in Central India.' *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 42(6):1173–1191.
- Sijapati, Bandita . 2013. 'In pursuit of recognition: regionalism Madhesi identity and the Madhes Andolan.' Pp. 145–172 in Mahendra Lawoti & Susan Hangen (eds.). *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Nepal: Identity and Mobilization after 1990*. Oxford, New York: Routledge.
- Singer, P. 2009 [1975]. *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Tamang, Seira . 2000. 'Legalising state patriarchy in Nepal.' *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 5(1):127–156.
- Tandon, G. 2069 B.S. (2012). *Pashubali, Nished Cetana*. Kathmandu: Puprinters.
- Tandon, G. . 2014. 'No sacrifice.' *Nepali Times*, 17 November (translated from *Annapurna Post* ).
- Tarabout, Gilles . 2018. 'Ruling on rituals: courts of law and religious practices in contemporary Hinduism.' *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal* 17. doi:10.4000/samaj.4451.
- Thapa, R. 2009. 'Animal fights.' *Nepali Times*, 20–26 November.
- Toffin, Gérard . 1976. 'Le *si kê bheây*, festin de la tête chez les Newar.' *Kailash* IV(4):329–338.
- Toffin, Gérard . 2016. *Imagination and Realities. Nepal between Past and Present*. New Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Torri, Davide . 2016. 'To kill or not to kill? The issue of blood sacrifice and the transformation of ritual patterns in Hyolmo shamanism.' *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research* 47:15–39.
- Ullucci, Daniel . 2011. 'Contesting the meaning of animal sacrifice.' Pp. 57–74 in Jennifer Wright Knust & Zsuzsanna Várhelyi (eds.). *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zharkevich, Ina . 2019. *Maoist People's War and the Revolution of Everyday Life in Nepal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zotter, Astrid . 2021. 'Who kills the buffalo? Authority and agency in the ritual logistics of the Nepalese Dasaï festival.' Pp. 193–220 in Ute Hüsken , Vasudha Narayanan & Astrid Zotter (eds.). *Nine Nights of Power: Durgā, Dolls and Darbārs*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

## Afterword

- Fuller, C.J. 2004. *The Camphor Flame: Popular Hinduism and Society in India* (rev. edn.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Galanter, Marc . 1989 [1971]. 'Hinduism, secularism, and the Indian judiciary.' Pp. 237–258 in *Law and Society in Modern India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, Rachel Fell . 2011. *Revelry, Rivalry, and Longing for the Goddesses of Bengal: The Fortunes of Hindu Festivals*. New York: Columbia University Press.