4

Discipline

In 1799, the mahajans of Pali paid the local butchers five rupees in exchange for the butchers' promise to refrain from slaughtering animals.[1] When the Rathor crown in Jodhpur heard of this, the *dīvān*, at the time an Osvāl merchant-administrator named Mumhta Sardar Mal, ordered the governor of Pali to provide the mahajans with a copy of the crown's order banning violence against animals, probably in order to lend weight to their efforts to get the butchers to abandon their trade.[2] Why did the merchants try to stop butchery in their town? Why did the state support this effort? This episode and the documentary trace it left on the Rathor archive was a product of a kingdom-wide campaign that engulfed all of Marwar in the latter half of the eighteenth century, which this chapter and the next one will discuss. Such a campaign to enforce vegetarianism upon an entire body of subjects using the punitive and surveillance capabilities of the state is without precedent in Indian history, raising the question of why the eighteenth-century Rathor state channeled its resources into the policing of its subjects' dietary choices. I show in this chapter that this campaign in pursuit of a kingdom-wide law against animal slaughter came down much harder on certain groups that, not coincidentally, were among those explicitly demarcated as "*achhep*" in Rathor court orders.

The encoding of the "Hindu" and the "Untouchable" rested not only on ideas of embodied pollution and uncleanliness. A central element of the redefinition of the Untouchable in Marwar was the elevation of nonharm to living beings as the ethical practice of elite, Hindu identity. The "innate" tendency to take animal lives, whether for ritual, sport, or consumption, then was deemed not only unethical but also a trait of the Untouchable. The quest for a vegetarian body politic served as a powerful plank for the demarcation of "low" castes and Muslims as inherently different. The Rathor state introduced a set of laws enforcing noninjury

toward its nonhuman subjects in the late eighteenth century, which I will discuss in greater detail in the next chapter. These were not just goals the failure of whose implementation relegated them to the realm of ideals. Rather, Vijai Singh and his merchant and brahman functionaries zealously pursued the implementation of these regulations across the towns and villages of late eighteenth-century Marwar. The crown used its administrative apparatus to hound the practitioners of violence against animals, apprehending anyone who was accused of the crime in all its myriad manifestations. The majority of those accused, however, were involved in meat eating since this was the most common reason for taking animal lives.

The political campaign against nonvegetarianism and other sources of violence against animals created a fissure in Marwari society between meat-eaters and vegetarians. Vijai Singh and his merchant bureaucrats sought to universalize their own ethics throughout the entirety of their domain. It is noteworthy that of all the ethical precepts that the Rathor state enshrined in law—temperance, chastity, a disavowal of gambling, and nonharm—only the last one was rigorously pursued by the Rathor state by active and unrelenting enforcement throughout its territory and across all castes. This is in line with observations of the Jain attitude toward ethical codes in twentieth-century Rajasthan and Gujarat. That is, *ahiṃsā* or nonharm is the only ethical precept that Jains do not see as applicable only to their own path, but rather as one that it is their duty to promote among all. Still, while in twentieth-century contexts this promotion of nonharm by non-Jains was especially to be pursued during the holy days of Paryūśaṇ, in the eighteenth-century Rathor context we see this effort underway all through the year.[3]

Through a circumscription of alimentary alternatives grounded in an appeal to ethical precepts, the Rathor state sought to create moral subjects. The pursuit of an ethical, and in this case, vegetarian body politic was accompanied by the simultaneous delineation of peoples whose bodies irremediably were the domain of the unethical and the criminal. State functionaries singled out butchers (*kasāīs* and *khaṭīks*), vagrant hunters (*thorīs* and *bāvrīs*), and Muslims in particular, for campaigns of arrest, dispossession, and surveillance. It is in this punitive campaign that we gain a glimpse of the anxiety generated among the region's ruling elite by those deemed "Untouchable." The overlap between those most suspect as animal killers and those explicitly deemed "Untouchable" in other Rathor state orders is remarkable. What also stands out is the betrayal in state orders of anxiety toward the ability of *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* to wield arms. With respect to these two communities, the campaign for the protection of animal lives also served the dual purpose of legitimizing the disarming of "low"-caste subaltern groups that could and did rebel against the Rathor government.

THE UNTOUCHABLE AS CRIMINAL

Bāvrīs and *thorīs* were castes that dwelt on the margins of villages and in scrubby tracts. *Bāvrīs* lived at a remove from settled society and were largely landless. They used their ability to recede into uninhabited lands to carry out small-scale theft, usually by breaking into homes. Late nineteenth-century observers noted that *bāvrīs*, like *sāṃsīs* (often spelt "Sansi"), were willing to eat a range of wild animals that most other groups did not consider food. Foxes, spiny-tailed lizards (*sānḍā*), monitor lizards (*goh*), and migratory demoiselle cranes (*kuraj*) are a few examples of the animals they were thought to eat, at least in the late nineteenth century.[4] *Thorīs* were a landless caste, marked by their poverty and their reduction to begging and wage labor for survival. What all these castes had in common was a willingness to use arms, sometimes just sticks and knives, to rob others. The *sāṃsīs*, though they occur rarely in the commands of the Rathor state, were also a vagrant and landless caste and were associated with petty crime in other parts of north India.[5]

The material I discuss in this chapter on *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* in the Rathor archive is yet another set of shifts that can be fully understood only with reference to the Rathor command separating Hindus from Untouchables, which the introduction presents. As a reminder, in that command, *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were among the castes explicitly named as not belonging to the domain of the Hindu and as belonging to the "*achhep*" or Untouchable.[6] From the perspective of the Rathor state, *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were not just Untouchable—as also made clear by other commands presented in chapter 2—but along with butchers and Muslims, were irredeemably steeped in habitual animal slaughter. In fact, as will become clear in the pages to come, the irremediable tendency to take animal lives and eat meat may indeed have been articulated through these policies as a marker of being Untouchable. It is noteworthy that in the campaign to protect animal lives, the Rathor state also treated with greater suspicion and singled out for harsher treatment than others nearly all the castes that were explicitly named as "Untouchable" in the 1785 order cited in the introduction—Muslims, leatherworkers, *thorīs*, and *bāvrīs*.

State punishments for animal slaughter differed for different sections of its populace. This differential treatment may have arisen from the everyday, on-the-ground operation of the state. But about midway through the decades-long campaign, in 1779, two Rathor orders broadcast to each district these differential punishments, varying by caste and status, for the crime of *jīv haṃsyā* ("injury to living beings").[7] If members of the wealthy, landowning communities slew an animal, whether on a hunt or otherwise, their lands were to be confiscated. The crown instructed all of its district authorities to gain the acquiescence of the landed elite, mostly rajputs, for the new policy through this punishment.[8] For the rest of the subject body, anyone guilty of involvement in the killing of animals was to be detained and only released after the imposition of as heavy a fine as the person could bear.[9] Other orders, also

dispatched to all the kingdom's districts over the years, were more specific about the punishments for different kinds of violence upon different kinds of beings. For the "crime" of castrating bulls, the punishment was to be imprisonment for a few days in the course of which the violator was to be terrorized into agreeing to never commit this deed again.[10] Laxity in covering the flames of lamps, which imperiled the lives of winged insects, was to be punished with a fine of one *paisā*.[11] This set of punishments for elite or middling groups stands in contrast with how the Rathor state responded to allegations of animal slaughter at the hands of butchers, *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*, and Muslims, as the following sections will show.

BUTCHERS

As early as 1764, that is, around the time of Vijai Singh's formal initiation in 1765 into the Vallabhite sect, an unidentified officer issued a command on behalf of the crown to the *jāgīrdār's* men, peasant headmen (*chaudharīs*), and the people of a village called Palyasani: "The court (*darbār*) has forbidden butchery (*kasāb karaṇo*) and yet it continues to occur in Palyasani. This is not all right. Do not permit butchery going forward. If it happens again then the butchers' hands will be cut off (*pher huvai to kasāyāṁ rā hāth vaḍhsī*) and they will be punished (*sajhāvār husī*)."[12] Again, in 1775, the crown dispatched an order to Sambhar district in which it observed that the *kasāīs* (a Muslim caste of butchers) were continuing with their trade and urged the local authorities to put an end to the practice. Interestingly, the crown invoked the authority of the neighboring Jaipur kingdom when commanding the butchers to refrain from animal slaughter, stating that if they refused to comply, they would be presented with a written order from Jaipur.[13] The ban on animal slaughter was evidently incompatible with the butchers' trade and an assault on their livelihood.

The state then escalated its efforts against the butchers. In 1784, it rounded up and jailed all the butchers of Nagaur, among the largest towns in the kingdom. Muhnot Gyanmal, an Osvāl mahajan, and Pancholi Parsadiram then issued an order directing the magistrate of Nagaur on what to do next:

> [To the Nagaur magistracy, 1784] And the butchers are under arrest there. An order to release them will be written. You release them but make the following efforts: Release them on the bail condition (*jāmaṇ*) that they not hurt animals again. Replace four members of the magistracy's troops with two butchers and two brahman administrators. Tell the butchers who are hired in the magistracy to keep a watch to prevent animal slaughter and that if it happens, they have to solve the case. Tell the brahman officers to keep an eye on the butchers and to inspect their houses to make sure that the butchers do not keep any goats or sheep. The main goal is to make sure that there is no animal slaughter. There should be no negligence in this . . .
>
> —By the permission of Muhnot Gyanmal and Pancholi Parsadiram[14]

Faced with the persistence of animal slaughter and meat eating, as also with their own continuing anxieties about these practices, the two crown officers devised the solution of offering two members of the local butcher caste steady employment in exchange for their surveillance over their own community. But this was not enough. As a check on the butcher footsoldiers, the crown ordered the governor of Nagaur to employ two brahmans as officers in the same department. The brahmans' work also was to keep an eye on the butchers of the town and they were to do so by regularly roaming through the butcher quarter to ensure that butchers did not even possess animals, let alone kill them. The crown officers made it clear that no negligence in the execution of these commands would be tolerated.

Soon after, perhaps realizing just how difficult these measures were to sustain, the merchant-administrator Muhnot Gyanmal sent an order on behalf of the crown to the magistrate of Nagaur to expel all the butchers who were imprisoned there from the kingdom. To make sure that the command was executed, the magistrate was to send an escort (*tathā kasāī jīv haṃsyā bābat uṭhai kaid mai hai tiṇā nu mulak bārai kāḍh deṇ ro hukam huvo hai su uṇā kasāyāṁ nu sāthai ādmī de nai mulak bārai kaḍhāy dejo śrī hajūr ro hukam chhai*).[15] We do not know of course if all the butchers of Nagaur were indeed thrown out of Marwar, but given how widespread and sustained the campaign against animal slaughter in Marwar was during these decades, it is possible.

In 1795, in Bhim Singh's reign, the Rathor state was still pursuing this agenda. Dodhidar Khivkaran and Joshi Balu, a brahman, ordered all the governors of Marwar to shut down any butcher shops that may be functioning and to make sure the work did not resume.[16] In 1797, a Muhnot merchant-caste officer in Jodhpur ordered that the magistrate in Didwana should go ahead with the fine of seventy rupees that he had assessed upon butchers for killing animals.[17] In 1803, Prime Minister Bhandari Gangaram, an Osvāl mahajan, sent out an order on behalf of the king to all the districts underscoring the need to shut down all slaughterhouses (*kasāīkhāno huṇ mat dejo śrī hajūr ro hukam chhai*).[18]

Another community that was hit hard by the ban on animal slaughter was that of birdcatchers. While the Rathor state did not issue kingdom-wide commands about birdcatchers, this community too found its occupation becoming a hazardous one. In 1776, some birdcatchers (*chiḍīmār*) were caught in Nagaur for capturing birds and other creatures. Bhandari Chaitram Kusalchand, a mahajan, ordered on behalf of the crown that their nets be burned (*tathā samāchār śrī hajūr mālam huvā chīḍīmāryāṁ jāl nākh nai jīnāvar chīḍī kabūtar vagairai nag pakaḍīyā . . . chīḍīmārāṁ rai jāl hai su balāy dejo*). The birdcatchers were too broke (*nādār*) to pay a fine, but the three cloth-printers who bought the birds from them were to be fined, the mahajan's order stated.[19] A month later, the birdcatchers' wives formed a delegation and appealed to the crown in Jodhpur, pointing to their poverty and the hardship they were suffering due to their husbands' imprisonment. The

merchant-administrator Singhvi Tilokmal then ordered the Nagaur magistrate to fine the birdcatchers in proportion to their means and to release them.[20]

THORĪS AND *BĀVRĪS*

Tracing the evolution of the Rathor state's attitude toward *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*, as with the butchers, also reveals intensified persecution. In 1768, the merchant-caste officer Muhnot Suratram dispatched a decree to all of its constituents in which it blamed the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* who dwelt in the countryside for routinely killing animals. Reiterating the ban on hurting nonhumans, the crown ordered its district governors to fine them. Underscoring the predilection of *bāvrīs* and *thorīs* toward hunting, Muhnot Suratram warned district administrators to stop them from taking animal lives and to keep an extra watch on them (*tathā praganā ra gāṃvā mai thorī bāvrī gāṃv rī nīṃv mai jīv jināvar mārai chhai su sārā gāṃvā mai kuhāḍ deṇo koī jīv jināvar māraṇ pāvai nahī kiṇī mārīyo to nukhsāṇ husī īṇ bāt ro visekh tākīd rākhṇī*).[21] Some years later, in 1775, the Rathor state's response to a large number of reports of animal slaughter from some villages in Merta district was to pin the blame on yet another "Untouchable" vagrant community, the *sāṃsīs*.[22] Just as with *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*, the Rathor state saw these landless, mobile people as regular slayers of animals. It directed the governor of Merta to make special arrangements to prevent animal deaths at the hands of itinerant *sāṃsīs* (*parganā mai sāṃsī phīrtā jīv hatai su visekh tākīd karāy deṇī su jīv hatai nahī* or "*sāṃsīs* roam the districts killing animals, make special arrangements to make sure they do not kill animals").[23]

By 1779, this suspicion of *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, and to a lesser extent, other armed vagrants like *sāṃsīs* had developed into a policy of social surveillance. In an order from that year addressed to each of its district headquarters, the crown laid down the punishment for those found guilty of animal slaughter. Unlike the temporary confiscation of land grants that the crown prescribed as punishment for *jāgīrdārs* and the fines upon all others, the Rathor state developed a different approach for the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*. Since these groups could get away with hunting without being spotted by the state's officers, the crown ordered that it was ordinary crown subjects who would also watch *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*.[24] The state ordered all of its district governors to get a written commitment from the peasants and their representatives (*chaudharīs*) to assume collective responsibility for making sure that the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* no longer killed animals. If the body of villagers collectively failed to prevent animal slaughter, it was they who would be slapped with a fine for the crime.[25]

With this administrative measure, the crown drew a clear line of separation between armed vagrants such as the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* on the one hand and its body of settled, agriculturist subjects on the other. The latter were now mandated with the task of keeping a watchful eye, on behalf of the crown, upon the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* who were their neighbors. Already the objects of mistrust and suspicion, the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* would now also become the recipients of social

hostility. The residence of *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* in or near a villages would now become an onerous burden upon the residents, since they were forced by the crown to shoulder the blame and the fines for any incidence of animal slaughter committed by these groups.

After three years, the Rathor state further escalated its policy of persecuting *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*. The *dīvān*'s office in Jodhpur now directed each of its district governors to expel the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* from every village in which they dwelt and throw them out of the kingdom.[26] The *dīvān*'s office was held in that year, according to the officer lists of the Rathors, in *khālisā*; that is, it was reserved by the Maharaja. In practice, however, it is more likely that specific mahajan officers were informally performing its functions. This order from the *dīvān* commanded that not a single *thorī* or *bāvrī* was to remain in the kingdom. The effort to expel these two groups was still on two years later, in 1784, when an officer named Pancholi Nandram disapprovingly observed the continuing residence of *bāvrīs* in the countryside, accusing them of theft and injury to animals (*aur gāṃv mai bāvrī hai su kujamānā nai rāh chorī chakhārī karai nai jīv haṃsyā karai*).[27] It instructed the magistracies of Nagaur, Merta, Sojhat, Jaitaran, Parbatsar, Phalodhi, Maroth, Siwana, Daulatpura, and Koliya districts to immediately expel them from each village and out of the kingdom (*tiṇā nu mulak bārai kāḍh deṇā kiṇī gāṃv mai bāvrī raiṇ nahī pāvai śrī hajūr ro hukam chhai*). The command was reiterated in 1798, when the state noted that despite a round or two of expulsion, the *bāvrīs* had started to reappear in the villages of Marwar. It reiterated that all *bāvrīs* were to be banished from the kingdom. Local authorities were to report any *jāgīrdār* who failed to execute this order and, at the crown's command, revoke the *jāgīrdār*'s revenue assignment.[28]

These directives had the intended effect. For instance, the charans, a respected community of litterateurs, ritualists, and genealogists, of Panchetiya village in Sojhat district rounded up all the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* who dwelt in their village and presented them before the local authorities.[29] Complaining that these *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* had repeatedly indulged in animal slaughter, the charans advised the local authorities to pay special attention to these people. They warned that if the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* got away, they would certainly descend into criminal activity again. Despite the words of warning by the charans, district authorities released the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* without any punishment. When the crown got wind of this, it commanded the district authorities in Sojhat to round up these groups again and to punish them suitably to guarantee that they never hurt an animal again.[30] For individuals from these blacklisted communities, punishment for animal slaughter was much harsher than for others. For instance, the crown ordered district authorities to fine Thori Padmiya and his nephew on charges of slaying many animals. The authorities were to then expel them from the village in which they lived. If they had already been expelled, the fine was to be borne by the village's *jāgīrdār*.[31] Banishment from one's village or town or worse, from the kingdom, were harsh

punishments in a penal regime that preferred to exact fines for the vast majority of crimes.

Some of the state's rulings against the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* provide a sense of its rationale for targeting these groups for harsher treatment in the campaign against animal slaughter. In a ruling from 1779, an unidentified officer described the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* as "thieving castes" (*chor jāt*) who secretly killed animals in the scrub (*thorī bāvrī chor jāt hai su rohī meṁ chhāṁnai chhurkai sikār bījī jīv haṃsyā karai*).[32] Referring to the *thorīs*' and *bāvrīs*' use of guns while hunting deer in the brambly thickets on the edges of deserts, audible to villagers dwelling nearby, Pancholi Nandram announced on behalf of the crown that these groups had no need for guns (*aur uṭhā keik gāṃv meṁ thorī bāvrī rahai chhai su īṇ jāt rīt rahai rohī mai kaḍmādai jiṇ mai hiraṇ āy paḍai nai bandūk ro bhaḍko huvai to pākhtī ra hā suṇai su īṇ maiṃ bandūk ro kām hī paḍai nahī*).[33] Clearly, from the perspective of the Rathor state's administrators, perhaps a reflection of wider societal perspective, there were legitimate and illegitimate bearers of arms. Landless Untouchables were not, in this view, among the "legitimate" bearers of arms. As noted above, the Rathor state observed that the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* regularly committed theft, especially during times of unrest in the kingdom (*kujamānā* or "bad times").[34] While most of the Rathor state's orders for disciplining or even expelling *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* only mentioned a concern for the protection of animal lives, occasional orders such as these revealed an added, and perhaps underlying, reason for why the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were particularly targeted by the Rathor state's quest to end animal slaughter within its territories.

As ecologically "marginal" people, by which I mean people who could recede into fastnesses and scrub, *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were a challenge to the state and a nuisance to administrators of settled villages. The *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were much weaker than other groups that also navigated the margins of settled cultivation, hill-dwelling communities such as the *meṇas* (today, *mīṇās* or Meenas), *mers*, and *bhīls*, both in terms of their martial resources and their socioeconomic standing. The *meṇās*, *mers*, and *bhīls* did not receive anything near the kind of treatment that *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* did from Rathor state or society. Some *meṇās*, *mers*, and *bhīls* were organized into well-armed bands led by chieftains, bands that could raid settled villages in broad daylight without the state's *jāgīrdārs* and other agents being able to resist them. Rajput chiefs too engaged in raiding. Tanuja Kothiyal discusses this blurriness between the *meṇās*, *bhīls*, and *mers* on the one hand and rajputs on the other, suggesting that Rathor court sources from the early modern period are invested in the representations of rajputs as kings and these other communities as bandits ineligible for kingship precisely due to overlap between lordliness and banditry that continued to exist in the more arid as well as hilly parts of Marwar; that is, in areas where Rathor control was weak.[35] Unlike the *meṇās*, *bhīls*, and rajputs—all armed groups that raided—the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* were more scattered and less formidable foes to the state. Most importantly, they also did not control

land. Their mobility and association with theft made them enough of an irritant to cause the Rathor state to use their reliance on hunting as an excuse to surveil, disarm, and even expel them. At the same time, the acknowledgment in Rathor orders above of continuing reports of the use of arms by *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* suggests that these groups were able to resist Rathor disciplinary efforts to some degree.

Here we have an example of the limits to the reach of the Rathor state, enabled in this case by ecology: the thorny scrubs and sand dunes of desert tracts and thickly forested woods of the Aravalli Hills. Historians of Rajasthan broadly and its western tracts like Marwar in particular are mindful of the region's ecology, given the particularly arid climate there. Historians of early modern Marwar have read the ecological constraints such as frequent famine and the precarity of agricultural cultivation there as generating protections from excessive taxation and oppression.[36] Tanuja Kothiyal points us to the spatial mobility that the harsh climate of the Thar Desert demanded from all of the region's residents and the disjunctures that emerged between a centralizing state and its rajput subordinates that commanded ecological frontiers.[37]

My findings here about the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* provide a prehistory for the development in colonial hands of the "criminal tribe" concept. In the nineteenth century, British colonial observers popularized the idea that certain castes, or "tribes," in South Asia were hereditary practitioners of banditry and theft and had been so for centuries. In 1871, the colonial state passed the Criminal Tribes Act, which sought to discipline and redirect toward more respectable professions those members of communities habitually steeped in crime. The Rathor state's attribution of an inherent tendency toward killing animals and its criminalization of the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* as entire castes offers a precolonial lineage, otherwise glimpsed only in the mediated voices of "native informers" in colonial accounts, of not only the stigmatization and peripheralization in discourse but also the criminalization in practice and state law of certain vagrant castes that were later deemed "criminal tribes."[38]

The manner in which the Rathor state dealt with the *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* reflects its perception and configuration of these groups as inherently criminal, even if this criminality was figured in the era of enforced nonharm as a proclivity for hunting. Some of the state's orders discussed above also betray its perception of *thorīs* and *bāvrīs* as always inclined to steal and to raid villages. Their criminality then was represented as inherent to their caste and it was a threat to both humans and nonhumans. It also was a source of anxiety to Rathor administrators, and this anxiety spilled into the Rathor archive as an excessive concern with *thorī* and *bāvrī* activities. In a limited way then, decades prior to the establishment of colonial rule over Marwar, records indicate that the kernel of an idea of inherently criminal castes came to exist and be deployed in law in precolonial times. Since the ancient period, Sanskrit and Pali texts have reflected a sense of difference and a

perception of threat from forest-dwelling peoples.[39] In the early modern period in other parts of South Asia too there is evidence of hill- and forest-dwelling groups being associated with plundering raids and banditry.[40]

In the existing scholarship on banditry in western and north India, however, groups like the *menas*, *mers*, and *bhīls* are simply lumped together as communities whose raiding activities prior to British rule led to their being classified as "criminal tribes." As my discussion above shows, the only groups that the Rathor state declared and treated as inherently and collectively criminal were the *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, and *sāṃsīs*. The *menas*, *mers*, and *bhīls*, despite being regular and active raiders in eighteenth-century Marwar, were not part of this criminal category in the Rathor state's eyes. The evidence from Marwar then shows that the mere association with hereditary banditry and the use of arms was not sufficient for a caste to be considered innately criminal in precolonial times. Rather, it was a complex of factors—landlessness, poverty, and the resultant martial weakness—in addition to a hereditary association with theft that led to a caste's perception as criminal. In this sense, the "criminal caste" of precolonial times was distinct from the "criminal tribe" as it emerged in the nineteenth century.

MUSLIMS

Muslims received perhaps the harshest punishments among Rathor subjects when they were indicted for animal slaughter. A Muslim (*turak*) killed a goat in the town of Jalor and sold the meat to some shoemakers and *raibārīs* (a pastoralist group) in 1764. At the time that the buyers of the meat were fined, the Muslim escaped unpunished. When administrators in Jodhpur heard of this, they ordered that for the crime of killing the goat the Muslim be immediately banished from the town (*turak bakro mārīyo huvai tiṇ nū saihar bārai kāḍh dejo*).[41] In 1785, a few Muslims (*musalmānāṁ*) killed animals in Jaitaran town for which they were jailed and then released on bail. Soon after, Pancholi Gulalchand ordered their expulsion from the kingdom.[42] Two Shekhanis, members of a Muslim community, served almost three years in jail for repeatedly killing animals.[43] During a review of the inmates in Nagaur's prisons, the crown commanded that these two were now to be released from prison but only to be thrown out of the kingdom. It ordered its subordinates in Nagaur to ensure that the two women were never able to reenter Marwar.[44] In other cases, even as Muslims accused of animal slaughter did not face expulsion from the kingdom, the charge could be used to repeatedly harass members of their entire local caste group. This happened in the case of Julavas (weavers) Mehmud and Asiya, whom the magistracy of Nagaur fined the hefty sum of eighty rupees in connection with the recent discovery of a six-year-old episode of meat eating by two women of their local caste group of weavers. They petitioned the crown for help, saying they had nothing to do with that case.[45]

DIETS AND LIVELIHOODS

This campaign against *jīv haṃsyā* translated into nothing less than an assault upon the dietary preferences and nutritional base, as well as aesthetic and ethical choices, of a swath of Marwar's population. This swath overlapped heavily with all those who had not embraced, or had not been allowed to embrace, sectarian Vaishnavism over the past century or more.

The Rathor crown outlawed the possession of livestock by these now suspect communities, that is, butchers, *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, and Muslims. Reflecting the attitudes of the king and his advisors, the state saw members of these communities as incapable of resisting the urge or an inducement to kill animals, even after they had been arrested, fined, placed under surveillance, and explicitly prohibited from doing so. Toward this end, the state prohibited the sale of livestock to members of these communities and to those from outside the kingdom. In addition, the state ordered that any livestock already in the possession of these groups were to be forcibly sold off or handed over to members of reliably vegetarian castes.[46]

Singhvi Gyanmal's order from 1785, to be implemented across the kingdom, commands the confiscation and sale of all herds of goats and sheep in the possession of butchers, *thorīs*, and *bāvrīs* (*khaṭīk bāvrī thorīyāṁ rai evaḍ huvai su ṭhīk kar nai sārā bīkāy dejo rākhjo matī*).[47] Singhvi Gyanmal, a mahajan, was a high-ranking officer of the state, and five years after authorizing this command, he became *dīvān* of the kingdom.[48] In the same year, two unnamed *pyād bakhśīs* prohibited "Muslims and other low castes" (*musalmān vagairai nīch jāt*) from keeping herds of goats or sheep.[49] Singhvi Gyanmal ordered a careful watch on Muslims "and others" across all seventeen districts of the kingdom who owned chickens to ensure that they did not kill them. If they did, they were to be rigorously punished.[50] Members of agriculturist communities, especially *jāṭs* and *bishnois*, whose religious convictions upheld a vegetarian diet, were beneficiaries of this policy. They received control over herds of goats and sheep that had earlier belonged to butchers.[51] For instance, in 1776 the crown ordered the distribution of the herds of the butchers of Nagaur among the *jaṭs* of a village.[52] Bishnoi Bala and Jat Sukha were respectively given charge of such herds in Nagaur district.[53]

In all these cases, herds were taken forcibly from the butchers and not purchased from them, as indicated by the concession made to them by the state in allowing them to continue ownership over the wool these animals produced.[54] This was hard to implement, as suggested by a butcher, recognized by the state as poor and in need of funds, having to petition the crown in Jodhpur to receive overdue payments for the wool his sheep had generated. The sheep were in a *jāṭ*'s control.[55] This was a wealth transfer from a subset of the Untouchable castes—butchers and Muslims more generally—to vegetarian peasant castes.

When a *jāṭ* peasant was discovered to have sold some animals to *thorīs*, the crown ordered that both the *jāṭ* and the *thorīs* should be fined if any of those

animals were slaughtered.[56] In Koliya district, a moneylender who had seized a *jāṭ's* herd of goats, probably due to the latter's indebtedness to him, sold the herd to a butcher.[57] The *jāṭ* reported this "crime" to the crown.[58] Purohit Kesoram, the *daftar rā darogā* Asopa Surajmal, and Asopa Fatehram, all three brahmans, ruled on this case on behalf of the crown.[59] They demanded an explanation from the mahajan and ordered that any livestock that were in butchers' possession should be sold immediately.[60] The state became so worried about livestock ending up in the wrong hands that it instructed its officers to regularly survey the herds in their domain to ensure that no animals were sold at all.[61]

The crown's targeting of butchers, *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, and Muslims shrank their respective resource bases and forbade them from practicing animal husbandry. For communities that were already being marginalized, if not expelled, and in the case of the butchers, forced to abandon the occupations in which they were skilled, being prohibited from keeping animals was a severe blow.

All three groups did not control land and so, when pushed out of the trades in which they earned their resources, animal husbandry could have been a viable new source of livelihood. Even if practiced on a small scale, the dairy produced by domesticated animals could have been a valuable source of sustenance for a dispossessed people. Barred from owning pastoral wealth and forced out of the professions in which they were skilled, the butchers in late eighteenth-century Marwar would likely have been reduced to poverty. The crown dismissively recognized this by recommending that if they were worried about earning a living, the erstwhile butchers of Nagaur should become load-carriers.[62] The campaign to stamp out animal slaughter in Marwar was a blow to the livelihoods, nutritional base, and dietary preferences particularly of butchers, Muslims, and *thorīs* and *bāvrīs*. For Muslims, as well as followers of other religious paths such as goddess worship that entailed ritual animal sacrifice, the prohibition restricted their ability to fully practice their faiths.

SURVEILLANCE, INFORMING, AND SOCIAL CONFLICT

As a result of the crown's directive to its officers and to its subjects to keep an eye upon their neighbors from the butcher, *thorī*, and *bāvrī* communities, informers began to present the desired reports to the crown. In 1784, Muhnot Gokul, a mahajan who worked for the governor, spotted meat in some butchers' homes in Parbatsar district.[63] The local authorities failed to carry out a rigorous investigation and could not apprehend the guilty, who had purportedly run away to Malwa, a region in modern-day Punjab and northern Rajasthan that lay to the north of Marwar. The crown reprimanded the local authorities for failing to mount a full-fledged investigation and ordered that the one person who had been caught in connection with the matter should be fully punished.[64]

In another instance, acting on information collected by royal newswriters (*uvākāṁ rī fardāṁ rā samāchār*), the local authorities arrested two women, one of the caste of dyers (*rangrejāṁ*) and the other a blacksmith.[65] In captivity, the two coughed up the names of all the others who had been involved in the meat-eating episode with them. As a result, a drummer in royal employ (*savāī nagārchī*) was caught and he too was pressured to name names. Sensing laxity on the part of district administrators, the *pyād bakhśī* Bhandari Ramchand ordered that all those named in the case should be fined and a search undertaken for the absconding butchers.[66]

The crown's surveillance networks helped to point its energies toward particular individuals suspected of animal slaughter. In 1785, the crown received reports (*samāchār śrī hajūr mālam huvā*) from a village in Nagaur district of the role of a *thorī* in shooting a deer dead, of a *gujjar* (pastoralist) in castrating a bull, and of butchers (*khaṭīks*) regularly slaughtering animals.[67] The crown was informed by its newswriters that the butchers of Bagru village in Sambhar district were freely slaying animals and selling the meat in the towns.[68] Two guards of the local magistracy had been in charge of keeping an eye on the place, and the crown adjudged that it was they who should pay a price for the crime. The crown ordered that the guards be fined in proportion to their means.[69]

An atmosphere of surveillance and informing became palpable in Marwar. For instance, Rathor records reflect the curious phenomenon of meat showing up in the homes of respectable Marwaris without any solicitation of it on their part, or so they claimed. When district authorities fined a woman from the goldsmith caste, Sunari Viri, for eating meat, she appealed to the crown for mercy, arguing that she was innocent.[70] She blamed her Muslim neighbors who, she said, had regularly killed animals and had thrown the animal flesh into her house. The crown responded favorably to her appeal and ordered the local administration to dismiss the case against the *sunārī*, without ordering an inquiry against the Muslim neighbors she had named.[71] The next year, in 1786, the crown summoned a *jāgīrdār* when some of his employees were accused of hunting animals in Desuri district.[72] The *jāgīrdār* defended himself by blaming a *ḍheḍh* (leather-working) woman, who it appears had reported him, for having filed the complaint out of malice toward him. The crown closed the case, concluding that the perpetrator of the crime was a *golā*[73] man from outside the region who had since gotten away.[74] Bhat Harchand's wife and son, all from a caste of hereditary genealogists, were arrested for eating meat, and in their defense, the *bhāṭ* blamed a *khaṭīknī* (a woman of the butcher caste) for bringing meat, without any solicitation, to their home.[75]

Each subject was a potential informer and, given the state's intolerance toward meat eating, many a Marwari seized the opportunity to settle scores by accusing a neighbor, a caste fellow, or a kin for being involved in animal slaughter. Jat Valiya's son, of a peasant caste, unintentionally caused a sheep's death while watching his family's crops. A brahman soon came to their house, asking for alms, and when

the *jāṭ* refused to give him any, the brahman created a ruckus. Later, the brahman went to the authorities and accused the *jāṭ* of killing the sheep that had earlier died. As a result, the Daulatpura governor fined the *jāṭ*. It was only after the *jāṭ* managed to relay this account to the crown that the fine against him was dropped and the brahman asked to explain himself.[76] In another episode, someone falsely named *khaṭīkni* Mani, a woman of the butcher caste who earned a living from dying hides, of being involved in animal slaughter.[77]

In a similar case as that of Jat Valiya above, the Brahman Kachro of Parbatsar accused Jat Harko of shirking his duties at the royal temple in Parbatsar district in which they both worked and of eating meat. In his defense, the *jāṭ* argued in 1776 that he reported to work every day and had never been involved in *jīv haṃsyā* (injuring animals). Instead, it was the brahman who disappeared for long intervals to the town due to which prayers were only intermittently held at the temple. The *jāṭ* said it was because he demanded his salary from the brahman that the latter had become incensed and fabricated these baseless allegations against him.[78]

When Mahajans Dunga and Dipa hired an ascetic (*sāmī*, vernacularization of "swami") to revive Dipa's unconscious wife by performing an exorcism (*dīpā rī lugāī ro ḍīl bechāk tho jiṇ su sāmī nu jhāḍā rai vāstai bulāy lyāyā thā*), someone informed the crown that he and his family had consumed meat and alcohol as part of the ritual.[79] As a result, the Desuri magistrate stationed his men at the two merchants' homes. The merchants then asked the crown for help, alleging that someone had concocted the story and that the report was false (*jhūṭī chuglī kīvī*).[80] Another *jāṭ*, Devla, of a village in Nagaur district protested in 1777 his indictment for animal slaughter when he was innocent. He argued that the *jāgīrdār* of his village harbored ill will toward him after the *jāṭ* had demanded repayment of the twenty-five rupees he had loaned to the *jāgīrdār* eight years ago. Out of malice, the *jāgīrdār* teamed up with another *jāṭ* and lodged a complaint of animal slaughter against Jat Devla, taking advantage of the sudden death of one of the goats in his herd. Jat Devla protested against this false report (*jhūthī chuglī*) that resulted in a fine of seventy rupees upon him. In response, Singhvi Tilokmal ordered on behalf of the crown that the governor of Nagaur conduct a hearing of the case that brought the *jāṭ*, the *jāgīrdār*, and all their witnesses to the case face-to-face.[81] Jat Khivla of Nagaur also had to ask the crown in Jodhpur to help when another *jāṭ*, he claimed, falsely reported him to the governor for killing a snake.[82]

An accusation of animal slaughter became a weapon in everyday conflicts, occasionally used even against locally powerful and armed rajput landholders. The landholder of Bhakhri village in Parbatsar informed the crown when the son of the local *jāgīrdār* killed a deer, one that was pregnant.[83] Mahajan Mayachand raised an alarm (*helā kīyā*) when he realized that a *jāgīrdār* was killing animals inside his fortress in Siwana district.[84] In 1789, rajput Hanvantsingh Jivansinghot informed the crown that another rajput, a young man who had been in the state's employ but had been fired for killing an animal, was innocent. He explained that the young

rajput used to frequently play with the boys of a local swami settlement.[85] One day, the rajput's retainers beat up the swami boys. Despite the swamis' complaints to him, the rajput failed to upbraid the servants involved. Soon after, a couple of the swamis' goats died due to an infection in the herd. When a third goat died, the seething swamis vented their anger toward the rajput by wringing its neck and complaining to the governor that the rajput had killed it. The rajput was declared guilty and fired from state service, and it was only after a determined campaign by Hanvantsingh that the crown accepted his innocence and ordered his reinstatement.[86]

Even though such informers aided the crown's campaign, these complaints generated fissures in families, caste communities, and local orders. A woman from the trading *mehrā* community petitioned the crown for help, saying that her son-in-law had become hostile toward her and started taunting her because she had reported him for eating meat.[87] Another farmer, Sirvi Birai, was thrown out of his village and threatened with murder after he reported the *jāgīrdārs* of the village to the authorities for killing an animal.[88] Jat Ratansi faced pressure to leave his village after a complaint by him resulted in the other residents of his village being fined by the authorities. When he first set out to present his case before the crown, these villagers intercepted and beat him *en route*.[89] Jat Ratna's wife complained to the governor when some Kyamkhanis in her village killed an animal. The Kyamkhanis were fined and, in revenge, persuaded the village *jāgīrdār* to confiscate all her belongings and throw her out of the village. Despite her procuring two subsequent orders from the crown for her resettlement in the village, she was not allowed back in.[90] In 1791, Jat Natha reported the other *jāṭs* of his village in Siwana district to the local authorities for killing animals.[91] Instead of the meat-eaters being penalized, it was Natha who was beaten up. He then approached the crown for help and managed to elicit a ruling from brahman Asopa Fatehram and the merchant-caste *pyād bakhśī*, Bhandari Balkishan that commanded the punishment of the guilty and of those who beat up Natha.[92] There were other instances too of informers facing retaliation.[93]

The campaign against animal slaughter quickly descended into an impossible tangle of allegations and counter-allegations. A *jāgīrdār* in Nagaur district who was accused of killing a local peasant's ram countered the allegation by naming a Bhati rajput as the person who had committed the crime.[94] Cotton-ginner (*pīñjārā*) Jīva told the governor's office that another cotton-ginner, Inayat, had gone to another village and eaten meat.[95] The governor fined Inayat but he petitioned the crown for a dismissal of the charges, saying that Jiva had made them up.[96]

Elsewhere, Pancholi Maharam came to Jodhpur to petition the crown, pleading the innocence of his son and another *pañcholī* who were behind bars for killing animals. Pancholi Fatehkaran and the *pyād bakhśī*, Mumhta Gopaldas, ordered on behalf of the crown that if no proof was available, the Merta magistracy should release the two men.[97] In another instance, a woman from the *bhāṭ* (bardic) caste

got a butcher to secretly deliver some meat to her home.[98] When news of this spread, she and her daughter-in-law fled and hid at a *pañcholī*'s home. They were soon caught by the local authorities and under pressure, named another man, the son of Pancholi Maharam, as being the one for whom she had ordered the meat. *Pyād bakhśī* Mumhta Gopaldas, a mahajan, ordered the arrest of everyone that the *bhāṭ* woman named.[99] Other allegations and charges also elicited contestation. A rajput and his supporters were able to convince the crown that an allegation of animal slaughter against him was entirely false and was born of a servant's anger toward his master, arising from a prior dispute.[100] In Merta, another *pīṇjārā* asserted his innocence, and in a bid to exonerate himself, he accused four other members of his caste of eating meat (*mānṭī khāvaṇ*).[101] Bhat Harchand of Merta blamed a woman of the butcher community for bringing meat to his home without his asking for it.[102]

Reports of animal slaughter, both true and concocted, created fissures in local communities when, for instance, caste fellows turned on one another. Butcher Natha attracted the ire of all the other butchers of Nagaur when he reported their now illegal activities to the crown.[103] Cloth-printer Nathu dutifully reported to the crown the trapping of birds and animals by some *chīḍīmārs* (birdcatchers) and the subsequent sale of this catch to some of his caste fellows.[104] He probably never imagined that this conflict would engulf his own family; soon after, one of his own sons falsely implicated the other for being involved in the purchase of those very trapped creatures.[105] Weavers Bilaval and Nathu, along with some unnamed members of their caste, found themselves facing eviction from their village by their caste fellows for reporting other weavers to the crown for killing animals.[106]

The crown's encouragement of an atmosphere where its subjects became its eyes and ears in the campaign against *jīv haṃsyā* created a mass of judicial complaints to sort through. The ban on animal slaughter became a weapon in the hands of the Rathor state's subjects for the playing out of their grievances against each other. Among castes in which *jīv haṃsyā* was anathema, the membership of someone found guilty of the crime would become a source of intra-caste conflict. An atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust would certainly have resulted from the ever-present possibility of a friend, a neighbor, an employee, a kin, or a caste fellow turning into an informant, not to mention the threat posed by the crown's own network of newswriters.

CASTE AND DIET

The scale of the effort to criminalize meat eating and impose a vegetarian diet that played out in late eighteenth-century Marwar was one that, with our current state of historical knowledge, lacks historical precedent and perhaps also remains without parallel. To that extent, the processes described in this chapter and in chapter 5 are a hitherto unknown episode in the history of South Asia. Reading

the mass of state orders pertaining to animal slaughter in the context of the wider changes underway in Marwar makes it possible to draw connections between this seemingly anomalous set of developments and the transformations the region was experiencing in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

The project to build a vegetarian polity was entirely in consonance with Vaishnav and Jain ethics to which much of Marwar's elites subscribed by the late eighteenth century. It served to further stigmatize the *achhep* or "Untouchable" pole against which a Hindu identity was taking shape. Now, to the "lowliness" and "impurity" of the Untouchable was added the moral stain of supposedly being given to taking nonhuman lives. In the hands of the Rathor state and its merchant bureaucrats, the drive to protect animals became an added weapon with which to beat down a subset of the Untouchables that also included Muslims. Along with *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, and butchers, Muslims saw their livestock transferred and bore the brunt of a ban preventing them from owning any animals. These groups bore an outlawing of their dietary preferences and ritual practices entailing animal slaughter. Most significantly, they bore the brunt of being deemed inherently and collectively criminal.

For most others in Marwar, however, the campaign against animal slaughter created an atmosphere of surveillance and dissolved over the years into a welter of allegations and counter-allegations that were frequently exhausting if not impossible to untangle. The crown's authority still rested in part on that of rajput landlords, many of whom continued to hunt and eat animals, and this curtailed its ability to punish everyone who was guilty. Stray orders indicate that the ban was not easy to execute over a sustained period of time. So a 1795 order noted that butchers were plying their trade across the kingdom, and in the same year, a rajput in Didwana advised the local magistrate to not fine butchers because butchery had resumed even in the capital Jodhpur.[107] This may of course have been a rumor, but it is also possible that the rajput may have been right. Still, an order issued toward the end of this period, in 1801—a missive to the governor of Desuri district—underscored the outlawing of animal slaughter, reminding him to make special arrangements to prevent it.[108] In 1803, an order from Jodhpur issued by a mahajan, Lodha Kisanram, observed that *jīv haṃsyā* had been curtailed in the city of Jalor even as it noted that the state's officers themselves were killing animals within the fort.[109] Despite this continuing concern for an overarching ban on killing animals, in the end, it was the *thorīs*, *bāvrīs*, butchers, and Muslims who bore the greatest burden of the Rathor state's battle for vegetarianism and nonharm.

Whatever its degree of success on the ground, the singling out of vegetarianism as the most significant element of a moral regime of nonharm gave rise to a coercive campaign that forced those deemed "Hindu" to be vegetarian while also constructing those not Hindu, or not allowed to be Hindu, as immutably given toward now-immoral meat eating. The campaign against meat eating in Marwar was an

important prong in the forging of an early modern Hindu subject. This process, however, was deeply political, built upon the legislative, punitive, and surveillance capabilities of the crown. Touching the everyday lives of ordinary people in the towns and villages of Marwar, the forging of this new community was premised on the delineation of the Untouchable domain as indelibly marked by qualities of body and mind—an inherent and inescapable tendency toward meat eating—that were incompatible with Hindu-ness. This in turn legitimized oppression through state law and even expulsion of some of those who belonged to the core of the imagined untouchable domain. This effort to protect life overlapped with the Rathor state's effort to outlaw abortion too, discussed in chapter 7, within its domain. Like the Rathor state's interventions in the domains of abortion and illicit sex, drinking, and gambling, the campaign to impose an ethic of nonharm was in principle universally applicable to all subjects. The difference between the other ethical goals and the pursuit of nonharm lay in the latter being pursued with varying degrees of enthusiasm and severities of punishment across the subject body. The former set of laws were in effect applied more rigorously on the kingdom's aspirant elites—the merchants and brahmans. The injunction to cease animal slaughter, however, was enforced on all, with merchant communities policing themselves for conformity but with butchers (Muslims and "low"-caste Hindus), landless vagrants, and Muslims being penalized the most by the state.

The fact that a recent "convert" to Vaishnavism, Maharaja Vijai Singh, was at the helm of affairs no doubt played an important role in the elevation of nonharm into universal law. At the same time, with Vijai Singh being a beleaguered king facing constant challenge from his rajput feudatories, his embrace of and enacting as law the ethical codes of Vaishnavs and Jains could well have also been a strategic move. For mahajans, all Vaishnavs and Jains were a rival power center within the state, one that could help Vijai Singh counter his rebellious rajput nobility.

In this period, an ethic of protection toward nonhuman life forms, particularly its manifestation in a vegetarian diet, came to be associated with elite social rank. This was a process that built on a long history of growing disassociation from animal slaughter within brahmanical thought and practice and the Vaishnav and Jain insistence on nonharm. Yet, it was the particular influence that merchants enjoyed in western Indian polities such as Marwar, particularly from the eighteenth century onward for reasons already delineated, that nonharm and vegetarianism become markers of high caste for all. State power—the enactment and enforcement of a universal ban on animal slaughter—played an important role in the naturalization of the association between ritual purity, high social rank, and an animal protectionist ethos. This process reinforced the move within brahmanical thought and practice that associated ritual purity, and therefore an important determinant of caste rank, with nonharm.

For the merchants, the elevation of their castes' ethical codes to universal law and the commitment to protecting animal life imbued them with an aura of

virtue. Not only were they model subjects in dutifully observing noninjury, but as bureaucratic agents of a state working to prevent violence against animals, they were acquiring merit in the spiritual scheme of things. This helped offset their tremendous economic gains, made as much through commissions, brokerage, and deposits as through debt. The mahajans made money from money, and in the eighteenth century they made a lot of it. A campaign to protect helpless animal lives, I suggest, then allowed the mahajans to offset their increasing association with wealth and power with that of committed caregivers to beings that could not advocate for their own interests.

While rajputs in the old order legitimately wielded wealth and power as kings, warriors, and holders of land, merchants' entry into the topmost echelons of the caste order was new and based in large part on their mastery of capital and the interest it could generate. Brahmans, even though they did enjoy a high ritual rank, had not historically commanded wealth or political power in Marwar. Their rise in the region, as leaders of Vaishnav orders and as administrators for the state, was of recent vintage. The inclusion of merchants and brahmans among a newly defined elite then required a transformation of the social order and the ideological basis underpinning it. To be carried through, this change needed the power of virtue.

The ban on the killing of animals was central to the ongoing polarization of Marwari society, a process in which state authority played an indispensible part. Butchers and vagrant hunters such as *bāvrīs* and *thorīs* were marked as suspect and placed under pervasive surveillance. Painted as agents of violence against sentient beings, they were subjected to extreme forms of punishments by the standards of the day. Mass arrest, expulsion from villages, economic dispossession, and surveillance were some of the punishments that the Rathor state awarded to these groups. In all of this, the body emerged as a crucial site for the expression of high caste, "Hindu" status, and the attribution of being "Untouchable." Command over the senses—a rejection of meat eating, drinking, gambling, and "excess" sex—and an ethical embrace of nonharm recast the bodies of elite subjects, lifting them out of base desires into a realm of subtle and "clean" communion. This effort was directed not only at the Other but also simultaneously at the Self.