Chapter 2

Heritage and food history

A critical assessment

Laura Di Fiore

Heritagization of food: places and histories

In recent years the copious literature generated by food studies has responded to the promptings of the "heritage turn" and channelled attention into the topic of food as heritage. Food as an identity heritage is not an ontological entity but the product of appropriation dynamics (Bienassis 2011), triggered by certain groups, communities and societies. The process of heritagization – sometimes the French term *patrimonialization* is used (Grasseni 2013) – thus rests on a cultural construction of food that tends to invest it with an identity paradigm and sense of belonging. The identity may already exist, at least in part, but in some cases is "invented" or at any rate transformed in the course of *patrimonialization*. But food cultures are, in turn, constantly being reproduced and reinvented (Ceccarelli, Grandi and Magagnoli 2013; Grasseni 2007) through the acquisition of new symbolic value. Hence a historical analysis becomes essential to multidisciplinary food studies. Historicizing the processes that produce cultural paradigms enables them to be deconstructed. Attention to the historical aspect is part and parcel of constructing cuisines, culinary paradigms and feeding styles as the heritage of a given community and a given local area.

The production of a food heritage rests on a twofold anchor: one part historical, the other geographic (Geyzen 2014). A sizable part of the recent literature has analysed cuisines and eating patterns in terms of significant place-based identity markers and indicators of belonging; the scale has varied, from local to regional, national and even transnational. To connect food and place is to mix physical with sociocultural features, as is evident in the concept of *terroir*. Going by the definition given by experts at the French Institut national de l'origine et de la qualité (INAO) – the first national institute charged with protecting it – *terroir* consists in "a specific geographical space where a human community has historically produced a collective knowledge, based on the intertwining of a physical environment with human factors" (Ferrières 2013, 25; Parker 2015). The uniqueness of foods from specific places is acknowledged to lie in their being the product of a complex geographical-historical milieu composed of factors both natural (geological properties of the soil, micro-climates) and

human (long-standing knowledge and skills handed down from generation to generation). But as Fabio Parasecoli has pointed out, "connections between food and place are not 'natural'" (Parasecoli 2017, 2). For them to be perceived as such, first, the foods need to be claimed as exclusive in origin to a particular place and local culinary tradition, and second, the claim needs to be upheld by an official institute. The seal on the *patrimonialization* of food is what Parasecoli calls "place-based labels" which, differing no doubt in degree and purpose, focus "specifically on the geographical origin of a product" (Parasecoli 2017, 7).

From this concept of a *terroir* underlying the certification of origin, it thus emerges that the geographical/physical side and the historical/cultural side are intimately connected. Even when the labels are directly concerned with a market and economic factors, the scope of historical and sociocultural features is evident. One example here might be the geographical descriptors issued by the European Union as part of a programme started in 1992 that has enabled food and foodstuffs to be registered under a brand name certifying the geographical provenance (in terms of ingredients and/or production processes).[1] The main aim of EU geographical descriptions is to provide a guarantee for both consumers and producers: they prevent a registered name from being used inappropriately. However, the cultural aspect is by no means lacking from such labelling. The regulation stipulates that the certificate of origin and the geographical description are designed to protect "the quality and diversity of the Union's agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture production" as making "a major contribution to its living cultural and gastronomic heritage". As we see from the controversies over geographical certification of Italian *parmigiano reggiano* or Greek *feta* or the *foie gras* issue, the question is not just economic: identity plays a by no means secondary part (de Soucey 2010, 433). Again, although the nomination forms for EU brand certification require nothing but a specific description of the product giving details of the physical characteristics and production phases,[2] it is common for the section devoted to the link with a geographical area to allow mention of traditional practices dating back in time and handed down across the generations.[3]

However, when it comes to other kinds of labels, such as those attesting UNESCO recognition of mankind's immaterial cultural heritage, the historical-cultural-identity aspect of the food tradition jumps into first place. The United Nations agency pursues another purpose from Europe's certification of geographical origin, for by including certain dishes, culinary traditions and cuisines in its Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) it aims to safeguard and acknowledge "cultural diversity and human creativity", seen as a common good of mankind.[4] What, then, does "Intangible Cultural Heritage" consist of? The concept was created in 2003 by the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage: it tried to redress the Western bias in the 1972 World Heritage Convention which was dedicated to mankind's natural and cultural heritage. In the 2003 definition Intangible Cultural Heritage refers to:

> the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity.
>
> (Blake 2006; Lixinski 2014)

From 2010, when certain cuisines and eating patterns were inscribed, food culture has loomed increasingly large in the practices and forms of know-how listed as ICH.[5]

The nomination forms for inscription on the list reveal the primacy of the cultural side to heritage. The description of the item (or "element") should emphasize "the characteristics of the bearers and practitioners of the element" and "the current modes of transmission of the knowledge and skills related to the element" and provide "an explanation of its social and cultural functions and meanings today, within and for its community".[6] Unlike the European Union's Geographical Indications, these forms specifically recommend that "overly technical descriptions should be avoided". Hence the nomination files of the items on the list contain many more references to the importance of "a customary social practice" and its symbolic significance, such as "togetherness, consideration of others, sharing the pleasure of taste, the balance between human beings and the products of nature", than to the strict characteristics of the food in question.[7] This slant to the submission of cuisines or dishes to the UNESCO committee can also be detected from the pictures and videos that form an integral part of nomination files, which focus more on the associated sharing and consuming patterns than on the food itself.

Lest we fall into oversimplification, note that priority to cultural goals does not mean that UNESCO food labelling lacks all economic implications. True, one recent study on the use of UNESCO recognition for marketing has shown that this is still a limited occurrence (de Miguel Molina, de Miguel Molina, Campos and Oña del Val Segarra 2016). We no doubt need to await further research assessing the economic impact of such a recent phenomenon (Pfeilstetter 2015). One field where the effect of UNESCO labelling does tend to count – from cuisines figuring on the ICH list to the election of Creative Cities of Gastronomy (Pearson and Pearson 2016) – is the world of tourism to which food studies have been devoting special attention in view of the growing trend for gastronomic tourism (Bessière 2013; Long 2013; Timothy 2016). But once again with food-based tourism, the cultural, historical and identity dimension outweighs the more material side that we usually associate with tourism. The image of heritage cuisines and "traditional" or "authentic" food – vexed definitions, as we shall see – forms an essential feature in the branding of

tourist venues whose appeal is boosted and sometimes entirely generated by the presence of local gastronomy. The tourist is promised a more authentic experience of the place – a factor of identity to cherish in the memory and hence, more generally, denoting the local cultural heritage (Björk and Kauppinen-Räisänen 2017; Thomé-Ortiz 2018).

For this reason, the process of food heritagization via labelling linked to inclusion in the UNESCO ICH strikes me as a good lens through which to examine the dynamics of culture and identity-building concerning food heritage. I begin by analysing the place-based identity paradigms justified by UNESCO procedure and how they are deployed on various spatial levels that subtly overlap and intertwine. Secondly, I take a close look at a basic building block of that place-based identity construct, namely recourse to past history. In doing this I spotlight some of the critical features of institutional food heritagization.

The geographical complexity of international labelling

Given the link between food and place – a distinctive feature of food heritage – UNESCO heritagization of the immaterial accords pride of position to localities and, more precisely, the communities that inhabit them. These are the primary subjects under which culinary traditions, know-how and gastronomic practice can be listed.

The nomination procedure lays particular stress on "participation of the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals, in the elaboration of nomination files".[8] The community's free, prior, informed consent is an obligatory part of the inscription documentation. The UNESCO guidelines to preparing the nomination form spell it out: "No topic has received greater attention from the Committee [than the communities' role]".[9] But who actually represents or embodies these communities? The central role goes to local institutions like town halls, subnational administrative bodies or mayors' associations. Likewise, local associations of chefs and cooks, cultural organizations, and various kinds of labour associations stand as examples of the community with roots in the localities. Localities and communities are the prime entities applying to UNESCO for candidacy of a food brand or cuisine which is important to safeguard for the economic fabric and cultural identity of the area. Take the "Mediterranean Diet", for example (Scepi and Petrillo 2015; Stano 2015; Turmo, Verdù and Navarrete 2008). The nomination file specifies that "the communities that recognize it as part of their common intangible cultural heritage [are] Agros (Cyprus), Brač and Hvar (Croatia), Soria (Spain), Koroni/Coroni (Greece), Cilento (Italy), Chefchaouen (Morocco), [and] Tavira (Portugal)".[10]

In applications to the UNESCO committee the peculiar virtues of traditional food or "foodways" are described as in danger of being eclipsed by the advance

of the global market with its economic mechanisms and its standardization of foodstuffs and consumer patterns. Thus, in presenting the nominations of the French Gastronomic Meal (Csergo 2016; Tornatore 2012) and the Japanese Washoku for inclusion in the UNESCO list, the respective professional and workers' associations expressed concern at the risk of their culinary tradition and specific know-how disappearing (Ichijo and Ranta 2015, 147–57). Similarly, in the more recent case of UNESCO recognition going to the "Art of the Neapolitan Pizzaiuolo" – inscribed in December 2017 – the emphasis on know-how rather than the product in itself reflected the urgent need to counter the claims of the main competitor for pizza paternity, the United States. The United States achieves the highest consumption rate and earns the greatest profits through its major pizza chains. In this case too the 3,000 *pizzaiuoli* practising the art and the category associations (including the Associazione Pizzaiuoli Napoletani and the Associazione Verace Pizza Napoletana) sought UNESCO protection for the art of pizza preparation, which they described as "threatened by globalization, distorted and often counterfeited all over the world".[11]

Yet this local/global rivalry proves to be a rhetorical simplification compared with the far more complex intersecting levels on which identity dynamics are played out. For one thing, the local cuisines claiming protection against the thrust of globalization aspire to achieving (and bolstering) a distinctly global appeal. Once the heritage nature of a cuisine is made official, the trend is to tailor its singular features to the expectations of a global consumer elite. In the end arise what Claire Sammells calls "haute traditional cuisines" (Sammells 2014, 144). A typical instance of this occurred with traditional Mexican cooking, inscribed in 2010. The nomination file presented that cuisine as native, traditional and feminine, stressing its deep roots with no reference to its cosmopolitan overtones. With nomination successfully in the bag, promotion of Mexican cuisine became the exclusive province of male chefs, a transnational class of professionals trained in the French tradition. The accent was also placed on global ingredients and techniques, tailored to the taste buds of cosmopolitan consumers (Sammells 2014, 147–50).

This global shift by local culinary paradigms is not just a top-down process. Local players – entrepreneurs, local institutions and cultural and trade associations – build a bottom-up picture of the authenticity of their food, seeking to appeal to a global public and to global institutions. Thus, promotion of local products and traditions leads to a kind of "commodification of the locality" via deliberate marketing strategies (Grasseni 2013) which transform "local" into "typical" (Grasseni 2013; Vitrolles 2011); they reduce their food culture to essential points, sometimes glossing over what may be actual cosmopolitan features (as with French cuisine), and then adapt them artificially to international tastes and requirements. This trend by some long-standing nominations is not found in the case of the community behind the "Art of the Neapolitan Pizzaiuolo". It may partly be due to the latest UNESCO directives, but this last community

Food in UNESCO intangible cultural heritage

TURKEY
AZERBAIJAN
IRAN
KAZAKHSTAN
KYRGYZSTAN
OMAN
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
QATAR
ARABIA
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
MOROCCO
ITALY
CROATIA
GREECE
CYPRUS

Multinational elements
Food customs and/or Food preparation as primary concepts

- *Mediterranean diet* 2013
- *Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katyrma, Jupka, Yufka* 2016
- *Arabic coffee, a symbol of generosity* 2015

States parties to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Paris, 17 October 2003

Source: *UNESCO, List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, ich.unesco.org*

López, 2018

Figure 2.1 Food in UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage

gets identified not just with the associations mentioned, but with the "whole population" of the Naples metropolitan area and even with the whole community "all around the world" that upholds the symbolic and cultural values enshrined in properly prepared pizza.[12]

Secondly, simple opposition between local and global so easily obscures the real dynamics at work in the UNESCO-run process of heritagization, where it is nation states rather than local communities that vie with one another. This fact depends firstly on the UNESCO labelling procedure itself, which forbids communities to apply for nomination directly. State institutions filter the local proposals and end by being the only entities directly interacting with the international body. Again, UNESCO's preference for broadly shared traditions paradoxically tends to jeopardize the cultural variety and diversity it is meant to protect. Thus, certain local food patterns often end up representing a whole nation, overshadowing the local and regional matrix of some cuisines. This was clear with the Mexican nomination. A native cuisine from a small region – the so-called Michoacán paradigm – was turned into a national cultural model (Domenici 2018). Again, with the French Gastronomic Meal, the "community concerned" became identified with "the entire French nation"; likewise with more recent inscriptions, such as *kimchi* preparation or Belgium's beer culture: the food heritage candidate tends to stress national points in common although the communities and social groups are local.[13]

In this way the community that is presumed to enjoy the UNESCO nomination loses contact with the locality it represents, which is crushed by absorption into the national orbit. Local and regional culinary traditions get presented and perceived as representing the nation (de Soucey 2010), and it is on that scale that the economic effects of nomination are measured. This goes for the food industry as for the culture industry, for example in the case of tourism. Such enforced inclusion in a predominantly nationalistic model obscures the many cultural, class or gender differences involved in feeding rituals and habits, not to mention division and conflict within the local community itself. Aware of this risk, the UNESCO committee and its evaluation bodies recently stressed "the persisting problem whereby the communities concerned by the element or activity in question are not well-defined".[14] They particularly point out that the "communities are not monolithic and homogeneous, but are stratified by age, gender and other factors", and encourage candidates to describe the "diversity of actors and their roles in relation to specific intangible cultural heritage and the social dynamics that it generates".[15] These points refer to forms of identity different from place-based ones: very much the kind of sociocultural identity that food studies, and food history especially, have gone into so eloquently. In relation to the more or less recent past, for example, historians have investigated the symbolic and identity meanings of food for certain social classes, involving reconstruction of rituals and venues (Bouchet 2016; Erby 2017), and more generally the eating habits of the middle and working classes (Finn 2017; Lloyd 2015; Ray 2015; Scholliers 2012), as well as specific profiles

linked to working in the food system – from chefs to food industry workers – (Olmedo 2015; Van den Eeckhout 2013); they have probed feeding patterns in specific collective experiences or extreme situations – school, hospital, prison, war (Collingham 2013; Hawkins and Tanner 2016; Maes, Vanhouche, Scholliers and Beyens 2017) – often looking at objects of material culture connected with eating. The recent literature has been concerned with food heritages with religious connotations (Avieli 2009; Freidenreich 2014), as well as gender dynamics filtered through the lens of food consumption and preparation, especially focusing on the role of women in what tends to be conceived as a feminine domain (Cairns and Johnston 2015; Jones-Gailani 2017; Segalla 2016; Szabo and Koch 2017) – at least in the home – as well as on generational identities displayed through tastes and feeding habits (Anderson 2017; Tichit 2015).

Contrasting with the monolithic communities outlined by UNESCO nominations that so differ from the multiply nuanced situations analysed by the recent literature, the candidates presenting the "Art of the Neapolitan Pizzaiuolo" are far more strictly linked to the locality of urban Naples and more widely stratified socially, including unusual groups that make this a heritage of great interest. The art of the pizza is a distinctly "social" and "family heritage". It entails "functions of social aggregation and inter-generational exchange", using a ritual loaded with Neapolitan dialect and slang.[16] Indeed, it ranks as a key feature in the socio-economic fabric of the city, spelling emancipation from poverty. Many a youthful victim of typical southern Italian social marginalization has found learning the *pizzaiuolo* trade a refuge from straitened circumstances and sometimes crime. For the consumer too the pizza is cheap, accessible to the least well-off. It is also a symbol of social solidarity through the custom of "standing a pizza" (*una pizza sospesa*), a courtesy free meal ticket for someone who probably can't afford it.[17]

The UNESCO nomination tendency to dress up communities in very similar colours, lifted out of context and given a national frame, has also resulted in a spate of disputes among countries. When nation states get to dominate the labelling procedure, they take it as an opportunity to wield forms of soft power on the international scene. Nation states tend to exploit official certification of an exclusive product or cuisine and use the kudos of recognition to promote their own food image as a strategy of "national branding".

Political exploitation of food is nothing new, but it has risen to new proportions in recent years. It is called *gastrodiplomacy* (Ichijo and Ranta 2015, 108–12), and entails producing and using food brands as a weapon of soft power in the international arena. This has increased considerably following the impact of the global food market, where the alleged peculiarities of national culinary identity are being powerfully manipulated. To gauge the relation between food and globalization, Michaela de Soucey has invented a new concept: *gastronationalism*, which "signals the use of food production, distribution, and consumption to demarcate and sustain the emotive power of national attachment, as well as the use of nationalist sentiments, to produce and market food" (de Soucey 2010

433). As a vector of "collective national identity" (de Soucey 2010, 434), labelling procedure becomes an international battlefield where states flaunt their own "cultural nationalism in response to globalisation"; the paradoxical upshot is that institutions like UNESCO, "meant to limit the scope of nationalism", "end up enhancing the nationalist case" (Ichijo and Ranta 2015, 157). There is a potency behind such "gastrolinguistics" (Cavanaugh 2016; Lakoff 2006), and once a food or cuisine is defined as "national", thereafter it will be hailed and perceived as such. Successful nomination of a cuisine justifies a country appropriating it and delegitimizes all claim to it by others. Food then turns into a "contested medium of cultural politics that demarcates national boundaries and identities" (de Soucey 2010, 433). Claims to food paternity, like so many frontier lines, prove a crucial way of defining national belonging. In the end this traces an insidious line of inclusion/exclusion.

Food labels have fuelled many a dispute. One interesting example is the Turkish–Armenian quarrel over *keşkek*, which made it onto the UNESCO list as a Turkish heritage in 2011; another is the 2014 recognition of *lavash* as an Armenian product. This caused a broad rumpus throughout the region, with Azerbaijan at the fore (Aykan 2016). We have seen "*hummus* wars" in the Middle East and "*kimchi* wars" between China, Japan and Korea, raising identity issues and national interests, and in some cases even questions of national security. Mindful of the impact of language and the risks it may entail, the ICH section of UNESCO has issued a warning in the *Memoire for applicants* not to use "inappropriate vocabulary" or potentially divisive expressions like "pure", "true", "unique" or "original", and more generally to avoid turns of phrase "not conducive to dialogue or that had political connotations to be avoided. [...] [L]anguage that risks inciting tensions or awakening grievances, whether between communities or between States, should be rigorously avoided".[18]

Where foods or culinary traditions cross national borders, the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage actually contemplates attribution to more than one country and multi-country candidature is possible; items already on the list can be extended to a number of states. Nominations for such "shared heritages" are warmly encouraged. The "Mediterranean Diet" is an example of this procedure, "Arabic coffee" another, though the fact is that there are few enough such transnational food cultures on the UNESCO list.[19] It does seem that change is afoot, however. December 2016 saw the inclusion of "Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katyrma, Jupka, Yufka"[20] on the ICH list at the joint request of Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey, the very countries of western Asia that had contested the nomination for *lavash* bread going to Armenia. Again, Algeria's candidacy of couscous turned into a broader dossier centring on Maghreb: that involved the whole geographical area, including Morocco and Tunisia, where the Berber dish is indeed widespread.

For the time being, though, transnational candidatures are few and far between, however much UNESCO may encourage them. It goes to show how

national identity and interest continue to play a key role in the international game of labels. But this is to ignore the sharing of recipes and customs by adjacent areas, and the exchange and circulation of know-how among different and even far-flung regions, through which all cuisines become hybrid.

"Traditions" with no history: using the past in food heritagization

Contacts in the spatial sense are thus ignored or considerably scaled down in labelling practice, and the emphasis is placed on alleged continuity in time. A unique eating style or custom gets confined to a limited area and its roots are traced back into the past; it is styled "traditional" or "authentic", and the fact of being handed down over a number of generations purports to guarantee its vertical descent in time. This rules out any horizontal exchanges, contacts or influences from other places and communities, whether present or past. But what kind of past history is so repeatedly being claimed in heritagization processes as legitimizing cuisines and culinary practices?

"Authentic", "original" and "traditional" are the common terms cited to support the paternity claim for cooking styles. The "olde worlde" adjectives suggest the transmission of know-how and recipes from generation to generation, a kind of sedimentation over the centuries, knowledge belonging to one community that not only possesses the secret but lays claim to some symbolic or identity title. Harking back to the past is definitely a vital feature in building up a food heritage and often, by a mechanism of complete assimilation, "the past is turned into heritage" (Parasecoli 2017, 3). One recently produced conceptual guide to food as heritage gives the main ingredients as "tradition", "authenticity" and "memory" (Geyzen 2014).

But such a conceptual framework has problems. For one thing, the term "authentic" and its synonyms belong, as we saw, to the "inappropriate vocabulary" for UNESCO nomination files, and not just because of the nationalistic connotations making such claims of exclusiveness a potential source of friction. The idea of authenticity is also against the basic principles of ICH. As its subsidiary body stated in 2011 and 2012, UNESCO does not intend to "fix intangible cultural heritage in some frozen, idealized form", since "it is not concerned with the question of how 'original' or 'authentic' an element is or what its 'ideal' form should be, rather what matters is how an element figures in the lives of its practitioners today" (Bortolotto 2003, 75). The principle is therefore *safeguarding without freezing*.[21] Yet research by Chiara Bortolotto has shown that the term "authenticity" continues to figure frequently in nomination files by virtue of its connection to the "idea of antiquity ('thousand-year-old practices') or to territorially rooted (often rural) communities" (Bortolotto 2003, 76). A past conjured up by the idea of authenticity as a *sine qua non* does indeed become immobile, crystallized in an original form to be handed down unchanged over the centuries via teaching and recipe books allegedly preserving

local memory and tradition. Food studies has explored the link between food and memory (Holtzman 2006; Sutton 2006). It evokes an emotional side to the food experience, encompassing "edible memories" (Jordan 2015) and nostalgia for "granny's cooking". In such a framework recipe books – on which the literature has again recently focused – become the custodians, no less, of culinary memory. But, on one hand, they tend to reproduce a crystallized version of know-how and practice divorced from the change that historical development implies; on the other hand, they share in the general mechanism of *selection* whereby memory – individual or collective, of a cultural construct or a personal experience – filters the past by omission and "oversight" and inevitably leaves a partial version (Abarca 2004; Sutton 2006). The selection mechanism, note, is not so different from outright "invention of tradition" which, in itself and historically viewed, may be dismissed as insignificant except as a social and cultural construct.

Frozen, immobile, shaped by individual and collective memory – such is the past as evoked by food heritagization, a past that paradoxically turns out to be quite ahistorical, since in this way one ignores its actual dynamics, the central role in which is played by cultural exchange, the diffusion of skills and the circulation of eating patterns across Europe and around the globe. These are phenomena that food history has increasingly unearthed in recent years as a specific feature in the formation of the world's food cultures (Claflin and Scholliers 2013; Montanari 2002; Pilcher 2008). It is these spatial connections that get especially obscured, for example in UNESCO candidatures, where evocation of the past is always vague and partial. If we take the latest culinary nomination on the list, we will see that the "Art of the Neapolitan Pizzaiuolo" follows the prevailing trend. It refers to the need for preserving its "authenticity" – though that is just what the UNESCO committee stigmatized in its *Decisions*, since that way one undermines the assumption of a "living heritage, which is by definition constantly recreated by the communities concerned".[22] The authenticity of the Neapolitan heritage allegedly dates from 1889, when the Neapolitan pizzeria Brandi produced a pizza in homage to Queen Margherita: the colours of tomato, mozzarella cheese and basil supposedly alluded to the Italian flag. Recent studies have queried the historical basis of that well-known story (Helstoski 2008; Nowak 2014), reference to which is a pure case of exploitation of the past. Note how the fact of Neapolitan identity being reluctant to be absorbed into a broader Italian identity has not stopped it appropriating the national symbol of the pizza which so denotes it abroad.

More generally, the historical references that loom so large in the paternity suit for the pizza actually boil down to two: that fleeting reference to a late 19th-century episode, and a generic claim to a 16th-century origin. Citing the multicultural nature of the city of Naples does not warrant the same feature being applied to the art of the pizza and its historical development.

The heritagization of food via food labelling procedures seems to be heading quite a different way from the flourishing spate of food studies within which

food history has appeared in the past few years. Some form of dialogue with scholars would be no bad thing, to try and put an end to the limitations currently cramping the institutions' view of food as a heritage.

Food heritages figure as monolithic entities rigidly linked to geographical location. The communities in question get levelled into models that ignore fine differences and internal division, and the locations get caught up in national frameworks that make no allowance for connection, circulation or exchange with other places. The origins and permutations of such phenomena are ignored, and the phenomena themselves are currently denied by a lingering hostility to transnational nominations. The past serves to legitimize claims to and appropriation of heritage, but reduces, in the process, to a completely ahistorical abstraction. It is chopped up by the mechanisms of memory, selected for the purposes of transmitting knowledge, and cobbled together according to local marketing needs to fashion "commodity-heritages" (Grasseni 2005, 80). This is to obscure the long history of connection and transferral, chapters like the medieval exchange (Montanari 1988, 1993), the "Columbian exchange" (Crosby 1972) and the circulation of food cultures throughout empires (Laudan 2013; Leong-Salobir 2011). These are the real dynamics of the global culinary heritage, and they lie behind the hybrid, entangled nature of all culinary identities.

Notes

1 Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs.
2 European Union, *Agriculture and Rural Development*, *Door*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/door/list.html?locale=en accessed November 2018.
3 Recent examples are "Marche" oil, registered on 20 April 2017, and the "London cure smoked salmon", registered on 12 April 2017. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/door/list.html?locale=en accessed November 2018.
4 UNESCO, Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, art. 2. Retrieved from https://ich.UNESCO.org/en/convention accessed November 2018.
5 https://ich.UNESCO.org/en/lists accessed November 2018.
6 UNESCO, *Aide-mémoire for completing a nomination to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity for 2016 and later nominations*. Retrieved from www.UNESCO.org/culture/ich/en/forms accessed November 2018.
7 UNESCO, Nomination file no. 00437 for inscription in 2010 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Retrieved from www.UNESCO.org/culture/ich/en/RL/gastronomic-meal-of-the-french-00437 accessed November 2018.
8 UNESCO, *Forms to be used for nominations, proposals, assistance requests, accreditation requests and periodic reporting*. Retrieved from www.UNESCO.org/culture/ich/en/forms accessed November 2018.
9 UNESCO, *Aide-mémoire for completing a nomination*, p. 15.

10 UNESCO, Nomination file no. 00884 for inscription in 2010 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Retrieved from www.UNESCO.org/culture/ich/en/RL/mediterranean-diet-00884 accessed November 2018.
11 UNESCO, Nomination file no. 00722 for inscription in 2017 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Retrieved from https://ich.UNESCO.org/en/RL/art-of-neapolitan-pizzaiuolo-00722 accessed November 2018.
12 UNESCO, Nomination file no. *00722*.
13 UNESCO, Nomination file no. *00437*.
14 UNESCO, *Aide-mémoire for completing a nomination,* p. 16.
15 Ibidem.
16 UNESCO, Nomination file n*o. 00722*.
17 Ibidem.
18 UNESCO, *Aide-mémoire for completing a nomination*, p. 10.
19 Previously the Turkish coffee had been included in the list in 2013. Retrieved from https://ich.UNESCO.org/en/RL/turkish-coffee-culture-and-tradition-00645 accessed November 2018.
20 Retrieved from https://ich.UNESCO.org/en/RL/flatbread-making-and-sharing-culture-lavash-katyrma-jupka-yufka-01181 accessed November 2018.
21 UNESCO, *Safeguarding without freezing*. Retrieved from www.UNESCO.org/culture/ich/en/safeguarding-00012 accessed November 2018.
22 UNESCO, Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, *Decisions*, Twelfth session, Jeju Island, Republic of Korea, 4–9 December 2017, p. 63.

References

Abarca, M.E. (2004) "Authentic or not, it's original", *Food & Foodways* 1: 1–25.

Anderson, D. (2017) "Consuming memories: food and childhood in postbellum plantation memoirs and reminiscences", *Food Culture and Society* 3: 443–61.

Avieli, N. (2009) "'At Christmas we don't like pork, just like the MacCabees'. Festive food and religious identity at the Protestant Christmas picnic in Hoi An", *Journal of Material Culture* 2: 219–41.

Aykan, A. (2016) "The politics of intangible heritage and food fights in Western Asia", *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22(10): 799–810.

Bessière, J. (2013) "'Heritagisation', a challenge for tourism promotion and regional development: an example of food heritage", *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 4: 275–91.

Bienassis, L. (2011) "Les chemins du patrimoine: de Notre-Dame au camembert", in A. Campanini, P. Scholliers and J.-P. Williot (eds), *Manger en Europe. Patrimoines, échanges, identités*, Brussels: Peter Lang, 45–91.

Björk, P. and Kauppinen-Räisänen, H. (2017) "A destination's gastronomy as a means for holiday well-being", *British Food Journal* 7: 1578–91.

Blake, J. (2006) *Commentary on the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Leicester: Institute of Art and Law.

Bortolotto, C. (2003) "Authenticity: a non-criterion for inscription on the lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, IRCI Meeting on ICH, Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention", in *Final Report, The 10th Anniversary of the 2003 Convention, 10–11 January 2013*, Tokyo, Japan.

Bouchet, T. (2016) *La gamelle et l'outil: manger au travail en France et en Europe de la fin du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours*, Nancy: Arble bleu.

Cairns, K. and Johnston, J. (2015) *Food and Femininity*, London: Bloomsbury.

Cavanaugh, J.R. (2016) "Talk as work: economic sociability in northern Italian heritage food production", *Language & Communication* 48: 41–52.

Ceccarelli, G., Grandi, A. and Magagnoli, S. (eds) (2013) *Typicality in History: Tradition, Innovation and Terroir/La typicité dans l'histoire: tradition, innovation et terroir*, Brussels: Peter Lang.

Claflin, K. and Scholliers, P. (eds) (2013) *Writing Food History: A Global Perspective*, London: Berg.

Collingham, E.M. (2013) *The Taste of War: World War II and the Battle for Food*, London: Penguin Books.

Crosby, A. (1972) *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Csergo, J. (2016) *La gastronomie est-elle une marchandise culturelle comme une autre? La gastronomie française à l'UNESCO: histoire et enjeux*, Paris: MenuFretin.

de Miguel Molina, M., de Miguel Molina, B., Campos, V.S. and Oña del Val Segarra, M. (2016) "Intangible heritage and gastronomy: the impact of UNESCO gastronomy elements", *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology* 14(4): 293–310.

de Soucey, M. (2010) "Gastronationalism. Food traditions and authenticity politics in the European Union", *American Sociological Review* 75(3): 432–55.

Di Fiore, L. (2018) "Bibliography 'Food as Heritage'", *Storicamente* 14(2). doi: 10.12977/stor692

Domenici, D. (2018) "Gastropolitiche messicane. Il processo di riconoscimento UNESCO e l'idea di nazione", *Storicamente* 14(2). doi: 10.12977/stor721

Erby, K. (2017) "Dining on dissolution: restaurants, the middle class, and the creation of the family dinner in mid-nineteenth-century America", *Food Culture and Society* 4: 671–84.

Ferrières, M. (2013) *Terroir: jalons pour l'histoire d'un mot*, in G. Ceccarelli, A. Grandi and S. Magagnoli (eds), *Typicality in History: Tradition, Innovation and Terroir/La typicité dans l'histoire: tradition, innovation et terroir*, Brussels: Peter Lang, 23–43.

Finn, M. (2017) *Discriminating Taste: How Class Anxiety Created the American Food Revolution*, Camden, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Freidenreich, D. (2014) *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geyzen, A. (2014) "Food studies and the heritage turn: a conceptual repertoire", *Food & History* 12(2): 67–96.

Grasseni, C. (2005) "Slow food, fast genes: timescapes of authenticity and innovation in the anthropology of food", *Cambridge Anthropology* 25(2): 79–94.

Grasseni, C. (2007) *La reinvenzione del cibo. Culture del gusto fra tradizione e globalizzazione ai piedi delle Alpi*, Verona: QuiEdit.

Grasseni, C. (2013) "La patrimonializzazione del cibo. Prospettive critiche e convergenze 'sul campo'", *Voci* 10: 87–110.

Hawkins, S. and Tanner, A. (2016) "Food, glorious food: the functions of food in British children's hospitals, 1852–1914", *Food and History* 14(1): 107–33.

Helstoski, C. (2008) *Pizza: A Global History*, London: Reaktion Books.

Holtzman, J.D. (2006) "Food and memory", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 361–78.

Ichijo, A. and Ranta, R. (2015), *Food, National Identity and Nationalism: From Everyday to Global Politics*, New York: Springer.

Jones-Gailani, N. (2017) "Qahwa and kleiche: drinking coffee in oral history interviews with Iraqi women in diaspora", *Global Food History* 1: 84–100.

Jordan, J. (2015) *Edible Memory: The Lure of Heirloom Tomatoes and Other Forgotten Foods*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, R. (2006) "Identity à la carte: you are what you eat", *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics* 23: 142–65.

Laudan, R. (2013) *Cuisine and Empire: Cooking in World History*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leong-Salobir, A. (2011) *Food Culture in Colonial Asia: A Taste of Empire*, London: Routledge.

Lixinski, L. (2014) *Intangible Cultural Heritage in International Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd, P. (2015) *Food and Identity in England, 1540–1640: Eating to Impress*, London: Bloomsbury.

Long, M. (2013) *Culinary Tourism*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Maes, E., Vanhouche, A.-S., Scholliers, P. and Beyens, K. (2017) "A vehicle of punishment? Prison diets in Belgium circa 1900", *Food, Culture and Society* 1: 77–100.

Montanari, M. (1988) *Alimentazione e cultura nel Medioevo*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Montanari, M. (1993) *La fame e l'abbondanza. Storia dell'alimentazione in Europa*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Montanari, M. (ed.) (2002) *Il mondo in cucina. Storia, identità, scambi*, Roma: Laterza.

Nowak, Z. (2014) "Folklore, fakelore, history", *Food, Culture & Society: An International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 17(1): 103–24.

Olmedo, E. (2015) *Identity at Work: Ethnicity, Food and Power in the Malaysian Hospitality Industry*, Singapore: Springer.

Parasecoli, F. (2017) *Knowing Where It Comes From: Labeling Traditional Foods to Compete in a Global Market*, Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Parker, T. (2015) *Tasting French Terroir: The History of an Idea*, Oakland: University of California Press.

Pearson, D. and Pearson, T. (2016) "Branding food culture: UNESCO Creative Cities of Gastronomy", *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing* 2: 164–76.

Pfeilstetter, R. (2015) "Heritage entrepreneurship. Agency-driven promotion of the Mediterranean Diet in Spain", *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(3): 215–31.

Pilcher, J. (2008) *Food in World History*, London: Routledge.

Ray, U. (2015) *Culinary Culture in Colonial India: A Cosmopolitan Platter and the Middle-Class*, Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

Sammells, C.A. (2014) "Haute traditional cuisines: how UNESCO's List of Intangible Heritage links the cosmopolitan to the local", in R.L. Brulotte and M.A. di Giovine (eds), *Edible Identities: Food as Cultural Heritage*, London: Routledge, 141–58.

Scepi, G. and Petrillo, P.L. (2015) "The cultural dimension of the Mediterranean Diet as an Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity", in G.M. Molinelli (ed.), *Cultural Heritage and Value Creation*, Cham: Springer, 171–88.

Scholliers, P. (ed.) (2012) "Convergence and divergence in Europe since 1800. Cuisine of elites, bourgeoisie, and middle classes", *Special Issue Food and History*: 3–209.

Segalla, S. (2016) *Le radici del cibo: donne, trattorie, passaggi d'epoca*, Milano: Guerini e Associati.

Stano, S. (2015) "From nutrients to foods: the alimentary imaginary of the Mediterranean Diet", *ESSACHESS: Journal for Communication Studies* 8(2): 115–32.

Sutton, D.E. (2006) *Remembrance of Repasts. An Anthropology of Food and Memory*, Oxford–New York: Bloomsbury.

Szabo, M. and Koch, S. (2017) *Food, Masculinities, and Home: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, London: Bloomsbury.

Thomé-Ortiz, H. (2018) "Heritage cuisine and identity: free time and its relation to the social reproduction of local food", *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 13(2): 104–14.

Tichit, C. (2015) "Du repas familial au snack entre copains: le point de vue des enfants sur leur alimentation quotidienne (enquête en milieu scolaire à Paris, France)", *Anthropology of Food* 9. http://journals.openedition.org/aof/7883

Timothy, D. (2016) *Heritage Cuisines: Traditions, Identities and Tourism*, London: Routledge.

Tornatore, J.L. (2012) "Anthropology's payback: 'The Gastronomic Meal of the French'. The ethnographic elements of a heritage distinction", in R. Bendix, A. Eggert and A. Peselmann (eds), *Heritage Regimes and the State*, Göttingen: Universitätsverlag: 341–65.

Turmo, I., Verdù, J.M. and Navarrete, G.R. (2008) *Alimentación y Dieta Mediterráneas. Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial de la Humanidad*, Sevilla: Consejería de Agricultura y Pesca.

Van den Eeckhout, P. (2013) "Cooks and waiters on the move: the World and International Exhibition in Ghent, 1913, as a destination for hospitality workers", *Food and History* 2: 287–316.

Vitrolles, D. (2011) "When Geographical Indication conflicts with food heritage protection: the case of Serrano cheese from Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil", *Anthropology of Food* 8. http://journals.openedition.org/aof/6809