

Distributed by the University of Nebraska Press

Food and Judaism

A Special Issue of  
Studies in Jewish Civilization  
Volume 15

Editors

Leonard J. Greenspoon

Ronald A. Simkins

Gerald Shapiro

The Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization  
The Harris Center for Judaic Studies  
The Center for the Study of Religion and Society

Creighton

U N I V E R S I T Y  
P R E S S

## Does God Care What We Eat? Jewish Theologies of Food and Reverence for Life

Jonathan D. Brumberg-Kraus

In this paper, I intend to explore the presumptions behind our justifications for killing or not killing animals for food. I contend that we presume the existence of something: life, vitality, something not completely reducible to the chemical composition of its parts, a quality of existence that previous generations called "the soul." Eating (or not eating) food that was alive is a way of perpetuating these presumed qualities and their rank in a hierarchy of being. I show here how I think Judaism does this, and I put forth some ideas and models to stimulate thinking about these *issues*. What, for example, are the ethics of dealing with "souls" or whatever comparable term one might use for these phenomena?

So, does God care what we eat? Yes! Kashrut—obviously. But why does God command us, as it says in the Torah, to "distinguish between the unclean and the clean, between the living things that may be eaten and the living things that may not be eaten?" (Lev 11:47). One of the main reasons God commanded the dietary laws was to distinguish the Jews, God's chosen people, from all the other nations of the world. Thus, one thirteenth-century medieval Spanish rabbi, Bahya ben Asher, the author of an ethical manual on eating, characterized the Torah *as a "Regimen of the Pleasures" [dat sha'ashuim], a rule of spiritual health intended for the Jews alone as a remedy for Adam's sin:*

*We are distinguished by our regimen of the pleasures from the nations who err, rebel and sin. For we found our Rock in the desert in the land of souls, and there He set for us a table against the nations, and thus David, peace on him, said, "Set before me a table against my enemies" (Ps 23:5).'*

A second reason was that God wanted us to be mindful and intentional about how we eat, in order to distinguish ourselves from animals. For Rabbenu Bahya, as for many of his medieval intellectual contemporaries—Muslim and Christian doctors and scientists as well as Jews—people who eat indiscriminately and without thought are no better than animals:

It is well known of the majority of the children of Adam, that their hearts are asleep and slumber, they eat with the blood, they spill blood themselves. *Like an ox eats straw* they eat their bread, and their souls are wasted and devastated, full of the wine of lust and empty of the wine of intellect. Their drunken excess turns against them, hard in pursuit of tangible pleasures, far from the way of truth. How many are those who *serve their senses*, to fulfill their desire, who gather to drain their cups to please their gullet! And how few are the elite who eat to sustain their body for their Creator's sake! There are some, witless and ignorant, the shifty man, who enjoy without blessing, neglect blessings. There are some fools who spit the good of the world into their vessels; the light of their calm will flash away like lightning, they forget the point when they eat at their tables, if they drink from their bowl. But unique is the one who fears and delights in the Lord even over a dinner of vegetables.'

In this view, people who are ruled by their animal desires to eat and drink are incapable of showing proper respect for God. Rules about food, particularly prohibitions against eating blood and requirements for blessing food, transform our ordinary animal instinct to nourish ourselves. They become opportunities to serve and respect God; thus, a third reason for the dietary rules is to promote proper reverence and gratitude toward God. It is within this context that I shall examine the prohibition against consuming blood. The prohibition against eating meat with the blood in it is the paradigmatic example of a fourth reason for the rules of kashrut: to teach reverence for life. But what exactly is the nature and quality of the life that these *mitzvot* are intended to teach us to revere? How can killing animals for food possibly be construed as a way of fostering reverence for life?

The answer to this question can be found in the Torah's equation of blood and life in its prohibition against eating meat with the blood in it. This command appears first in Gen 9:4: "You must not however eat flesh with its life-blood in it" and is reiterated in Lev 17:14: "For the

life of all flesh—its blood is its life. Therefore I say to the Israelite people: You shall not partake of the blood of any flesh, for the life of all flesh is its blood. Anyone who partakes of it shall be cut off." I should note here that the Hebrew word translated "life" in these Biblical passages is *nefesh*, which in later medieval texts comes to mean "soul," as in the terminology for the tripartite medieval Platonic conception of the human soul: vegetative soul [*nefesh tzomahat*], animal soul [*nefesh behemit*], and rational soul [*nefesh sekkalit*].

Rabbenu Bahya, in his *Commentary to the Torah*, quotes a long passage from his better-known teacher, Nahmanides (Ramban), to call attention to the Torah's frequent and emphatic equation of blood and *nefesh*. Bahya gives Nahmanides' four explanations of the reason for the prohibition against eating blood. *Nefesh* has different connotations in Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew it means something like "life" or "vitality." Its interpretation as "soul" (implying a dualistic view of body and soul) belongs to later rabbinic and medieval Jewish thought. R. Bahya and Nahmanides knew the difference. Accordingly, I will leave *nefesh* untranslated, though I will use "life" in contexts that seem to refer to its biblical sense [its *peshat* meaning] and "soul" when a text refers to its later philosophical meaning. In this quotation, note especially Nahmanides' rejection of the position of the foremost medieval Jewish philosopher, Maimonides:

Because the *nefesh* [life] of the flesh is in the blood, and I have set it on the altar for you (Lev.17:11). Nahmanides wrote that there are many reasons for the prohibitions against blood. The first is because it is the Lord's portion, like the fat, because just as one burned the fat as incense, as it is written, "All the fat belongs to the Lord" (Lev. 3:16), so they poured the blood on the altar, and accordingly, the Torah prohibited both the fat and the blood, because it was the Exalted One's portion....And another reason was because it is the *nefesh* [life], and the Holy One Blessed Be He never permitted the [consumption of] *nefesh* [life]. And so we found with Adam that all living creatures were prohibited to him and only the grasses and fruits were permitted to him for food, until Noah came and the Holy One Blessed Be He permitted him all the living creatures, since they would not have been saved were it not for him. But what he permitted to him of them was specifically the body and not the *nefesh* [soul], and if so, the *nefesh* still stands under the first prohibition. And

another reason is because the blood is the animal soul (*nefesh behemih*); it is not *fit* for its nature to be mixed with our nature. We receivers of the Torah require that we be pure of body and fit to *receive* intelligible things, and we have been commanded to cultivate [lit., grow] our nature to be mild and merciful, not cruel. Were we to eat the blood it would impregnate our soul with cruelty and a coarseness of nature, and make it nearly like an animal soul, because a thing which is eaten turns into the flesh of the body of the eater, and impregnates him with a nature just like him. But blood is not like the rest of foods that change with digestion. Accordingly it says, "The *nefesh* [life] of the flesh is in the blood, and I have set it as an expiation on the altar for you" (Lev.17:1 1). All these reasons come from the Rabbis. And Maimonides, may his memory be a blessing, wrote on the reasons for the commandments that the prohibition of blood was a way to distance people from engaging in practices with demons, for when Israel went out of Egypt, who were expert in this wisdom, and they grew accustomed to it from the Egyptians, who were drawn to it. Some of their sages when they wanted to gather them, would make a pit and pour blood there, and the demons would collect around the edges of the pit, and when they wanted to prophesy the future they would eat the blood, and this is what Scripture warned against when it said don't eat over the blood....This is the opinion of the Teacher, may his memory be a blessing, in the *Guide to the Perplexed...but* Nahmanides wrote about this that if this was the main reason, why does Scripture say "*nefesh*" every time it mentions the blood prohibition? Therefore, even if Maimonides' explanation makes logical sense, the language of the scriptural verse does not mean this, and so he [Nahmanides] explained it according to what I just wrote.

These two [quotes from] the verse [Lev 17:14] teach that the *nefesh* is in the blood and the blood is in the *nefesh*, that the two are mixed together—like wine mixed with water, where the water is in the wine and the wine is in the water, each in its partner. Accordingly he [Nahmanides] explained and said that [where it is written], "The blood of all flesh do not eat, because the life of all flesh is its blood" [Lev.17:14], comes to explain that the blood is **the** *nefesh* (soul) itself, that

they became one flesh, they shall not be separated, and that no blood is found without *nefesh* [soul] and no *nefesh* [soul] without blood, like matter and form in everything that has a body, that one is not found without the other.'

Bahya goes on to differentiate between blood that pours out of a wound and blood that flows through a body. I think he is trying to account for the fact that a certain amount of blood can pour out of a wound before a person or animal dies from blood loss, and, technically speaking, the quantity of blood up to that point is not exactly equivalent to the life; it is not exactly "life-blood." In any case, one is prohibited from eating both types of blood, presumably out of reverence for the life-blood it could be.

Thus, it is clear that both the Bible itself and its medieval interpreters presumed a quasi-scientific theory equating life, blood, and soul behind the prohibition against eating meat with the blood in it. In other words, we show *respect* for life by not eating the "life" part of permitted animals. However, if that were the case, why doesn't the Torah forbid meat eating altogether? Nahmanides brings as one of the reasons for the blood prohibition the rabbinic tradition that it was God's original intention that humans be vegetarian.' Only with Noah did God allow as a concession the right to eat animals, provided that the life, specifically the blood, was removed from them. This view comes from a talmudic tradition that interprets Gen 9:3-4 in relation to Gen 1:29-30 in exactly this way:

Rabbi Judah said that Ray said, "The first human being was not permitted to eat meat, as it is written, "For you it shall be to eat, and for every animal on the land" (Gen 1:29-30), and not, "Every animal on the land for you [to eat]," and when the children of Noah came, [He] permitted them [to eat meat], as it is said, "Like the green grasses, I am now giving you everything [to eat]" (Gen 9:3). It is possible that this doesn't exclude not eating a limb from a living animal, so [in the following verse] the Torah teaches, "But the flesh with its *nefesh*, its blood, you shall not eat" (Gen 9:4).<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, if meat eating according to kosher law does not appear to be God's original intent, does God ultimately want to wean us away from meat eating, or is meat eating the way to fulfill God's Torah? Essentially, does God want us to be vegetarians or meat eaters? Within this question lies the issue of God's justice; positions for both meat

eating and vegetarianism have certainly been taken in the tradition. For purposes of comparison, let us examine the relative positions of Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla, another thirteenth century Spanish kabbalist and contemporary of R. Bahya, and the pro-vegetarian position of Rav Abraham Isaac Kook, the first chief rabbi of Israel from this past century.

R. Gikatilla does a kind of end run around the tradition, positing that God changed his intention with Noah. He does this by offering a story that took place during the time of creation and that he feels justifies the morality of God's permission to kill animals for food. R. Gikatilla's position assumes a theory of reincarnation:

And now I have a great key to open this matter. What did the Lord (may He be blessed) see to command in the Torah the slaughter of animals for human beings to eat? For *is* it not written, "The Lord *is* good to all, and His mercy extends to all His works" [Ps 145:9]? And if He acts mercifully, why did He command that beasts be slaughtered for human beings to eat—where is the mercy in that? But the secret is in the beginning of the verse, which said, "The Lord is good to all," good in fact, and accordingly "His mercy extends to all His works."

During the work of creation, an agreement was reached *with the cow*, to be slaughtered, and she said, "Good." And what was her reason? Since the cow had no higher soul to conceive of the work of *HaShem* and His powers, the Lord (may He be blessed), when He was creating the world, told all the beasts to stand before Him, and He said, "If you consent to be slaughtered, and to have human beings eat you, then you will ascend from the status of a beast that knows nothing to the status of a human being who knows and recognizes the Lord (may He be blessed)." And the beasts replied, "Good. His mercies are on us." Whenever a human being eats a portion of the portions of a beast, it turns into a portion of the human being. Here the beast *is* transformed into a person, and her slaughter is an act of mercy, for she leaves the torah of beasts and enters into the torah of human beings. Death is life for *it*, in that it ascends to the degree of angels—and this *is* the secret of "Man and beast the Lord will save"[Ps 36:8].

If you really reflect on the secret of slaughtering animals, then everything comes from the side of His mercy and love for all His creatures. And thus reflect on the reason why our rabbis

said in tractate *Pesachim* of the Talmud, "It *is* forbidden for an *'am ha-'aretz* [illiterate person who cannot study] to eat meat." For it was not commanded in the Torah to slaughter a beast unless one knows the "torah of beasts, wild animals, and fowl." And whoever engages in Torah is permitted to eat meat. Thus an *'am ha-'aretz* does not eat meat because he is like a beast without a soul, and he is not commanded to slaughter a beast only so that another "beast" can eat *it*, but rather, if so, it [the beast] becomes like carrion and prey [in other words, it is forced to a lower, "unfit" status, to which it presumably would not consent].<sup>6</sup>

For this position, eating meat is a necessary behavior that maintains the hierarchy of status differentiating us from irrational animals bereft of a rational soul and incapable of raising their spiritual status on their own; in this activity we are also brought nearer to the image of God. This interpretation lends new meaning to the "torah of beast and fowl...to distinguish between the living things that may be eaten and the living things that may not be eaten" (Lev 11:46-47). The "torah of beast and fowl" becomes an active Torah, for beast and fowl are to be eaten by those who engage in their torah; eater and eaten are thus distinguished from one other by their relative position in a spiritual hierarchy.

In his vegetarian position, Rav Kook stressed that God wishes to involve us in the process of unifying the differentiated reality, rather than to perpetuate or justify this differentiation. Being weaned from the "torah of beast and fowl" to a vegetarian torah is part of this process of *tikkun* [repaid! Richard Schwartz, a professor of mathematics and Orthodox Jewish activist for vegetarianism, summarizes Rav Kook's pro-vegetarian position in this way:

Ray Kook believed that the permission to eat meat was only a temporary concession; he felt that a God who *is* merciful to his creatures would not institute an everlasting law permitting the killing of animals for food<sup>8</sup>....According to Rav Kook, because people had sunk to an extremely low spiritual level [in the time of Noah], it was necessary that they be taught to value human life above that of animals, and that they first emphasize the improvement of relationships between people. He felt that if people were denied permission to eat meat, some might eat the flesh of human beings instead, due to their inability to control a *lust* for flesh. *lie* regarded the permission *to* slaughter animals

for food as a "transitional tax" or temporary dispensation until a "brighter era" dawns, when people will return to vegetarian diets'.... Rav Kook writes that the permission to eat meat "after all the desire of your soul" was a concealed reproach and an implied reprimand. He argues that a day will come when people will detest the eating of the flesh of animals because of a moral loathing, and then people will not eat meat because their soul will not have the urge to eat it.<sup>10</sup>

The permission to eat meat is circumscribed by the many laws and restrictions of kashrut. Rav Kook suggests that the reprimand implied by these regulations *is* an elaborate apparatus designed to keep alive a sense of reverence for life, with the aim of eventually leading people away from meat eating."

Probably to acknowledge the fact that the time had not yet arrived when humanity would return to the vegetarianism that God originally intended for it, Ra<sup>y</sup> Kook used to eat a token amount of chicken every Sabbath. Moreover, Rav Kook felt that the "moral struggle" against one's inclination to eat meat until the time when God would make victory possible was a good thing:

The only way you would be able to overcome your inclination would be through a moral struggle, but the time for this conquest is not yet. It is necessary for you to wage it in areas closer to yourself. The long road of development, after man's fall, also needs physical assertion, which will at times require a meat diet, which *is* a tax for passage to a more enlightened epoch, from which animals are not exempt....The advantage of the moral sense when it is linked to its divine source [is that it] knows the proper timing for each objective, and it will sometimes suppress its flow in order to gather up its strength for future epochs, something that the impatient kind of morality that is detached from its source would be unable to tolerate.<sup>12</sup>

Ray Kook's gradualist vegetarianism is perhaps his way of reconciling the tension between God's desire to have us both differentiate and unify the manifold aspects of creation. Thus, on the one hand, restraint in eating animals comes from the moral imperative to recognize that they are like us:

The regulations of slaughter, in special prescriptions, to reduce the pain of the animal registers a reminder that we are not dealing with things outside the law, that they are not

automatons devoid of life, but with living things....The feelings of the animal, the sensitivity to its family attachment implied in the rule not to slaughter an ox or a sheep "with its young on the same day" (Lev 22:28), and, on the other hand, the caution against the callous violation of the moral sense in an act of cruelty shown particularly in the breakup of the family implied in the directive concerning a bird's nest, to let the mother bird go before taking the young (Deut 22:26-27)—all these join in mighty demonstration against the general inequality that stirs *every* heart."

On the other hand, Ra<sup>y</sup> Kook says that human beings "excel" over their fellow creatures with a "firm spiritual superiority?" Thus, it seems that the crucial difference between Rav Kook's vegetarian position and the meat eating one of R. Bahya and Gikatilla has to do with the moral implications of human beings' spiritual superiority over animals, on which all three seem to agree. For Rav Kook, the consequence of our spiritual superiority is that we will not eat animals despite our higher rank in the chain of being. For those who make a case for eating meat, the spiritual superiority of humankind over animals (epitomized by *talmidei hakhamim* [those who engage in Torah]) is precisely why at least some of us are entitled to eat the "flesh of beast and fowl."

In conclusion, Jewish theological discussions over whether or not to eat meat assume that both animals and humans have souls. The *difference of* viewpoint about what God wants us to eat depends on whether one believes that the superiority of human souls entitles people to eat animals or that humans ought to be above eating them. Neither of these positions shares the belief of many contemporary ethical vegetarians and animal rights activists, that human beings and animals are of equal moral status. Nevertheless, both Jewish positions, the meat eating and the vegetarian, find it abhorrent to eat the vital life force, the *nefesh, that animates animals* when they are alive, believing that it is the same vital force that animates us human beings. The traditional Jewish sources, following the Bible's identification of the *nefesh with the* blood, determine that this life force must not be eaten. However, once the term *nefesh*, under the influence of Greek philosophical views of soul/body dualism, takes on the post-biblical connotation of an immaterial soul qualitatively different from the body that houses it, there is a difference of opinion whether or not that sort of soul/*nefesh is*, as it were, "edible." The meat eating position of the thirteenth century Spanish

kabbalists understands the eating of meat with the right spiritual intentions to be a kind of reincarnation, in that it raises the souls of the lower animals to a higher rational, spiritual level as they are integrated into the souls of the Torah scholars who eat them." Naturally, any animals with sense would have agreed to this process, as the story of the animals' assent told by Gikatilla conveniently assures us. In this "gastronomic theory of metempsychosis," animal sacrifices in the Bible serve as a powerful metaphor for *this* process.<sup>16</sup> Just as the fires of the sacrificial altar raise the animal flesh into a refined bodiless odor that is pleasing to God [*re'ah niho'ab*], so the right-minded intentions of the Torah scholar transform the animal souls he eats into higher souls—circumventing even the need to involve female creatures in the rebirth process."

Obviously, an important part of this theory is the privileging of rationality over the animal and vegetative capacities of the soul. In this view, our rationality, so long as it is in accord with God's reasoning (specifically, the Torah), gives us the right to kill and eat creatures with only animal and vegetative souls. However, *if* it is in fact the case that animals do not have rational souls, how could they then have had the capacity to consent to be slaughtered for food; how could they know what it would mean to have their souls raised? The vegetarian position avoids this paradox by drawing a different conclusion about rational souls: rational, spiritually enlightened souls will not eat other souls because they will not "taste good" to them. For Rav Kook, the perfected soul by its very nature "will detest the eating of the flesh of animals because of a moral loathing, and people [with *such* a soul] will not eat meat because their soul will not have the urge to eat it." <sup>18</sup>

Both carnivorous and vegetarian diets can find support in the traditional Jewish sources about the nature of the *nefesh*. Remember the traditions Nahmanides assembles, in which he uses both "high" and "low" views of the soul to explain the prohibition against eating blood without really trying to reconcile them with one another. Some souls seem to have a taste for flesh, some do not. In the philosophical realm of souls, it may well be that the old Hebrew saying applies: *al ta'am ve-re'ah ayn le-hitvake'ab* [there's no accounting for taste].

Both the vegetarian and meat-eating positions in the classic Jewish sources base their moral conclusions about what to eat on a belief in some sort of immaterial, eternal, God-like "soul." In other words, these moral imperatives to eat or not eat meat presuppose a medieval

hierarchical and dualistic conception of the soul that presumably we modern people do not share. Moreover, it is significant that both these classic Jewish positions are based on a mystical understanding of the process of eating, where eating is an act of *tikkun*, of cosmic repair, a way of raising the status of souls, not only of the diner, but also in some cases of one's dinner.

Whether or not we share these assumptions, Jewish mystical attitudes about food raise important questions about our own modern, scientifically informed assumptions and experiences of what it means to be alive. Does it make sense for human beings to sacrifice the lives of other beings—animals—for food, clothing, medical experimentation, or for other activities intended to enhance our lives, without the assumption of a hierarchy of being or "souls" like that implicit in these classic Jewish theories about food? It *is* arguable that the kabbalistic interpretation of meat eating and animal sacrifices shows "reverence for life" by striving to raise all forms of life to the highest possible level, even if that means consuming it.

On the other hand, most vegetarians sense, on an intuitive level, that killing something to eat it *is* inherently disrespectful. Thus in certain "exo-cannibalistic" cultures that ate their defeated enemies, "there was no more certain way to insult someone than to say, 'I will *use* your head as a cooking pot,' or to refer to a man or a part of him as 'cooked,' or to give some dish the man's name."<sup>19</sup> This is essentially what meat eaters do to the animal flesh they eat; this also serves as an expression of precisely the low moral level Rav Kook says we human beings will grow out of when the messianic era comes. So, *is* the idea of higher and lower forms of life—upon which classic Jewish ethics of reverence for life is based—morally sound or even empirically demonstrable? Must any sort of ethical claim to revere life necessarily believe in a soul—a *nefesh*—*the vital life force that animates* human beings and animals alike? It seems that the very thing that we share with animals, the *nefesh*/life-force/blood, is precisely that part of the animal the Bible says we must not eat.

This raises the question as to why is it wrong to eat the animal's *nefesh*. Is it because *the animal* with its *nefesh*/life in it is too much like us; if we eat their living limbs with the *nefesh*/blood still in it, we would be like cannibals and murderers (Gen 9:3-4)? Or because the *nefesh* is precisely that part of humans and animals that is not ours to give and take; is it *the case that the nefesh* is God-given, intrinsically sacred, and

therefore must not be dishonored in this way? The evolving meaning of *nefesh* over *time* makes sorting out responses to this question ever more complicated.

Regardless of how we answer these questions, one thing is clear: Jewish ritual and mystical traditions intentionally transform eating into moral philosophy. In turn, that moral philosophy transforms our eating into divine service, as if we were offering sacrifices to God in the Temple. As it says in *m. Avot* 3:3: "At every table over which three have eaten and have spoken words of Torah over it, it as *if* they have eaten from the table of God."

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Bahya ben Asher ben Hlava, *Shulhan ShelArba* in *Kitve Rabenu Bahya [Kad ha-kemah--Shulhan she/ arba—Pirke avot]* (ed. Charles B. Chavel; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1969), 459. The citations of R. Bahya are based on this Hebrew edition of *Shulhan ShelArba*; the translations of this and other post-Biblical Hebrew texts are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

Bahya ben Asher, *Shulhan ShelArba*, 460.

Bahya ben Asher ben Hlava, *Be'ur al ha-Torah*. (ed. Charles B. Chavel; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1968) v. 2:506-7.

<sup>2</sup> See also in this volume, Gary Rendsberg, "The Vegetarian Ideal in the Bible," in *Food and Judaism* (vol. 15 in *Studies in Jewish Civilization*; ed. L. J. Greenspoon, et al.; Omaha: Creighton University Press, 2005).

B. Sanhedrin 59b.

Joseph Gikatilla, *Shaare Orah* (ed. Joseph Ben Shlomo; Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1981) 2:11-12. See also R. Bahya, *Shulhan she! 'Arba*, 496:

Our sages taught, It is forbidden for an *'am ha-'aretz* to *eat meat*, as it is written, "This is the *Torah* of the beast and fowl.[Lev. 11:46] All who engage in Torah are permitted to eat the meat of beasts and fowl, and all who do not engage in Torah are forbidden to eat beast and fowl (*b. Pes.* 49b.). The explanation of this among the enlightened is [that] when we set aside a soul for a soul, this is nothing other than the animal [lit., mobile] soul that we annihilate for the intellectual soul. But because one is an *'am ha-'aretz* and has no intellectual soul, you have it that he is forbidden to eat meat, since [in him] we have nothing to set aside and annihilate the animal soul, *since* he *is* someone who has no intellectual soul, and understand this.

I discuss this tradition at length in "Meat-Eating and Jewish Identity: Ritualization of the Priestly 'Torah of Beast and Fowl' [Lev. 11:46] in Rabbinic Judaism and in Medieval Kabbalah," *A Association for Jewish Studies Review*, 24:2 (1999) 227-62.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Abraham Isaac Kook, "Fragments of Light: A View as to the Reasons for the Commandments" in *Abraham Isaac Kook—The Lights of Penitence, Lights of Holiness, The Moral Principles, Essays, Letters, and Poems* (trans. and intro. B. Z. Bokser (The Classics of Western Spirituality; New York: Paulist, 1978) 317-20.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 318.

*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Richard H. Schwartz, *Judaism and Vegetarianism* (New York: Lantern Books/Booklight, Inc., 2001) 3,4,10,11.

<sup>7</sup> Kook, "Fragments of Light," 318.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 319.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 317.

<sup>10</sup> Brumberg-Kraus, "Meat-Eating and Jewish Identity," 257.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 259.

<sup>13</sup> Kook, "Fragments of Light," 318.

<sup>14</sup> Margaret Visser, *The Rituals of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities, and Meaning of Table Manners* (New York: Penguin, 1991) 15.