

**Jonathan Brumberg-Kraus**

**“Truly the Ear Tests Words as the Palate Tastes Food” (Job 12:11): Synaesthetic Food Metaphors for the Experience of the Divine in Jewish Tradition**

Our insights into the neurological basis of synesthesia could help explain some of the creativity of painters, poets and novelists. According to one study, the condition is much more common in creative people than in the general population... Depending on where and how widely in the brain the trait was expressed, it could lead to both synesthesia and a propensity toward linking seemingly unrelated concepts and ideas—in short, creativity. This would explain why the apparently useless synesthesia gene has survived in the population. (V.S. Ramachandran and E. M. Hubbard)<sup>1</sup>

“Truly the ear tests words as the palate tastes food” (Job 12:11)

Religious visionaries and poets often combine the language of taste with that of the other senses (seeing, hearing, etc.) to create “synaesthetic metaphors” to describe their experience of the divine. The religious language of Judaism represents a particular instance of this general tendency. Classical Jewish religious texts use synaesthetic food metaphors not only to *describe* experiences of the revelation of the Holy, but also in meal rituals to *create* analogous experiences in those who perform them.

The quotation from the book of Job in my title, “Truly the ear tests words as the palate tastes food,” is but one of many examples of Biblical verses linking taste to other sense perceptions that either originally referred to or have subsequently been interpreted in the midrash to refer to experiences of the holy. The Song of Songs, which Jewish (and Christian) mystical tradition interprets allegorically to refer to the relationship between human beings and God, is a particularly rich source of synaesthetic metaphors.<sup>2</sup> For example, the lover piles on the multiple ways he senses his beloved in 5:1: “I have come into my garden, my sister, my bride, I have smelled my myrrh and spice, Eaten my honey

and honeycomb, Drunk my wine and my milk. Eat lovers and drink: Drink deep of love!” Hearing, taste, touch, and smell meet in the opening lines of the song (1:1-3): “The *song of songs*, by Solomon. Kiss me with the *kisses of your mouth*, for your love is *sweeter* [lit., “better,” *tovim*] *than wine*. Your ointments yield a *sweet fragrance*, your *name* is like *finest oil*.”<sup>3</sup> Or again, sight, sound, taste, and sight in 2:14: “Let me see your face, let me hear your voice; for your voice is sweet [Heb., *arev*], and your face is comely.” Other well-known Biblical metaphors that fuse taste with other sense perceptions of God are “*Taste and see that the Lord is sweet* [lit., in the Hebrew, “good,” *tov*]” (Ps. 33:9), and Ex. 24:11, the Israelite elders at Mt. Sinai “had a vision of God [Heb., *va-yehazu*] and ate and drank,” the “real eating” about which I have written and spoke at previous Oxford Symposia.<sup>4</sup> Another important example is the way the Passover haggadah combines the taste of the bitter herb, “*maror*” with the sound of the Biblical verse in Ex 1:14 about the Egyptians’ past oppression of the ancient Israelites: “They made life bitter [*va-yi-imareru*] for them with harsh labor at mortar and bricks.” On the one hand, the similar sounds for the name of the food and the Hebrew verb for the Egyptians’ oppression of the Israelites *equates* the taste of the food with the harsh experience of slavery. However, on another level, what linguists would identify as pleasing sounds, the /m/ and /r/ sound combination in *maror* and *yi-mareru*, are *at odds* with the unpleasantly bitter taste and memory for which they stand.<sup>5</sup> That is, the *maror* tastes “bad” but sounds “good.” Hence, synaesthetic metaphors can evoke not only complementary multisensory experiences, but also experiences of the coincidence of opposites. There are many other examples of synaesthetic taste metaphors employed in

Jewish texts and ritual practice, but I will focus on these to illustrate what such metaphorical food language tells us about revelatory experiences of the Divine.

Synaesthetic metaphors combining the taste with other senses communicate their creators' experiences of the Divine in at least five ways. (1) The piling on of different sense perceptions, e.g., in the Song of Songs, refers to the *multisensory* quality of the experience of the divine, especially in mystical experience. It's like hearing, seeing, tasting, smelling, and touching one's Beloved all at once! (2) Combinations of the sense of taste (or touch) that are felt directly in or on one's body with sight or hearing, which perceive things from a distance, refer to the religious experience of feeling God simultaneously both near and far, inside oneself and outside. For example, "The *ear tests* words, as the *palate tastes* food," "*Taste* the Lord and *see* that He is good," and "they *envisioned* God and they *ate* and *drank*." Metaphors of smell work similarly, because odors are both diffused over a distance and felt, even tasted quite intensely; and the full experience of taste is virtually inseparable from smell. (3) The metaphorical combinations of taste and sight or sound also refer to the experience of simultaneous cognitive knowing and sensual feeling: "knowing in the Biblical sense." (4) Taste metaphors also refer to the Divine as an experience of "the good," as in Ps 33:9. There is some question about what "good" means. Does it mean "good for you" as in morally, spiritually, and physically beneficial or good as in tasty, delightful, and pleasurable? Or does it mean "sweet" (*suavis*) as it was often translated in the Latin Christian tradition, that is having the "chemosensory" quality of sweetness, as opposed to the other four "taste primaries": saltiness, sourness, bitterness, or umami?<sup>6</sup> But Fulton points out that Christian monastic literature tends to use the terms "*suavis*" or "*suavitas*" as synonyms

for “good” as generically pleasurable and beneficial, rather than sweet as in “sugary.”<sup>7</sup> Similarly, the Hebrew word *arev*, often translated as “sweet,” as in “let me hear your voice, for your voice is sweet” (Song of Songs 2:14), seems to mean sweet as generally delectable, not saccharine sweet. Moreover, as we shall discuss later, what tastes sweet or good is culturally and socially determined.<sup>8</sup> Finally, (5) experiences of the holy may also taste bitter, i.e., unpleasant, as Job 12:11 implies. That is, the non-consoling words of his friends shortly preceding Job’s remark are a bit hard for him to swallow. Similarly the Passover traditions use the *maror*, the “bitter herb,” to recall how the “Egyptians embittered the lives of our Israelite ancestors with hard labor.” But again, analogously to “sweet,” does bitter in this case mean only “unpleasant,” or does it also refer to the specific chemosensory taste of bitterness? Probably the latter, given the foods often used by many Jews for *maror* in the Passover seder, like romaine lettuce. However, is the horseradish typical in Ashkenazi practice technically bitter, or just so spicy “hot” that it makes you cry if you eat a big enough portion of it? All these synaesthetic metaphors for the divine share the way they all construct the divine as something Other outside the perceiver, but taken inside her or him, corresponding to Rudolf Otto’s “idea of the holy” as an experience of a numinous Other, a mysterious something that simultaneously frightens one away and draws one to it.<sup>9</sup> Now let’s take a closer look at these five ways of tasting the Divine synaesthetically.

### **1. Revelation of the Divine as a Multi-sensory Experience**

Seeing, hearing, smelling, touching, and tasting the presence of one’s Beloved in the Song of Songs as a metaphor for the human-divine relationship emphasizes the richness and comprehensiveness of the visionary’s experience of the divine. We’re hit

with sights, sounds, odors, tastes, and sensations on our skin on all fronts at once, both overpowering and complex. It's as if the taste of the divine is "hyperpalatable," rewarding all of our senses and stimulating us to want more.<sup>10</sup> But in contrast to David Kessler's critique of hyperpalatability, which the modern food industry exploits to addict us to their food products,<sup>11</sup> Jewish Biblical culture constructs this multi-sensory experience as something good. The possible linguistic connection between the Hebrew word for sweet or delectable -- *arev*, as in "your voice is delectable" (S.S. 2:14) -- and the verb with the same root, *ayin, resh, bet* that means "to mix", as in *le-hitarev*, "to be mixed together," may hint as this. Montanari and Fulton suggest that a preference for a combination of flavors, of all the four (or five) flavors interacting with one another, "tempering" one another in an harmonious balance, is more characteristic of ancient and medieval cultural sensibility than modern Italian and other European cultural preferences for tasting distinctive flavors of individual foods on their own.<sup>12</sup> Ancient and medieval Jewish cultural sensibilities have a similar "taste" for synthesizing flavors, and extend that beyond the mixtures tasted in the mouth to the harmonious combination of "flavors" taken in through the other four senses, too. And so, "Let me hear your voice; for your voice is delectable and your face is comely... I have come into my garden, my sister, my bride, I have smelled my myrrh and spice, eaten my honey and honeycomb, drunk my wine and my milk." (S.S. 2:14, 5:1).

## **2. Tasting and Seeing, Tasting and Hearing**

Synaesthetic metaphors that combine tasting and seeing, or tasting and hearing, suggest that objects of perception seen or heard from afar are nevertheless experienced as

intimately as the food we must ingest into our bodies in order to taste it. Tasting, in contrast to seeing and hearing,

involves an extremely intimate exchange between the environment and the self, two entities that are ordinarily quite separate...The insulated, safe, self, protected by skin from the rest of the world, experiences a material breach of this boundary a few times a day in the act of eating. The world enters the self...The intake of food happens at one and only one locus: the mouth. This largest of the breaches in the sheath that protects the body is the principal material incorporator of the outside world. It is the last defense, the point at which the *critical decision of incorporation* occurs: swallow it or spit it out.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, when Job compares the palate's tasting food to the ear's testing words, he's referring precisely to this sort of "critical decision" whether or not to *incorporate* his friends' words, to take them intimately to heart; presumably in this case, his ear would like to "spit them out." Conversely, in Psalm 33:9, though one sees God's goodness from a distance, the metaphor suggests that one can nevertheless taste His goodness as if he or she physically incorporated it. Because of the peculiarities of Hebrew syntax, namely the characteristic parallelism of Biblical poetry, it's a little ambiguous which perceptual domain -- taste, or hearing or sight -- are the synaesthetic metaphors' source and target domain. In other words, are the long-distance perceptual domains of hearing and sight being compared to the intimate, incorporating sense of taste, or vice versa? Some linguistic studies suggest that the usual "directionality" of synaesthetic metaphors is from the "lower" domains of perception (like taste and touch) to the higher (hearing and sight), because that direction is more "cognitively accessible."<sup>14</sup> Others suggest that while directionality tends to be significant for the cognitive accessibility of synaesthetic metaphors, cultural and other factors may nevertheless outweigh the significance of directionality in specific instances.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the peculiar cultural characteristics of Biblical

poetry and Hebrew play down the directionality of their synaesthetic metaphors. Their parallel syntax encourages interpreting them as going both ways. The Jewish synaesthetic metaphors connecting tasting and seeing, tasting and hearing, suggest that the objects of these modes of perception are *both* near and far. As the Jewish 12<sup>th</sup> century poet and philosopher Judah Ha-Levi put it in the opening lines of his most famous poem: “Lord, where shall I find You? Your place is lofty and secret. And where shall I not find You? The whole earth is full of Your glory!”<sup>16</sup>

### **3. Tasting and Seeing or Hearing as Knowing and Feeling**

Thus, synaesthetic metaphors in Judaism tend to stress the *fusion* of multiple, even opposing modes of perception into a singular experience of a sort of heightened “knowing,” which combines rational cognition with sense perception. This is the visionary experience of “real eating” that was supposed to have occurred when the Israelite elders “envisioned God and ate and drank” at Mt. Sinai (Ex 24:11). In the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the kabbalist and exegete R. Bahya ben Asher exploits Biblical poetry’s characteristic parallelism to turn this verse, and another verse from Psalms 103:4 into synaesthetic metaphors that emphasize the fusion of sense experiential and rational knowledge. Though Ex 24:11 is prose, R. Bahya interprets “They envisioned God, and they ate and drank,” as if it were two synonymous limbs of a line of Biblical poetry. “They envisioned God” and “They ate and drank” are not sequential actions, but rather syntactically parallel synonyms for a single synaesthetic visionary experience of seeing, eating, and drinking -- “tasting” God.<sup>17</sup> In his interpretation of Ps 103:1: “My soul -- Bless YHWH, all my insides, His holy name,” R. Bahya similarly fuses the body and soul’s perceptive capacities, coordinating their distinctive activities in a single process. In

this verse, “The invisible [my soul] is united by [Bless] ing with the Invisible [YHWH], and the visible [my insides] to the visible [His holy name].”<sup>18</sup> A single verb, “Bless!” serves for the two parallel processes, suggesting that the soul and the insides’ blessing is a single action. It’s as if the Psalmist’s soul speaks to the transcendent deity YHWH, whom he knows but can’t see, while his insides address the Name of God, the physical manifestations of God in the world that he literally *feels in his guts*. This departs from earlier Jewish philosophical dualism that believed the soul and the body had two separate sets of senses, exemplified in Judah Halevi’s earlier interpretation of Ps 33:9: the soul knows the goodness of God *analogously* to the way we taste food, but we don’t actually physically taste God.<sup>19</sup> A similar shift from this view occurs in medieval Christian mystical thought around the same time, which stressed the physical senses, not some separate set of spiritual senses, were means to actually know God.<sup>20</sup> One prominent representative of this new trend, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, puns a connection between *sapere* (“to taste”) and *sapientia* (“wisdom”) to emphasize the importance of experiential knowledge of God’s wisdom:

Perhaps...*sapientia* (wisdom) is derived from *sapor* (taste) because when it is added to virtue, like some seasoning (*condimentum*), it adds taste (*sapidam*) to something which by itself is tasteless (*insulsa*) and bitter (*aspera*).<sup>21</sup>

A similar conceit in Jewish thought plays on the post-Biblical meaning of the Hebrew word *ta’am* as “reason” as well as “taste” (as in *ta’amei ha-mitzvot* -- “reasons for the commandments”). Thus, Jewish tradition typically interpreted Ps 33:9 allegorically. “Taste (*ta’amu*) the Lord and see that He is good” means: study the reasons for the commandments (*ta’amei ha-mitzvot*) and you will see that He is good; that is, He is wise. According to one medieval kabbalist, knowing the reasons for the commandments is

“tasty” experience.<sup>22</sup> Biblical synaesthetic metaphors, especially those involving the “lower” senses of taste and touch, become shorthand for experiential knowledge of God and His ways – which medieval Jewish and Christian mystics especially prized.

#### **4. Tasting what is good**

A growing consensus among psychologists, biologists, and advocates for sustainable food asserts that our taste preferences probably originate in a biological predisposition to like foods that are good for us, and be repelled by foods that are potentially harmful to us. Hence human beings are “hard-wired” to prefer what tastes sweet to what tastes bitter, because at least in the early stages of our evolution, those preferences tended us toward the foods we needed and prevented us from eating what would kill us. Thus the “tasting good” and “good for us” dichotomy is not an either/or but a both/and phenomenon. Granted, environmental and cultural factors have dramatically complicated the simple equation that what tastes sweet to us is “good,” and what tastes bitter is “bad.”<sup>23</sup> Obvious examples are “industrial food’s” exploitation of our preference for sweetness by packing their “food-like” products with high fructose corn syrup, which contributed to the current obesity epidemic, and culturally “acquired tastes” for bitter foods, as in the combinations of bitter “hoppy”-ness and sweet “malty”-ness, that beer connoisseurs enjoy. Moreover, contemporary psychologists, notably Paul Rozin and Jonathan Haidt, among others, make a strong case for the psycho-physiological connection between taste preferences and *moral* preferences, particularly in the emotion of disgust, which literally means “bad taste.”<sup>24</sup> Conversely, what tastes good thus may be morally uplifting. It was for the medieval Christian mystics who interpreted Ps. 33:9: “Taste the Lord and see that He is sweet [*suavis*]” as a call to become like God,<sup>25</sup> or

much later, in the remarkable effect of Babette's feast on its pious participants, in Isak Dinesen's short story and the movie version of it.<sup>26</sup> The Hebrew word *tov*, which some Latin versions of the verse Ps. 33:9 translate as *suavis*, is much more semantically flexible. *Tov* nearly always has triple connotation of aesthetically pleasing (to taste and to see), morally desirable (to do), and conceptually coherent (to know) -- from all the "God saw it was good" evaluations in the first seven days of creation in Genesis, to the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good [*tov*] and evil that was "good for food, and ... a delight to the eyes," to "taste the Lord and see that He is good."<sup>27</sup> *Tov*'s multiple connotations in the Bible imply that what pleases us to see, hear, smell, touch, and taste is "good for us." Hence, the Bible and evolutionary biology seem to agree that we have a taste for what is good for us, what benefits us, whether as a result of God's design or natural selection. No wonder then that to the Psalmist and his subsequent interpreters, to "taste" the Lord was to see that He was *good*.

### **5. Tasting what is bitter**

The synaesthetic Biblical metaphors that evoke bitterness, like "they made life bitter [*va-yimareru*] for them with harsh labor at mortar and bricks and with all sorts of tasks in the field." (Ex 1:14) and "Truly the ear tests words as the palate tastes food" (Job 12:11) (which in context seems to refer to the bitter "food" of his friends' lame efforts at consolation) underline the difficulty of drawing simple moral inferences from taste preferences. On the one hand, evolutionary biology and psychology tell us that what tastes bad to us probably is bad for us. "Bitter" might simply equal "bad" if the bitter always tastes bad to us. But it doesn't, as I suggested above. Bitterness, when it's "tempered" with counterbalancing flavors such as sweetness, as in bittersweet chocolate

or some beers, or with counterbalancing sounds like the mellifluousness of the word “*maror*” and its cognates referring to bitter tasting foods, or when its “spiced” with wisdom (a frequent trope in medieval discussions of what the palate finds unpleasant) might still be “tasty.” For example, there’s the conundrum in medieval Muslim philosophy and mysticism that the sick person craves food that tastes good, but will physically harm him, while the wise person (or one under the direction of a wise doctor) knows that what seems at first bitter medicine will ultimately heal him. The point is that bitterness can be a culturally “acquired taste” made more palatable by one’s experience or accumulated wisdom. Thus Job’s metaphor that the “Ear tests words as the palate tastes food” might not just refer specifically to the bad taste his friends’ words left in his mouth, but also more generally to the complex physical basis of our ability to discern the difference between good and evil. In other words, our palate can taste lots of different flavors, not just bitterness (it’s significant that the verse only implies a bitter taste and omits mentioning it explicitly). If that bitterness were only part of a harmonious coincidence of opposite flavors, the whole sensation on our palate might end up an aesthetically pleasing taste, just as weighing the negative parts of what we hear against the whole of what we know might prove to be emotionally satisfying, even if it means holding conflicting, even painful ideas and experiences in our mind (as Job’s subsequent observations in chapter 12 of the apparent conflicts in nature seem to suggest). Our gut reaction to what we hear indeed “tests words,” that is, our hearing is no less intuitively discerning than our palates’ capacity to taste. And as Rozin, Pollan, Haidt, and Kass argue, our cultural and biological instincts are sound, albeit sometimes contradictory.

Having seen how classical Jewish religious texts use synaesthetic food metaphors to describe experiences of the revelation of the Holy, we will now discuss how Jewish tradition employs them in meal rituals to *create* synaesthetic experiences for those who perform them. First, there is the general ritual practice of “saying words of Torah about the table” over the table, particularly about things -- food, table settings, one’s company, etc. that one sees, hears, smells, tastes, or touches at the table. I’ve discussed this extensively elsewhere. This often involves reciting words read aloud from books at the table, sometime illustrated, sometimes not. The overall effect is to “punctuate” the words heard with food and drink tasted, smelled and seen – and vice versa. Secondly, two specific instances of Jewish eating and reading rituals exemplify the strategies to create synaesthetic experiences of the divine as far and near (outside and inside of me); and as “good” even though it tastes bitter or is partially inedible. One is the practice of eating three different kinds of symbolic fruits at the kabbalistic Tu Bishvat seder developed in the 17th century: fruits wholly edible (skins and insides); fruits with edible outsides but inedible pits (apricots, dates, plums, etc.); and fruits with inedible rinds or shells, but edible insides (like nuts). Each type of fruit and the relative proportion of its edible and inedible parts correspond to a different idealized “world” with the same proportion of good and evil in it. Wholly edible fruits like apples and berries correspond to the world of *beri’ah* (Creation) in which the powers of good completely predominate over evil. Fruits with edible outsides but inedible pits correspond to the world of *yetzirah* (Formation), in which the powers of good outweigh, but don’t completely obliterate the powers of evil. Finally, fruits with inedible rinds or shells and edible insides correspond to the world of *asiyah* (Action), this one we live in, in which the powers of good and evil

are evenly balanced. The *Pri Etz Hadar* (“Fruit of the Beautiful Tree”), the Tu Bishvat “haggadah,” prescribes reading aloud Biblical passages that refer to these fruits, and then passages from the *Zohar* that spell out their mystical meaning, that is, their correspondences to the three worlds.<sup>28</sup> The participants hear the words describing the correspondences, see and touch the parts they can and cannot eat, and taste the parts they can, in a mutually reinforcing single experience. The second example consists of two ways of eating the bitter herb at the Passover seder, first by itself, as we already said, to remember how the Egyptians embitter our ancestors’ lives, and then in the so-called “Hillel sandwich,” originally composed of the bitter herb eaten together with meat from the Passover lamb offering and matzah, but now usually made of the bitter herb and sweet charoset between two pieces of matzah. The late 19<sup>th</sup> century Hasidic Rabbi Yehudah Aryeh Lieb of Ger, also known as the *Sefat Emet*, provides the following interpretation of this practice that cultivates a synaesthetic appreciation of bittersweet human experience of the divine:

Hillel used to combine the Passover lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herb together. Because the bitterness of the exile is not a separate thing, ... but rather the whole order by which the Holy One of Blessing directs us is all one way. As is it is said, “He causes death, brings life, and implants salvation.” The word *maror* “bitter herb” is [numerically equivalent to] “*mot*,” death. For in exile we are considered as if we’re “dead.” But this is necessary in order for there to be new life and salvation for generations after. And therefore we need to eat the bitter herb because we are now in exile, and by eating the bitter herb we are able to sweeten the bitterness on this night. And thus when swallowing the bitter herb, we will not feel the taste of the bitter herb more than the matzah, but the bitter herb is sweetened now.

Here the interplay of the words heard, the combination of taste sensations, seeing oneself and the reality of the world around him or her, enables one not only to “sweeten the taste” of the bitter herb on one’s tongue and palate, but also the bittersweet taste of Jewish

experience and of the way God is said to exercise His will in the world. A common thread in Jewish synaesthetic metaphors and the rituals cultivating synaesthetic experiences is this tendency to reconcile opposites, which reason cannot do. It can only recognize that they are opposites. But experience, combined with our cognitive awareness of these complications and contradictions, can, especially when it involves the pleasures of taste. There is something elevating in knowing experientially that “it all fits together” when we sense the many in the one.<sup>29</sup> While the blaming words of “consolation” left a sour taste in Job’s ears (as it were), when the “ear tests the words” of the Gerer rabbi, punctuated with a bite of the Hillel sandwich, I at least find them much more delectable food for thought and my palate. Seeing, hearing, and tasting all of this with friends and family at my seder seems to “take” in me precisely because it is a synaesthetic experience.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ramachandran, Vilayanur S., and Edward M. Hubbard, “Hearing Colors, Tasting Shapes.” *Scientific American* April 13, 2003: 22.

<sup>2</sup> Green, Arthur. “The Song of Songs in Early Jewish Mysticism.” *Orim* 2, no. 2 (1987); Brenner, Athalya. “The Food of Love: Gendered Love Imagery in the Song of Songs.” *Semeia* 86 (1999); Fulton, Rachel. “‘Taste and See That the Lord Is Sweet’ (Ps. 33:9): The Flavor of God in the Monastic West.” *The Journal of Religion* 86, no. 2 (2006): 169-204.

<sup>3</sup> I’ve emphasized in italics the specific allusions to the different sense perceptions.

<sup>4</sup> Fulton, “Taste and See” for the Western Christian monastic tradition; and in Jewish tradition, see: Lobel, Diana. “Taste and See that the Lord is Good: Halevi’s God Revisited.” *Be’erot Yitzhaq: Studies in Memory of Isadore Twersky*. Edited by Jay M. Harris. Cambridge, MA: Center for Jewish Studies, Harvard University, 2005. On Ex 24:11, my “Ritualization of Scripture in Rabbenu Bahya ben Asher’s Eating Manual *Shulhan Shel Arba’*,” *Proceedings of the 13th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, Israel, August 2001* and “‘Real Eating’: A Medieval Spanish Jewish View of Gastronomic Authenticity.” *Authenticity: Proceedings of the 2005 Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery*. Devon, UK: Prospect Books, 2006. 119-131.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> See Tsur, Reuven. *What Makes Sound Patterns Expressive The Poetic Mode Of Speech Perception*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992. 63-66, 75-6.
- <sup>6</sup> Fulton, ““Taste and See,”” 170-1.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 171ff..
- <sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 171-2; Montanari, Massimo. *Food is Culture*. New York: Columbia, 2006. 61-6, 71-74.
- <sup>9</sup> Smart, Ninian. “The Experiential Dimension.” *Worldviews: Crosscultural Explorations Of Human Beliefs*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2000. 56ff.
- <sup>10</sup> Kessler, David A. *The End Of Overeating: Taking Control Of The Insatiable American Appetite*. New York: Rodale/Macmillan, 2009. 141.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.
- <sup>12</sup> Montanari, *Food is Culture*, pp. 62-3; Fulton, 196; Scully, Terence. “Tempering Medieval Food.” *Food in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays*; ed. Melitta Weiss Adamson. New York: Garland, 1995. 3-24.
- <sup>13</sup> Rozin, Paul. “Food is Fundamental, Fun, Frightening, and Far-reaching.” *Social Research* 66 (1999): 9-30. My emphasis.
- <sup>14</sup> E.g., S. Ullman, cited in Werning, Marcus, Jens Fleischauer, and Hakan Beşeoğlu. “The Cognitive Accessibility of Synaesthetic Metaphors.” *CogSci 2006: Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Ed. Ron Sun. Vancouver, BC: Cognitive Science Society, Inc., 2006. 2366.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 2369.
- <sup>16</sup> Tr. T. Carmi, *The Penguin Book of Hebrew Verse*. New York: Penguin Books, 1981. 338.
- <sup>17</sup> Bahya ben Asher ben Hlava, “Shulhan shel arba'.” In *Kitve Rabenu Bahya*. Ed. Charles Ber Chavel. Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kuk, 1969. 492.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 492.
- <sup>19</sup> Lobel, ““Taste and see that the Lord is good.””
- <sup>20</sup> Rudy, Gordon. *Mystical language of sensation in the later Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge, 2002.; Fulton, “Taste and See.”
- <sup>21</sup> *Sermones super Cantica canticorum*, sermon 85, par. 8, quoted and translated by Fulton, 192.
- <sup>22</sup> Joseph of Hamadan, cited in Daniel Chanan Matt, “The mystic and the mizwot.” In *Jewish Spirituality. [Vol. I]: From the Bible through the Middle Ages*. Ed. Arthur Green. Anonymus. New York: Crossroad, 1986. 367-404.
- <sup>23</sup> Paul Rozin et al. “Disgust: Pre-Adaptation and the Cultural Evolution of a Food-based Emotion.” In *Food Preferences And Taste: Continuity And Change*. Ed. Helen M. Macbeth. Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1997; Rozin, “Food is Fundamental.”
- <sup>24</sup> Paul Rozin et al. “Disgust.” 66; also see Kass, Leon. *The Hungry Soul: Eating And The Perfecting Of Our Nature*. New York: Free Press, 1994. For philosophical reflections on this connection.
- <sup>25</sup> Fulton. “Taste and See.” 201.
- <sup>26</sup> Kass. *The Hungry Soul*. 183-192.
- <sup>27</sup> Gen 1; 3:6; Ps. 33:9.
- <sup>28</sup> Mansour, Saleh J., ed. *Pri Etz Hadar hu seder Tu Bishvat*. Jerusalem, 5719[1958/9].
- <sup>29</sup> Kass. *Hungry Soul*. 92-93.