

## CHAPTER 33

# Jewish Meals in Antiquity

*Jordan D. Rosenblum*

### Introduction

Following a trend in both popular and scholarly literature, food has become a hot topic amongst scholars of Judaism in antiquity. In particular, scholars have honed in on how Jews in antiquity used regulations concerning what, and with whom, to eat as a means of constructing their own identity (e.g. Freidenreich, 2011; Kraemer, 2009; Rosenblum, 2010a; Weiss, 2010). Thus, meals were used to establish and maintain borders between those with whom “we” eat (Us) and those with whom we do not eat (Them).

In this chapter, we will explore rabbinic meal practices. The rabbis, who flourished in Palestine and Babylon after the destruction of the Second Temple by Rome in 70 AD, often discuss what, with whom, and how one should eat. Judaism in antiquity was, much like today, quite diverse, including groups as varied as the early followers of Jesus and the separatist Qumran sect that composed and collected the Dead Sea Scrolls. While the rabbis do not represent the entire range of ancient Judaism, focusing on them offers two advantages. First, though they do not represent the majority of Jews in antiquity, their small movement slowly develops into normative Judaism. Today, “Judaism” is rabbinic Judaism. Second, they both conserve and innovate meal practices. Thus, the rabbis draw from their surrounding (Jewish and non-Jewish) milieus, while at the same time creating new customs. The rabbis’ dual roles as conservators and innovators allow us to set into relief how they use food and meal regulations to connect with their surrounding (Jewish and non-Jewish) world while simultaneously disconnecting from it.

We begin by asking four questions. First, what did Jews in late antiquity eat? Second, how did they obtain their food? Third, how did they prepare their food? Fourth, how did they eat their food? In answering these questions below, we will learn much about how the rabbis, and Jews in antiquity in general, used culinary (what one eats) and commensal (how one eats) regulations to construct their identity. Then we will be able to examine how Jews in antiquity explained why they ate the way they did.

## What Did They Eat?

In order to reconstruct the diet of Jews in late antiquity, we must use a combination of archaeological and textual data. While both bodies of evidence are not without their problems, taken together they allow us to view the general outlines of their diet (for sources and discussion, see Kraemer, 2010, 403–7; Rosenblum, 2010a, 17–22).

Bread was the staple food. However, man does not live on bread alone (Deut. 8:3; Matt. 4:4). Thus, bread was dipped in olive oil or served with olives or legumes in various forms. As is the case today, the variety, quality, and quantity of one's diet depended on one's financial resources. Meat consumption, for example, was more common amongst the rich than the poor, who often had to rely on legumes for their protein. Similarly to other residents of the ancient Mediterranean, Jews complemented their diet with various fruits and vegetables, nuts, dairy products, and fish. Water and wine were common beverages. On festival occasions, including the weekly Sabbath, more food was eaten and animal protein was more likely to be consumed (as implied in *t. Peah* 4:8). Finally, while the Hebrew Bible provides a series of regulations regarding edible and tabooed animals (see Lev. 11; Deut. 14), which the rabbis augment, it is unclear to what extent these rules were followed by the general population. (Much like today, these dietary regulations were probably followed by some and not others, and, among those who did follow them, the range of interpretation likely varied.)

## How Did They Obtain Their Food?

The ubiquitous markets, which appeared on both a permanent and periodic basis, provided most of their food (Rosenfeld & Menirav, 2005). At these markets, Jew and non-Jew alike were able to purchase or barter for foodstuffs. Although both men and women went to the market, rabbinic literature evidences a discomfort with women doing so. Additional avenues for acquiring food included purchasing cooked food from an inn or hostel, trading informally, and growing or gathering food. Hunting was another means for people in the ancient Mediterranean to acquire meat, but rabbinic regulations regarding animal slaughter made this problematic for Jews.

## How Did They Prepare Their Food?

While the lack of certain animal proteins from the Jewish diet was noticeable, especially pork (Rosenblum, 2010b), neither the general cooking methods nor *batterie de cuisine* (tools necessary for the cooking process) of late antique Jews remarkably distinguished them from their non-Jewish neighbors. However, the rabbis did institute a variety of specific food practices that would have affected food preparation among Jews who followed them.

First of all, the rabbis regulated the role that non-Jews could play in the cooking process. Food now required a Jewish cook in order to be considered “kosher” (meaning “fit” for consumption; see Rosenblum, 2010a, 75–90). Second, an animal had to be slaughtered, and the resulting meat prepared, in a manner prescribed by rabbinic law. Here, the rabbis drew on biblical proscriptions, adding their own innovations (discussed below). Third, the rabbis interpreted the biblical prohibition against boiling a kid in its

mother's milk (Exod. 23:19, 34:26; Deut. 14:21) as referring to consuming *any* meat with *any* milk. The novelty of this interpretation is often missed, as they are the first group of Jews to read these biblical passages in this manner. (In the ensuing centuries, the application of this interpretation was developed much more broadly; in general, see Kraemer (2009), and discussion later). Finally, the rabbis instituted a variety of other food preparation processes. For example, the rabbis sought to control the preparation and consumption of wine, which they feared might have been (knowingly or unknowingly) offered as a libation to a pagan deity prior to Jewish consumption.

These food-preparation laws assured that the practice of turning raw ingredients into cooked food – from nature to culture, as Claude Lévi-Strauss (1975) has argued – served as a practice of distinction: between Jew and non-Jew, and between rabbinic Jew and non-rabbinic Jew. To offer one concrete example, let us return to rabbinic legislation regarding animal slaughter. The Hebrew Bible only mandates that, when slaughtering an animal, one pour its blood on the ground rather than consume it (Lev. 17:10–4; Deut. 12:15–27; 15:19–23). In a tractate devoted to non-cultic slaughter (*Hullin*), the rabbis spell out a myriad of rules, including regulations for how, when, with whom, and with what one may slaughter. While the details of rabbinic law regarding animal butchery and consumption are too complicated to explain here, the important point is that, according to the rabbis, “valid” animal slaughter required one to follow their innovative practices and rituals. And these practices and rituals served to differentiate both Jews from non-Jews and non-rabbinic Jews from other Jews.

## How Did They Eat Their Food?

An excellent location to establish the borders of a community is at the borders of its tables; this cross-cultural observation held true for Jews in the ancient world. However, the rabbis did not completely ignore the meal customs of their wider Greek and Roman world. Like early Christians, they preserved the overall structure of meals in their broader environment but reinterpreted or changed the meanings of specific elements (on Christianity, see Smith, 2003; Taussig, 2009; and Smith's chapter in this volume). In order to examine this bricolage, let us look at an early rabbinic text that discusses the order of a meal:

What is the order of a meal? Guests enter, and they are seated on benches and on chairs until [all of the guests] are gathered [and seated]. [Once] all of them are gathered, [and the servants] have given them [water] for their hands, every [guest] washes one hand. When [the attendants] have mixed for them the cup [of wine], each one recites the benediction [over wine] for himself. [When] they have brought before them appetizers, each one recites the benediction [over them] himself. [When] they have arisen [from the benches and/or chairs] and reclined [for the second course of the meal] and [the attendants] have [again] given them [water] for their hands, even though [each person] has [already] washed one hand, he [now] washes both hands. When [the attendants] have mixed for them the cup [of wine], even though [each person] has [already] recited a benediction over the first [cup], he recites the benediction over the second [cup, as well]. [When] they have brought before them desserts, even though [each person] has [already] recited a benediction over the first [appetizers], he recites the benediction over the second [ones, as well], and one [person] recites a benediction for all of them. One who arrives after three [courses of] appetizers [have been served] is not allowed to enter [and participate in the meal] (*t. Ber.* 4:8).

This meal would not seem very foreign to contemporary non-Jews living in the larger Greek and Roman world. It draws on symposium meal structure of the larger Greek and Roman milieu. Even its assumption of an elite, male guest list fits with the overall pattern.

However, it is important to note one important difference. The meal is punctuated by several benedictions. At these moments, diners must recite rabbinic formulae. Thus, this rabbinic table talk serves to distinguish the rabbinic meal (see Kraemer, 2009, 73–86; Rosenblum, 2010a, 98–101).

The meal described above is clearly an ideal meal. It assumes one has both the time to dine leisurely and the resources to afford a lavish meal and servants. It also assumes that the diners reclined (on rabbinic reclining, see Rosenblum, 2012). On a daily basis, especially for those of lesser financial means, meals were much simpler. Although the formal structure, dining posture, and *haute cuisine* might be lacking, one key element remained: those who adhered to rabbinic mores would recite the prescribed benedictions before and after consuming certain foods. At these moments, rabbinic table talk would differentiate the rabbinic meal from that of both the non-rabbinic Jew and the non-Jew.

While various lifecycle meals had Greek and Roman cognates (e.g. wedding and funeral banquets), some rabbinic meals were without precise parallels: those that pertained to Jewish festivals. Some of these festival meals occurred every week (the Sabbath meals) while others occurred once a year (for example, meals consumed in a booth (*sukkah*) for the festival of Sukkot (Tabernacles), which occurs every fall) (on Sabbath and Sukkot meals in early rabbinic literature, see Rosenblum, 2010a, 170–8). The most discussed Jewish festival meal in antiquity is the Passover *seder* (see, e.g., Brumberg-Kraus, 2005, 300–2; Kraemer, 2010, 414–5; Rosenblum, 2010a, 63–8, 128–30, 162–70). The Passover *seder* ritually reenacts and reinterprets the mythical exodus from Egypt by the Israelites. Drawn from a variety of rabbinic sources, this meal is thoroughly rabbinic. Yet, the structure of this most rabbinic meal is clearly indebted to that of the Greek and Roman symposium (see previous note for sources). Thus, while the rabbis construct meal practices that enact and maintain Jewish identity, they are still very much influenced by their surrounding environment.

The rabbinic meal is both distinctly rabbinic and distinctly ancient Mediterranean. On the one hand, drawing on Jewish tradition and innovative interpretation, the rabbinic meal appears to part of the emerging rabbinic culture. On the other hand, drawing on the overall structure of the symposium, the rabbinic meal appears very much a part of the Greek and Roman culture of the ancient Mediterranean.

## Defending the Distinct Diet of the Ancient Jew

While the previous section was by no means exhaustive, a trend has emerged: in many ways, “Jewish” food – as well as the way it was obtained, prepared, and eaten – did not differ drastically from that of the non-Jews. Yet, food still served to distinguish rabbinic Jews from non-rabbinic Jews and non-Jews. In this section, we will discuss how Jews in antiquity defended their unique cuisine.

While Jews ate much of the same food as their Mediterranean peers, they had their own dietary taboos, some of which have been discussed above. However, the practice of food aversions in general is not unique to Jews, either in the ancient world (see Beer, 2010) or cross-culturally, as every known culture taboos food that is otherwise edible. Yet, Jews in antiquity often felt compelled to defend their distinct foodways. It is in this

defense of food that we learn much about how these ancient Jews understood themselves and their surrounding world.

The Hebrew Bible does not provide much of a rationale for following the dietary regulations prescribed therein. Besides invoking the need to be a holy people (see Lev. 11:44–5), the biblical laws are to be followed simply because they are divine fiat. These rules have thus cried out for interpretation, from both ancient and modern interpreters (especially anthropologists; in general, see Kraemer, 2009, 9–24). Later on, the rabbis will divide biblical legislation into two types: *mishpatim* (commandments with a basis in logic) and *hukim* (commandments that, while illogical, must still be followed); the food laws are considered *hukim*, and must be followed despite their lack of explicit rationale and even rationality (see *b. Yoma* 67b). This later stance did not prevent ancient Jews from seeking to comprehend the logic of the biblical food laws. In fact, this stance did not even prevent rabbinic Jews – from ancient to modern times – from offering their own explanations.

In the Second Temple period (ca. 515 BC–70 AD), the notion of food as a means of social separation between Jews and others developed. This idea may have influenced biblical legislation; however, aside from the late book of Daniel, we only explicitly encounter this conception in non-canonical Second Temple-period texts (in general, see Kraemer, 2009, 25–37; Rosenblum, 2010a, 36–45). For example, according to the *Letter of Aristeas* (ca. second century BC),

In his wisdom the legislator [Moses], in a comprehensive survey of each particular part, and being endowed by God for the knowledge of universal truths, *surrounded us with unbroken palisades and iron walls to prevent our mixing with any of the other peoples in any matter*, being thus kept pure in body and soul, preserved from false beliefs, and worshipping the only God omnipotent over all creation.... *So to prevent our being perverted by contact with others or by mixing with bad influences, he hedged us in on all sides with strict observances connected with meat and drink and touch and hearing and sight, after the manner of the Law* (139, 142; transl. Shutt, 1985, 22, emphasis added).

As stated in the *Letter of Aristeas*, biblical food rules prevent one from mixing with bad influences. For the author of *Aristeas*, this separation is a positive thing. When later Greek and Roman authors notice this, however, they are much less sanguine about the subject, as they believe this separation at the table to be indicative of a larger misanthropy on the part of ancient Jews (for references, see Rosenblum, 2010a, 43–4).

However, the biblical food laws were also seen as more than just a means of social separation. They were also a means of instruction. Thus, we find later in the *Letter of Aristeas* that the biblical requirement to consume ruminant animals is intended to teach a lesson: one must learn from those who ruminate on food that we ourselves must ruminate in our thoughts (153–5). This same concept is discussed at length by the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher Philo Judaeus (first century BC–first century AD):

[Moses] adds a general method for proving and testing the ten kinds [of pure domesticated quadrupeds], based on two signs, the parted hoof and the chewing of the cud. Any kind which lacks both or one of these is unclean [Lev. 11:3; Deut. 14:6–8]. Now both these two are symbols to teacher and learner of the method best suited for acquiring knowledge, the method by which the better is distinguished from the worse, and thus confusion is avoided. For just as a cud-chewing animal after biting through the food keeps it at rest in the gullet, again after a bit draws it up and masticates it and then passes it on to the belly, so the pupil

after receiving from the teacher through his ears the principles and lore of wisdom prolongs the process of learning, as he cannot at once apprehend and grasp them securely, till by using memory to call up each thing that he has heard by constant exercises which act as the cement of conceptions, he stamps a firm impression of them on his soul. But the firm apprehension of conceptions is clearly useless unless we discriminate and distinguish them so that we can choose what we should choose and avoid the contrary, and this distinguishing is symbolized by the parted hoof. For the way of life is twofold, one branch leading to vice, the other to virtue and we must turn away from the one and never forsake the other (*Spec. Laws* 4:106–8; trans. Colson, 1984, 8:73–5).

For Philo, eating biblically means eating rationally. A good thinker is a good eater.

As the previous passages have also implied, a good eater is also an ethical person (and vice versa). We encounter this concept elsewhere in Philo's corpus:

But so prolific is [Moses] in virtue and versatile in giving admirable lessons, that not content with his own prowess, he challenges it to further contest. He has forbidden any lamb or kid or other like kind of livestock to be snatched away from its mother before it is weaned. He has also forbidden the killing of the mother and offspring on the same day. He now crowns his bounty with the words "Thou shalt not seethe a lamb in his mother's milk." For he held that it was grossly improper that the substance which fed the living animal should be used to season and flavour the same after its death, and that while nature provided for its conservation by creating the stream of milk and ordaining that it should pass through the mother's breasts as through conduits, the license of man should rise to such a height as to misuse what had sustained its life to destroy also the body which remains in existence. If indeed anyone thinks good to boil flesh in milk, let him do so without cruelty and keeping clear of impiety. Everywhere there are herds of cattle innumerable, which are milked everyday by cowherds, goat-herds and shepherds, whose chief source of income as cattle rearers is milk, sometimes liquid and sometimes condensed and coagulated into cheese; and since milk is so abundant, the person who boils the flesh of lambs or kids or any other young animal in their mother's milk, shows himself cruelly brutal in character and gelded of compassion, that most vital of emotions and most nearly akin to the rational soul (*Virt.* 142–4; trans. Colson, 1984, 8:249–51).

For Philo, the thrice-repeated biblical prohibition against cooking a kid in its mother's milk is a lesson in ethics. To season the meat of a baby with milk from the source upon which it once suckled is not only to mix the domains of life and death; it is also simply cruel. However, it is important to note that Philo clearly has no issue with consuming meat with cheese *in general* (which, as we shall see below, the rabbis prohibit). Philo's concern is that eating the milk of a mother together with the meat of her child is "cruelly brutal."

In these instances, the *Letter of Aristeas* and Philo represent a pivotal moment in the history of Jewish food. These authors are asking an important question: why? They understand these biblical regulations as binding, but they seek to explain *why* these particular rules were commanded. The importance of this shift for the study of Jewish food laws is often missed by scholars. At this moment, these authors seem to be saying "OK, God commanded these rules. So what do they mean?"

The ancient rabbis asked this question, in various ways and on various occasions, and predictably they arrived at a variety of answers. For example, the rabbis puzzled over what is intended by the wording "These are the *living things* that you may eat..." (Lev. 11:2). In this passage, the Lord commands the Israelites concerning which domesticated

quadrupeds they may consume. While this passage in Leviticus goes on to explain that these animals must chew their cud and have split hooves, the rabbis puzzle over the precise wording of this initial comment. Why “living things” (often translated simply as “creatures”) and not another word? According to a general rabbinic principle, every word in the Hebrew Bible is intentional and has the potential to convey meaning. It is the job of the rabbi to determine these precise meanings. Paradoxically, multiple “precise” meanings were tolerated, and even encouraged, in rabbinic thought. In *Leviticus Rabbah* 13:2, one possible explanation is offered.

Rabbi Tanhum son of Hanilai said: This may be compared with the case of a physician who went to visit two sick persons, one who would live, and another who would die. To the one who would live, he said, “This you may eat, that you may not eat.” But to the one who would not live, he said, “Whatever he wants [to eat], bring it to him.” Thus, of the other nations of the world, who are not destined for the life of the World to Come, it is written in regard to them, “[Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you]; as for the green herbs, I have given you all” [Gen. 9:3]. But to Israel, who are destined for the life of the World to Come, [God said], “These are the *living things* that you may eat...” [Lev. 11:2] (emphasis added).

So why does Leviticus 11:2 mention “living things”? Because those who consume only “living” things will partake in the World to Come. (The rabbis believed that there were two worlds: the present world and the World to Come. The World to Come, a future world in which the righteous will be rewarded and the wicked punished, is often used to solve the problem of theodicy, or divine justice.) The other nations of the world are bound by the earlier commandment, given to Noah in Genesis 9, allowing them to eat “all.” Israelites (meaning, for the rabbis, Jews) cannot eat “every moving thing that lives”; they must follow Leviticus 11 and eat only “living things.” This subtle difference in wording is read by the rabbis to mean that non-Jews may enjoy all food in this world, but then do not get to enter the World to Come, entrance to which is reserved for Jews who eat only “living things.” Interestingly, later in *Leviticus Rabbah* 13:3 we learn that Jews who abstain from eating these foods in this world will get to eat them in the World to Come, where the dietary laws change. However, until that time, Jews must only eat “living things,” which explains the meaning of Leviticus 11:2.

This interpretation is by no means clear from reading Leviticus 11:2. Yet, it is clearly a rabbinic attempt to explicate this verse. In the process, we learn that, for the rabbis, the biblical food laws mandate a diet that possesses all of the essential vitamins and nutrients to guarantee one’s entrance into the World to Come. This is one answer to the “why?” question. Why did God command these dietary rules? So that, by eating in this manner, Jews may merit entrance into the World to Come.

This explanation is one of many that the rabbis offer. Again, multiple opinions are regarded neither as problematic nor as mutually exclusive, even if they directly contradict each other. The ancient rabbinic enterprise is about possibilities; it is about uncovering questions and then parsing the potential (more often convoluted than realistic) scenarios. Questions are important. Answers, however, are not.

An excellent example of this rabbinic tendency is their discussions of the separation of milk and meat. Unlike Philo, who read the biblical commandment not to cook a kid in its mother’s milk literally, the rabbis read this injunction to apply much more broadly: “All meat is forbidden to be cooked in milk, except for the meat of fish and locusts” (*m. Hul.* 8:1). Anything in the category of meat is forbidden to be cooked with anything

in the category of milk. Although not quoted, *m. Hullin* 8:1 clearly offers its interpretation of the thrice-repeated biblical injunction. In the process, the commandment has gone from particular to general.

Once one reads this law as referring to a general prohibition, however, several problems arise (in general, see Kraemer, 2009, 39–72, 87–121). Why is the law repeated three times? Is chicken, which produces no milk, considered “meat” for the purposes of this law? How far does this separation go? And so on. These questions, and many more, are asked numerous times in rabbinic literature (e.g. *Mek. Kaspā* 5; *b. Hul.* 103b–105a). These answers are multiple, often contradictory, and rarely definitive.

To offer one concrete example, let us examine the question of why the law is repeated verbatim three separate times in the Hebrew Bible (Exod. 23:19, 34:26; Deut. 14:21).

Rabbi Jonathan says: Why is it stated in three places? Once to apply to domesticated animals, once to apply to wild animals, and once to apply to fowl. Abba Hanin in the name of Rabbi Eliezer says: Why is it stated in three places? Once to apply to large cattle, once to apply to goats, and once to apply to sheep. Rabbi Shimon son of Eleazer says: Why is it stated in three places? Once to apply to large cattle, once to apply to small cattle, and once to apply to wild animals. Rabbi Shimon son of Yohai says: Why is it stated in three places? Once is a prohibition against eating it, once is a prohibition against deriving benefit from it, and once is a prohibition against cooking it (*Mek. Kaspā* 5).

All of these rabbis agree that each of the three repetitions teach something unique. However, they do not agree on what each lesson is. The reader of this text is confused. Whose opinion is the correct one? Are these laws about large cattle, small cattle, and wild animals? If so, what about fowl?

Rather than looking for answers (which later rabbinic texts will attempt to offer), we should examine the process. As noted earlier, classical rabbinic literature is more concerned with the journey than the destination. In this case, there is a shared assumption that each time this injunction appears it communicates a new facet of the law. Thus, why was the law repeated? To explicate its intended applicability fully. However, simply knowing this is to possess a hieroglyph without a Rosetta Stone. The Hebrew Bible is thus cryptic and requires a rabbinic cipher to decode it. By offering us multiple answers, we see the range of possibilities imagined by the rabbis. Yet, though we have precise meanings of this passage, *the precise meaning* remains unresolved.

“Why do we eat the way we do?” This is the question that many Jews asked themselves throughout antiquity. (Unsurprisingly, it is a question that continues to be asked today.) These Jews accepted as binding the dietary rules contained in the Hebrew Bible. However, they faced two related problems: (i) the rationale for these rules is not explicit in the biblical text, and (ii) the rules do not address every variable in their changing reality. To address these concerns, Jews offered explanations for these rules and, especially in the case of the rabbis, interpreted and expanded biblical regulations.

## Jewish Meals in Antiquity

Omnivores have a major dilemma: they require a variety of foods in order to acquire all of the nutrients necessary for survival. Unlike species that can survive on a single food source for sustenance, omnivores must venture out into a dangerous world where



choosing the right or wrong mushroom is the difference between life and death. As omnivores, humans have not only learned to eschew certain foods that are poisonous, they have also developed cultural constructions whereby certain otherwise edible food items are tabooed.

In our glimpse of the Jewish meal in antiquity, we have seen how Jews both solve the omnivore's dilemma and use food taboos to live in this world and the World to Come. In many ways, Jews in antiquity obtained, prepared, and consumed food in a similar manner to their Mediterranean contemporaries. Yet, there were important differences, including specific benedictions, animal prohibitions, and other practices such as the prohibition on mixing milk and meat. These differences served to divide Jews from non-Jews and rabbinic Jews from non-rabbinic Jews. However, they also served to unite (rabbinic) Jews, as the rabbis themselves note:

[The other nations] would then go up to Jerusalem and observe Israel [the people of Israel, or Jews] – who worshipped only one God and ate only one food; whereas, amongst the nations, the god of one [nation] was not the god of another, and the food of one [nation] was not the food of another. [Thus,] they would say: “There is no better nation to cling to than this” (*Sifre Deut.* 354).

As this text implies, through theological and culinary monotheism – worshipping one God and eating one food – Jews are the envy of their neighbors. They unite through eating one food together.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Chris Jones and Dennis Smith for their insightful comments. Any mistakes that remain are my own.

## FURTHER READING

The starting point for the study of Jewish meals in antiquity is the outdated but still useful multi-volume work in German by Samuel Krauss (1910). An attempt to update this material has recently appeared (Hezser, 2010; see especially the entry by Kraemer). Another new volume that takes the archaeological evidence into full account is that by Magness (2011, especially 77–84). Students interested in this subject will find a growing library of relevant books in English, some focusing on the earliest group of rabbis (Rosenblum, 2010a), others on Judaism from ancient to modern times (Kraemer, 2009), and others examining Judaism from a comparative perspective (Freidenreich (2011), who compares Jewish, Christian, and Muslim texts on food). Of the previous three works, that by Rosenblum (2010a) is particularly suggested for those looking for further bibliography. The books by Kraemer (2009) and Freidenreich (2011) are written for a wider audience and are thus recommended for their readability. More technical discussions on the diet and economics of food for Jews in antiquity can be found in the work of Broshi (2001), Hamel (1990), MacDonald (2008), Rosenfeld & Menirav (2005), and Safrai (1994). For broader perspectives on food and Judaism, see the many essays in Greenspoon, Simkins, & Shapiro (2005), Hecker (2005), Diner (2001), and the popular books by Cooper (1993) and Fishkoff (2010).