

Michal Leibowitz

Professor Elaine Fisher

RELIGST 290

21 March 2018

Beyond Symbolism: *Tefillin* as the Creation of Loving Bodies

INTRODUCTION

Despite the centrality of the man-God love relationship in Jewish texts, liturgy, and ritual, contemporary scholarship on the topic is surprisingly scarce (Levenson xiii). It has long been acknowledged that in the Hebrew Bible, the word “love” has various uses and subtleties of meaning. Traditional scholarship has often understood the man-God love relationship in three ways: father/son, husband/wife, and covenantal partners (Lipinski et al.). However, the precise relationship of these three articulations to each other, and to the ritual and social realms, has not been adequately explored. Over the course of this paper, I hope to offer a novel understanding of the role *tefillin* plays in elucidating the love relationship between man and God, as well as in the creation of loving bodies that act upon the social realm. My investigation will rely upon the methods of Martin Riesebrodt to articulate the meaning of *tefillin* as a form of human intervention with the divine, and those of Catherine Bell to understand the role *tefillin* plays in embodiment and the negotiation of power relations.

In his book, *Love of God: Divine Gift, Human Gratitude and Mutual Faithfulness in Judaism*, Jon D. Levenson suggests that the love between God and Israel as conceived in Deuteronomy must be understood as the love owed by the covenantal vassal to his lord, and therefore, as both an active and affective love. Notably, he writes that “covenantally conceived, love is defined, first and foremost, by a set of deeds” (60). Therefore, we may conclude that the

fulfilment of divine commandments, including that of the *tefillin* ritual, is not only an *expression* of affective love, but an active engagement with loving. With this understanding, it seems particularly strange that *tefillin* are referenced biblically only as a sign or symbol, and that religious authorities went to great interpretive lengths to understand the texts literally and create an embodied ritual.

To investigate the social dimension of the ritual, I turn to Catherine Bell to understand *tefillin* as a strategic arena for the embodiment and negotiation of power relations. Because Bell's theory emphasizes ritualization as an arena in which asymmetric binary oppositions create hierarchies, it's particularly helpful to look at the male/female binary present in the *tefillin* ritual. With the recitation of the Hosea verses, "And I will betroth thee unto Me forever..." and the symbolism of the *tefillin* straps as a wedding ring, male bodies take on the symbolic role of the female lover in the relationship between God and Israel. In assuming this symbolic female role, male bodies simultaneously enforce the subordination of the female in the male/female binary and exclude female bodies from participation in the man/God love relationship. Over the course of this paper I will argue that the *tefillin* must be understood as more than an expression of love for God. Rather, the ritual must also be seen as the creation of loving, male bodies, which then act in and on the environment around them to deploy the ritual schemes present in *tefillin* in other sociocultural situations. However, as Bell points out, ritualization also affords the opportunity for resistance and negotiated appropriation and is in the context of this resistance that I will conclude my discussion with an analysis of Yona Wallach's poem, "Tefillin."

WHAT ARE *TEFILLIN*?

Tefillin, or phylacteries, are Jewish ritual objects worn primarily by Jewish men who

have reached the age of initiation (13 years).¹ *Tefillin* are leather boxes containing *Torah* passages. They are bound to the forehead and the non-dominant arm with leather straps (Rubin 193). Today, *tefillin* are generally worn during morning services on all weekdays of the year, except festivals and holy days (Rubin 198). Historically, however, *tefillin* were worn all throughout the day, and the practice is not inherently tied to morning prayer (Lookstein 68). *Tefillin*, like Torah scrolls and *mezuzot*, must be handwritten on leather parchment with specially prepared ink and in a specific style of writing. They are written by specialists trained in the relevant ritual laws and purchased by non-experts for personal use (Rubin 193; Mendlowitz 35).

The practical laws and requirements of the *tefillin* practice are elucidated in Judaism's oral tradition and discussed extensively in the Talmud and other rabbinic literature.²³ Such laws dictate the minutiae of the practice, including precisely how the *tefillin* must be bound to the arm and to the head, the dimensions of the boxes, the color of the straps, when and by whom *tefillin* may be worn, the order of the scriptural passages, where they may be stored, and many more details (Rubin 193-226).

Although the oral tradition contains extensive discussion of *tefillin*, there is little biblical mention of the practice. The ritual of *tefillin* is derived from four passages in the Torah: Deuteronomy 6:8, Deuteronomy 11:18, Exodus 13:9, and Exodus 13:16 (Bailey 89). These passages reference an "ot" or a sign "on your hand," a reminder "between your eyes," and "totafot," often translated as *symbol* or *frontlets* "between thine eyes" (Bailey 85). Historically,

¹ Although primarily worn by men, particularly in Orthodox circles, *tefillin* are worn by some women. The Talmud excludes women from the obligation of *tefillin* and Orthodoxy has widely accepted the idea that donning *tefillin* is an act of religious arrogance. In recent years, wearing *tefillin* has become a rallying point for Jewish feminists (Brody).

² Surprisingly, there is no discussion of *tefillin* in the Mishna, the primary oral code of Torah law (Bailey 84).

³ The oral tradition is a legal commentary on the written Torah which interprets and explains how commandments are to be carried out (Telushkin). The tradition is attributed to Moses' oral teachings since the revelation at Sinai (Bailey 84). In around 200 C.E., Rabbi Yehudah haNasi recorded the oral law in the Mishna, and then in around 400 and 500 C.E. discussions and commentaries on the Mishna's laws were written in a series of books known as the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds (Telushkin).

there was a debate about whether these commands and signs were to be taken literally or metaphorically. Rabbinic Judaism has generally (though with some exceptions) interpreted these passages literally based on the oral law and the Deuteronomic references to “tie them as symbols on your hands,” (the verb suggesting a physical act in parallel with the writing dictated in the other portion of the verse).⁴ We will examine these passages—and this Rabbinic literalism—in more detail below.

READING RITUAL: UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF *TEFILLIN* THROUGH LITURGY

In *The Promise of Salvation: A Theory of Religion*, Martin Riesebrodt emphasizes liturgy as a mode of evidence which serves as an ideal-type construction of the meaning of religious practice and also “relieves us of the need to speculate about subjective meanings” because of its institutionalized nature (87). In this portion of my paper, I will attempt to apply Riesebrodt’s theory and method to the practice of *tefillin* through an analysis of the associated liturgy in the hopes of obtaining a clearer understanding of the ritual and the role love plays in it. Note that Riesebrodt defines liturgy, rather widely, as “any kind of institutionalized rules and scripts that guide humans’ intercourse with superhuman powers, express its meanings, and are enacted in interventionist practices or worship” (84). In particular, Riesebrodt notes that these practices are expressed in spoken words, formulas, gestures, symbolic actions, or songs (87). Such definitions indicate that, for Riesebrodt, laying *tefillin* is a particularly rich liturgical subject, as the practice involves an institutionalized script comprised of spoken words, symbolic actions, and gestures. Although this will not be the focal point of my discussion here, it’s worth noting that *tefillin* are associated with salvation and protection from harm in biblical, Talmudic, and post-Talmudic

⁴ Interestingly, Karaites, who do not accept the oral law, understand these verses metaphorically and do not wear *tefillin* (Freeman).

literature and therefore correspond to the salvation aspect of Riesebrodt's method (Lookstein 66).⁵

In order to understand the meaning of the practice of *tefillin*—and by this, I refer to the purpose and meaning individuals attach to their own actions, as represented by institutionalized practice—I suggest a dual focus on the biblical texts contained inside the *tefillin* boxes, and the practices, blessings, and methods associated with wearing the *tefillin* themselves.

The Torah passages inside the *tefillin* boxes are Exodus 13:1-10, Exodus 13:11-16, Deuteronomy 6:4-9, and Deuteronomy 11:13-21. These passages include the four mentions of *tefillin* in the Torah and some context. The Exodus 13:1-10 passage invokes the covenant between God and Israel and discusses the duty to remember Israel's redemption from slavery in Egypt. The second, Exodus 13:11-16, also explicitly invokes the covenant between God and Israel and describes the obligation to inform one's children of Israel's redemption and their corresponding sacrificial duties. The third, Deuteronomy 6:4-9, emphasizes the unity of God and the obligation to love him. The fourth, Deuteronomy 11:13-21, contains the imperative for Israel to listen to God's commandments and to love God. It also contains assurance of reward for fulfillment of the commandments and warning of retribution for disobedience.⁶ We might sum up the major themes of these passages as follows: redemption from Egypt, God's covenant with Israel, love of God, and fulfillment of God's commandments. In each of these passages, the kind of love referenced seems to be based on covenantal duty to God. However, the text inside of the

⁵ At times, *tefillin* have been attributed amuletic properties (Lookstein 66). Even today, stories of miraculous healings and overcoming of misfortune are attributed to the sacred objects. At times of misfortune or illness, some religious authorities recommend that people have their *tefillin* or *mezuzot* checked to see if they are damaged ("Source of True Blessing"; Watts 70). There is also a line of thought that suggests *tefillin* plays a special role in salvation, beyond that of the ordinary merits accumulated in the fulfillment of *mitzvot*. Rabbi Asher, a medieval sage, was said to have taught that if a man has been scrupulous in his observance of the commandment of *tefillin*, "the scales of justice will be tipped in his favor" when the Day of Judgement arrives. If he was negligent with respect to the commandment, "the scales will be tipped against him" (Lookstein 66).

⁶ Note that there is some debate about the correct ordering of these passages. I have presented the majority view here.

tefillin boxes is not the only component of the *tefillin* ritual and is therefore not the only aspect which expresses a notion of love.

In *Kashrut, Tefillin, and Tzitzit*, Stephen Bailey notes that along with *tzitzit*, “*tefillin* are the most richly symbolic objects in Judaism,” and that, as symbols of fundamental teachings, they are “designed to bring to mind certain penetrating religious ideas and concepts so that not only do we not forget or ignore these truths but also have them in our consciousness daily” (84). Exactly what the *tefillin* symbolize seems to be under debate, with some suggesting they are a sign of the covenant between the Jewish people and God (Rubin 193), and others suggesting they primarily symbolize the redemption of the Israelites from slavery in Egypt (Rosenberg 39), or else the submission of one's mind, heart and actions to God (Cowen).

A rather late, yet widely accepted addition to the *tefillin* ritual is the recitation of Hosea verses 2:21-22, which seem to raise an entirely different understanding of the kind of love existing between man and God. The source for the recitation of the verses is 17th century kabbalist Natan Note Spira, and the practice has come to be accepted by many communities (Rosenberg 39). Customarily, the Hosea verses are said as the *tefillin* is wrapped three times around the middle finger, corresponding to the three times in which the word “betroth” is mentioned. According to Steinsaltz, “The winding of the strap around the finger forms a ring, symbolizing the ring of betrothal—the betrothal between God and the people of Israel, as expressed in this verse” (363-64). This idea is echoed in Rabbi Jonathan Sacks’ in-text commentary in the Koren Siddur, where which he writes: “These exquisite lines from the Book of Hosea speak of God's covenant with Israel as a marriage - a mutual pledge of faith, born of love. Wrapping the strap of the hand-*tefillin* around the middle finger like a wedding ring, we remind ourselves of God's love for Israel, and Israel's love for God” (17). In other words, the

addition of these verses into the practice of *tefillin* seems to suggest a distinct understanding of the love-relationship between Israel and God, operating not, it seems, on a covenantal track as Deuteronomy does, but invoking instead conjugal symbolism.

We can approach this divergence in a number of ways. First, one might suggest that the later addition of the Hosea text into the ritual suggests a shift in the conception of love at this time period. Such an approach is worth exploring but is beyond the scope of this essay and also fails to offer coherence to the meaning of the ritual as it is practiced today. Second, we can follow the persuasive account offered by Jon Levenson, who suggests that the love between God and Israel as conceived in Deuteronomy must be understood as the love owed by the covenantal vassal to his lord, and therefore, as both an active and affective love. This perspective is far less legalistic than many common interpretations of the Deuteronomic relationship (60). Levenson categorizes the marriage metaphor used in Hosea as a method to convey this covenantal relationship and suggests it is therefore far more similar to the Deuteronomic accounts of the man/God love relationship than it first appears (99). Levenson points out that like in the covenantal relationship, the marriage described in Hosea is inherently unequal with the husband featured as the source of his wife's bounty and the wife featured as the recipient of his service (101-102). He also points out that, like in the covenantal accounts of love in Deuteronomy and Exodus, the Hosea account of a love relationship features exile to the wilderness, an exodus, and a renewal of a covenant (Levenson 102-103). In other words, Levenson suggests the Hosea passages customarily included in the *tefillin* ritual express a picture of the love-relationship between God and Israel that is contiguous with the covenantal or vassal relationship presented in the Deuteronomy and Exodus *tefillin* verses.

If we follow Levenson's account, the role of love in the ideal-type construction of the meaning of the practice of *tefillin* is much clearer. In part, at least, donning *tefillin* is an expression of the covenantal love between God and Israel (and which is referenced through a marriage metaphor in Hosea). In wearing *tefillin*, one might say, a person expresses their love for God and fulfills an obligation to Him, which is part of the fulfillment of commandments that will lead ultimately to salvation.

But is this all that is going on in the ritual? Levenson writes that "covenantally conceived, love is defined, first and foremost, by a set of deeds" (60). With this understanding, it seems clear that the fulfillment of divine commandments, including that of the *tefillin* ritual, are not only an *expression* of affective love, but an engagement with loving. In other words, love is active in the covenantal relationship, not simply affective, and the fulfillment of a divine command is part of the creation of love.

But here, now that we have a clear picture of both what is expressed in the *tefillin* ritual and what practitioners believe the ritual does (it is an act of love and an investment in the covenantal relationship), we must also ask what the ritual does that its participants may not intend or may be blind to. What difference does it make, one might ask, if *tefillin* is embodied in a ritual as it today, versus if the textual verses had been left unembodied in the Torah, and were only read in synagogue or during Torah study? Wouldn't the same love relationship be communicated? Here, it's worth remembering that *tefillin* are only referenced biblically as a sign or symbol, and that rabbinic authorities went to great interpretive lengths to take the texts literally and create an active ritual from the verses referencing "these words". What has been gained or lost in the embodiment of the verses, "And tie them for a sign upon your hand, and let them be 'totafot' between your eyes"?

TEFILLIN AS THE CREATION OF LOVING BODIES: READING RITUAL LIKE CATHERINE BELL

Although Riesebrodt's theory has been invaluable in helping us to understand the role of love in the *tefillin* ritual from the point of view of the practitioner, Catherine Bell's ritual theory will allow us to explore the social dimension and the sense in which ritualization is a strategy for the construction of "limited and limiting" power relationships within social organizations (8). In her book *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Bell notes that ritualization must not be understood as the expression of a subjective state. She writes:

the molding of the body within a highly structured environment does not simply express inner states. Rather, it primarily acts to restructure bodies in the very doing of the acts themselves. Hence, required kneeling does not merely communicate subordination to the kneeler. For all intents and purposes, kneeling produces a subordinated kneeler in and through the act itself. (77)

Similarly, I would like to suggest that the commandment of laying *tefillin* must be understood as more than just an opportunity for the subject to express his love of God in a ritualized format. Laying *tefillin* does not merely communicate love to the agent, rather, laying *tefillin* produces a loving body in and through the act itself.

Before diving deeply into the consequences of this statement, it's best to make clear why Bell's theory is appropriate for a study of Judaic ritual. I find Bell's emphasis on the *circularity* inherent to ritualization relevant, for Bell emphasizes how the ritualized body produces ritualized practices which produce ritualized bodies, and so on. In other words, claims that Jewish ritual is an exact performance of divine command and rabbinic authority that is somehow disconnected from the immediate situation are suspect, because as Bell writes, "even the exact repetition of an

age-old ritual precedent is a *strategic* act with which to define the present” (101). That is, although ritualization might see itself as responding to a place, event, or tradition, it does not see how it creates place, event or tradition or participates in the circumstances to which it responds (109).

Turning back directly to the topic of *tefillin*, I suggest we look at the three basic dynamics of ritualization strategies and attempt to understand the *tefillin* ritual in light of them. The three strategies Bell notes are 1) binary oppositions 2) hierarchization and 3) “the generation of a loosely integrated whole in which each element 'defers' to another in an endlessly circular chain of reference” (101). In the case of *tefillin*, some of the binary oppositions are obvious—right/left, Israel/other nation, God/man, and male/female, for example.⁷ In each of these cases, the binaries are not strictly equal opposites—the first is privileged. For example, *tefillin* are most commonly wrapped on the left arm because the right arm is associated with strength (and therefore must *do the wrapping*).⁸ More pointedly, in this recitation of the words, “And I will betroth thee unto Me forever...” and the wrapping of the *tefillin* straps around the fingers (which is now commonly understood as symbolizing a wedding ring), male bodies take on the symbolic role of the female lover in the relationship between God and Israel. Since it is clear that God (who dominates the God/man binary) is here in the role of the man in the relationship, such a designation of roles enforces the subordination of the female in the male/female binary. Moreover, since for the most part only men wear *tefillin*, female bodies are excluded from participation in the relationship

⁷ Ruth Tsoffar notes that the etymology of the term *tefillin* suggests the importance of such discriminations. “Tefillin,” she writes, “from the Hebrew root פלל (*pll*) means to pray but also to discriminate. Tefillin marks gender, nation (Yisrael ≠ Goyim), and bodily distinctions. The preference of the head (law, canon, culture) over the hand and the rest of the body (sexuality, grotesque, nature) reinforces the opposition of classic, and pure versus unofficial and impure” (101).

⁸ Note that those who are left handed wear the *tefillin* on their right arms (Greenstone et al.).

altogether.⁹ To state this differently, in the *tefillin* ritual, the loving bodies created are specifically male bodies.¹⁰

Moreover, the concept of “ritual mastery,” suggests that these ritualized bodies will then act in and on the environment around them to deploy the ritual schemes present in *tefillin* in other sociocultural situations to make them more coherent with the ritualized (107). As Bell points out, ritualization however, also affords the opportunity for resistance and negotiated appropriation, and it is in the context of this resistance that I will conclude my discussion with a brief analysis of Yona Wallach’s poem, “Tefillin.”

READING YONA WALLACH’S “TEFILLIN” IN LIGHT OF BELL’S RITUAL THEORY

One of the most engaging parts of Catherine Bell’s book is her discussion of ritualization and power. In her book, Bell suggests that power is best understood as relational and contingent. Because of this structure, Bell proposes that although ritualization empowers those who seem to control it, such power is limited because ritualization also empowers those it seems to dominate (Vial). As Theodore Vial notes, “Thus, the field is wide open for a ritualized agent to appropriate ritual strategically, subversively if need be” (291). I’d like to suggest that Yona Wallach’s provocative poem, “Tefillin,” is such a subversive reappropriation of Jewish ritual.

“Tefillin” was published in March 1982, to mixed response. The poem, originally written in Hebrew, features a female speaker directing a male sexual partner in a sado-masochistic sex performance. The main prop in the dictated performance are *tefillin* (“You lay the tefillin for me

⁹ It is perhaps a recognition of this exclusion that has led *tefillin* to become, particularly in recent years, a rallying point for Jewish feminists. This is particularly notable in light of Bell’s recognition that ritualization is “a creative act of production, a strategic reproduction of the past in such a way as to maximize its domination of the present, usually by particular authorities defined as the sole guardians of the past and the experts on ritual” (92).

¹⁰ Notably, the exclusion of women from this relationship is often justified by Rabbinic authorities by the notion that women are already anatomically closer to God (because their capacity to bear children resembles divine creation) and therefore have no need for a ritual to enforce the connection (“Tefillin-Women”).

/ Bind them on my arms / Play with them inside me”). As Ruth Tsoffar notes in her essay, “Staging Sexuality, Reading Wallach’s Poetry,” “‘Tefillin’ can be read, and has conventionally been read, as an offensive attack on both Judaism and manhood—a ‘porno-religious-national poem’ of ‘emotional abuse of the entire nation’” (87). Although it may appear misguided to apply Bell’s ritual theory to a poetic text, if we read “Tefillin” as Tsoffar does, then we can see it as an act of ritualization by viewing it as engaging in the ritual of poetry and as an act of prayer (101).

As Tsoffar notes, Wallach’s poem utilizes *tefillin* in many of the conventional ways. *Tefillin* are still bound and wrapped, they are used to pray, and the language in the beginning of the poem: “I will lay tefillin,” is a conventional formulation of the act. Rather than ignore or reject *tefillin* altogether, Wallach’s speaker engages with them in “bind[ing] herself paradoxically and grotesquely to its [the patriarchy’s] sacred object” (Tsoffar 98). One can read this use of conventional elements of the *tefillin* ritual as an example of Bell’s notion of socialization—in using *tefillin* as the operative object in her erotic poem, Wallach demonstrates her mastery of schemes that can restructure and renounce both the self and society. Part of what is renounced, I would like to suggest, is the love relationship between man and God in which women—and their bodies—are excluded.

Moreover, Tsoffar suggests that Wallach’s “ritual theater” appropriates not only *tefillin*, but also “the whole ritualistic framework of halachic instructions, always addressed in masculine imperatives, and always presuppos[ing] the presence of an authoritative first person (God)” (104). Wallach’s use of the first person authoritative voice and other techniques deployed in ritual instructions can be seen as “appropriat[ing] and construct[ing] a vision...of the hegemonic order that promises a path of personal redemption, that gives one the sense of relative dominance

in the order of things, and thereby some ability to engage and affect that order” (Bell 209). I would like to suggest that the female speaker’s use of the voice of ritual authority appropriates the ritual and forces a part of its mode of operation (the sense that ritualization interprets its own schemes as impressed upon the actors from a more authoritative source) into the light.

Finally, if we turn to a focus on Wallach’s poem as an engagement in poetic ritual, we can see that in writing her poem, Wallach proposes a world where “[w]omen produce through verbal conception” (Tsoffar 115). This is clearly what Bell would characterize as a “a breakdown in the semblance of conformity to traditional models,” which Bell notes can shatter commonly accepted illusions of social cohesion (213). In this situation, part of the social cohesion which is shattered is the confinement of *tefillin* to the male body and the love relationship between man and God. Instead, Wallach’s poem aligns *tefillin* with violence and the female body with pleasure.

CONCLUSION

Over the course of this paper, I have sought an understanding of the love relationship between man and God through an exploration of the *tefillin* ritual. Using methodology derived from Martin Riesebrodt’s book, *The Promise of Salvation: A Theory of Religion*, I explored the liturgy and texts involved in *tefillin* to gain an understanding of the institutionalized meaning of the ritual (that is, to understand what such actions attempt to express). With the help of Jon D. Levenson, I concluded that the *tefillin* liturgy does offer a cohesive expression of the covenantal love-relationship between man and God, while also providing a forum for practitioners to participate in the creation of the love-relationship through the fulfillment of a divine command.

Then I turned to Catherine Bell's theory of ritualization to understand, not what the *tefillin* ritual seeks to express, but to understand what it *does* in the social realm. In applying Bell's theory to *tefillin*, I placed emphasis on the role of asymmetric binary oppositions, which for the *tefillin* ritual include the God/man and male/female oppositions. I argued that during the ritual, male bodies take on the symbolic role of the female lover in the conjugal relationship between God and Israel, simultaneously enforcing the subordination of the female in the male/female binary and excluding female bodies from participation. Ultimately, the ritual must also be understood not only as an expression of love, or even as an active engagement with loving, but as the creation of loving, male bodies which then act in and on the environment around them to deploy the ritual schemes present in *tefillin* in other sociocultural situations. In concluding with a discussion of Yona Wallach's poem, I offered an example of how ritualization also affords the opportunity for resistance and negotiated appropriation, empowering bodies even as it seems to dominate them.

Works Cited

- Bailey, Stephen. *Kashrut, Tefillin, Tzitzit: Studies in the Purpose and Meaning Symbolic Mitzvot Inspired by the Commentaries of Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2000. Print.
- Bell, Catherine M. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford University Press, 2009, web.vu.lt/rstc/a.pazeraite/files/2014/09/Catherine-Bell-Ritual-Theory-Ritual-Practice-Oxford-University-Press-USA-2009.pdf.
- Brody, Shlomo. "Why Do Orthodox Women Not Wear Tefillin or Tallit?" *The Jerusalem Post*, 15 Oct. 2010, www.jpost.com/Magazine/Personal-Notes/Why-do-Orthodox-women-not-wear-tefillin-or-tallit.
- Cowen, Alexander. "Tefillin and Its Significance." *Tefillin*, Kehot Publication Society, www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/81814/jewish/Tefillin-and-Its-Significance.htm.
- Freeman, Joshua. "Laying Down the (Oral) Law." *The Jerusalem Post*, 22 May 2007.
- Greenstone, Julius, et al. "Phylacteries," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12125-phylacteries.
- Levenson, Jon D. *The Love of God: Divine Gift, Human Gratitude, and Mutual Faithfulness in Judaism*. , 2016. Print.
- Lipinski, Edward, et al. "Love." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, 2nd ed., vol. 13, Macmillan Reference USA, 2007, pp. 227-232. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/CX2587512786/GVRL?u=stan90222&sid=GVRL&xid=f7896287>. Accessed 21 Mar. 2018.

- Lookstein, Haskel. "Tefillin and God's Kingship." *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1961, pp. 66–78. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/23255413.
- Mendlowitz, Reuvain. *Inside Sh'm: A Complete Buyer's Guide*. Lakewood, NJ: Israel Bookshop Publications, 2012. Print.
- Riesebrodt, Martin. *The Promise of Salvation: A Theory of Religion*. University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Rosenberg, Arnold S. *Jewish Liturgy As a Spiritual System: A Prayer-by-Prayer Explanation of the Nature and Meaning of Jewish Worship*. Northvale, N.J: Jason Aronson, 1997. Print.
- Rubin, Israel. *The How & Why of Jewish Prayer: A Handbook to Jewish Prayer Practice : the Mechanics of Jewish Prayer Including Its Laws, Customs, Rituals & Instructions*. Bet Shemesh: Arba Kanfot Press, 2011. Print.
- Sacks, Jonathan. *The Koren Siddur*. Jerusalem: Koren Publishers, 2009. Print.
- "Source of True Blessing." *Chabad of Central Florida*,
www.chabadofcentralflorida.com/page.asp?pageID=%7BFBE34F4B-3905-4AEE-B168-A76B63BA1B86%7D&displayAll=1.
- Steinsaltz, Adin. *A Guide to Jewish Prayer*. Schocken Books, 2002.
- "Tefillin - Women." *Aish.com*, www.aish.com/atr/Tefillin_-_Women.html.
- Telushkin, Joseph. "Judaism: The Oral Law -Talmud & Mishna." *Jewish Literacy: The Most Important Things to Know About the Jewish Religion, Its People and Its History*. William Morrow and Co, 1991, www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/the-oral-law-talmud-and-mishna.
- Tsoffar, Ruth. "Staging Sexuality, Reading Wallach's Poetry." *Hebrew Studies*, vol. 43, 2002, pp. 87–117. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/27913594.

Vial, Theodore M. "The Journal of Religion." *The Journal of Religion*, vol. 73, no. 2, 1993, pp. 289–291. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1204921.

Watts, Fraser N. *Spiritual Healing: Scientific and Religious Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Print.