

Rabbinic Training and Transdenominationalism

Some Personal Perspectives

Arthur Green

You might say that from my earliest Jewish experiences, I was destined to be a transdenominational Jew. Raised in a Jewish atheist household, I was given the opportunity of a Jewish education as a concession to my rather traditional maternal grandparents, who expected that each male grandchild would celebrate a bar mitzvah (my sister, by contrast, was given not a day of Jewish education). Living in Newark, New Jersey, my parents chose the nearby “temple,” which happened to be B’nai Abraham, under the leadership of Rabbi Joachim Prinz, whom they respected as a liberal communal leader. B’nai Abraham, a founding congregation of the Conservative United Synagogue of America, had left the movement soon after it hired Prinz, a Reform rabbi recently arrived from Berlin. To this day the congregation, now in suburban Livingston, remains proudly unaffiliated.

Much to my father’s chagrin, I began to take Judaism rather seriously and found myself deeply drawn to the synagogue. Once I came to understand that the temple service was essentially a performance, conducted by the cantor and the (mostly non-Jewish) professional choir, I had little ability to pray there. I turned instead to my grandparents’ synagogue in nearby Clifton, where prayer was infinitely more informal and participatory. This congregation was also undefined by denomination. It was an East European *shul*, the “regulars” still largely Yiddish speaking, but with mixed seating. The rabbi, a young immigrant yeshiva graduate, knew he could not pull it to Orthodoxy and made his peace with the situation, staying for many years in the unaffiliated pulpit.

My Jewish education came from those two institutions, the highly Zionist and Hebraist Hebrew School of B'nai Abraham and the "davnens, schnapps, and herring" *minyán* at the Clifton Jewish Center. Neither one forced me to answer the question, "What kind of Jew are you?" I could probably have responded best in negative terms when I was a child. I knew I wasn't Reform, because our family had attended a cousin's bar mitzvah in a Reform temple and were duly scandalized by the lack of male headgear and all the rest. I wasn't Orthodox, because unlike the one Orthodox kid in my public school class, I still turned on lights and answered the phone on the Sabbath. You might think that would have defined me as Conservative, but it was not a label I would have chosen for myself. I was Jewish in the very natural way that urban Jewish kids, grandchildren of East European immigrants, were Jews in the 1940s and '50s. "What are you, kid?" was a question still asked by bullies on the Newark streets in those days, and "Jewish" was an answer that sometimes got you a bloody nose. The adjective "Conservative" would not have helped in that defining moment.

Although the temple was unaffiliated, we kids did get sent to Camp Ramah, which had a major influence on me. From there I joined the Leaders' Training Fellowship, supposedly the elite future leadership of the Conservative movement. But in my college years I swung wildly, first toward orthopraxy (under the influence of Rabbi Yitz Greenberg and then still-Lubavitcher Zalman Schachter) and afterwards away from observance altogether (influenced by Albert Camus, Friedrich Nietzsche, Franz Kafka, and a few others).

When I began to take Judaism seriously again as a young adult, the communities that served as models for me were the *Lehrhaus* of Franz Rosenzweig (thanks to Nahum Glatzer, my teacher at Brandeis), the circle of the Ba'al Shem Tov, and the hasidic communities of Bratslav and Kotzk. Again, none of these had denominational labels. Rosenzweig had openly eschewed any such categorization and I had learned to admire him for it. And would anyone dare call Rabbi Nahman or the Kotzker an "orthodox" thinker?

Being a rabbinical student at the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS) in New York in those days gave me rather little exposure to the real Conservative movement, which hardly existed inside

the walls of 3080 Broadway. Discussions among future rabbis, and they were often quite intense, were conducted on a rather rarified plane. Often they had to do with theology, including such tough issues as faith after the Holocaust, the morality of Jewish particularism, and especially the authority of *halakhah*, Jewish law. Already then I felt that a certain theological bankruptcy in the more conservative branches of faculty and fellow students (those who rejected both Mordecai Kaplan's theology and Abraham Joshua Heschel's politics) was leading them to replace theology with philosophy of law. "Just 'bracket' the questions of God and revelation," they would say, "and Judaism provides a wonderful, sensitive legal system and basis for behavior." Later I would discover thinkers from the liberal side of Orthodoxy, including David Hartman, saying much the same thing. I would have none of it. I would have had little attraction to Judaism if it were primarily a legal system. I was, and remain, a religious seeker. I crave passion, not conformity; intimacy with God, not normative behavior within the law. I was increasingly attracted to Jewish mysticism as my spiritual language, and that only added to my alienation from those who were setting the denominational tone. With regard to observance (*not* my most important religious question), I understood already in those years that I was a selective traditionalist on more-or-less spiritual and aesthetic terms, not a participant in a binding legal framework. My choice to resign from the Rabbinical Assembly, quite a few years later, just confirmed a reality many years in the making.

The later key stations of my religious life, including Havurat Shalom, Somerville, Massachusetts; Germantown's Minyan Masorti, Kehillat Yedidya in Jerusalem, the Newton Centre Minyan, and now our little local Minyan Olat Shabbat, are all similarly unaffiliated. Hillel Levine, activist and scholar of religion, noted many years ago that the *havurah* phenomenon grew mostly out of the soil of Conservative Judaism because that movement had a particularly huge gap between values preached and those practiced, setting the stage for a whiff of hypocrisy, rebellion, and the quest for a new alternative. There may be other reasons for this as well, including the fact that the movement was better at giving its future leaders access to the sources than it was at creating rationales for living within its own definition of the halakhic framework. Hence the defections to both right and left.

For my own religious life and struggles, the continuum of *maskil* to *hasid* was much more meaningful than that which ranged from Orthodox to Reform. I was never much interested in knowing how much a particular person observed, whether he would drive to Shabbat dinner or only to shul, whether she ate fish out or only salads. I *was* trying to figure out whether I was an insider or an outsider to the tradition. Was I a scholar, living with a historical awareness that no longer allowed me to have faith? That was the maskil within me, reinforced by the cynical joking that was common in my JTS and later AJS (Association for Jewish Studies) academic circles. Or was I a neohasidic devotee longing for God's presence and trying to make some form of *avodat ha-shem* (service of God) central to my life? I was reading hasidic sources intensively, and not just as an academic exercise. While disinclined for many reasons to join the contemporary hasidic community, at the edge of which I stood for some time, the religious seriousness and passion I found in those sources continued to attract me, despite everything the maskil in me knew. I have lived out something of that struggle every day for the past four decades, in periods of both greater and lesser religious observance.

By the 1970s I began to notice that I was not alone in my discomfort with the available denominational labels. My friends who were working as rabbi-directors in Hillel Foundations around the country were serving the most diverse and interesting Jewish communities anywhere, in those happy years before denominational groups began to appear on the college campus. Those communities emphasized study and personal seeking, and these could well be conducted across denominational lines. The same was true in the academic community of Judaic scholars formed around the Association for Jewish Studies. We AJS members might have worried about whether a particular author or scholar was apologetic rather than critical in presenting Jewish sources or a particular historical epoch, but we were hardly concerned with whether or not he (mostly, in those days) *davvened mincha* (prayed the afternoon service).

Emerging Signs

A decade or so later the transdenominational framework began to appear beyond the college campus.¹ I first noticed it in adult education settings when such more serious programs as Wexner Heritage, Melton, and later Hebrew College's own Me'ah all appeared on the scene without any denominational sponsorship. This was followed in the 1990s with the appearance of community day schools that sought to serve students whose family affiliations ranged from modern Orthodox to secularist-cultural. It began to feel that some of the best energies in the Jewish community were devoted to various sorts of educational efforts that cut across denominational lines.

Throughout this period, rabbinic education and placement remained almost exclusively in denominational hands. This was true despite the 1930s effort of Stephen Wise to create the Jewish Institute of Religion (JIR) in New York, intended to fill the wide space between the JTS definition of Conservative Judaism and the Cincinnati version of Reform. JIR existed without a label, as does its successor, the Academy for Jewish Religion. But the graduates had often struggled to find placement, and they had not significantly changed the face of the American rabbinate. Indeed, it seemed fitting to most observers that rabbinic training be denominational. Rabbis, after all, had to stand for something. Unlike academic scholars, commitment was essential to their self-definition and communal role. Wasn't the something that rabbis stood for best defined by the respective denominational platforms?

I recall a conversation I had with Rabbi Daniel Lehmann when he asked me to serve on an advisory board for the then-in-formation New Jewish High School in Boston (now Gann Academy). While agreeing to serve, I suggested to him that a transdenominational high school faced a grave problem. All the most compelling Jewish educational settings of the past had succeeded because of strong and clear vision. These included such diverse educational streams as Chabad, B'nai Akiva, HaShomer HaTza'ir, and Camp Ramah of the 1950s. What would the pluralism of the New Jewish High School imply? That there was no right way to be Jewish? My concern, as a committed pluralist, was that the ideology of plural-

ism might forcibly vacate all other ideologies. If that were the case, I feared the school might not have the clarity of vision that would allow for a convincing education. Jewish secondary education also has to stand for something, and that something has to be more than pluralism.

Little did I realize then that my questions to Lehmann were just a stage setting for the precise challenge I would be taking on five years later in defying the conventional wisdom and established traditions of contemporary Jewry by creating a new transdenominational program of rabbinic training at Hebrew College. Clear to us (President David Gordis, Provost Barry Mesch, and myself, in the initial conversations) was that at Hebrew College rabbinical students would be trained in critical study of the sources and would be exposed to a postcritical embrace of Jewish faith. We advocated a personal reengagement with the sources, despite all one might learn about the historical settings in which they were written. We knew that the rabbinate demanded some sort of faith commitment and we said that neither non-Jews nor avowedly secularist Jews could enroll in the rabbinical program. But the nature of that faith and the extent of commitment to religious observance would be each student's own responsibility, and we, the Rabbinical School faculty, would not dictate in areas of either theological or halakhic conscience. (With regard to ethical probity, and on the single issue of students' choice of Jewish marriage or life partners, we did set standards.) That left me asking the very same questions I had put to Lehmann: To what values, other than pluralism and diversity, is your school committed? Can a transdenominational program that educates rabbis stand for something? What kind of rabbis will these be, those who have studied together with colleagues who will find their place in other denominations or in none at all?

The initial four years of the educational experiment at Hebrew College (as of this writing we are eagerly anticipating the ordination of members of the first class of rabbinical students in June 2008), have taught those of us who shaped the initial program a great deal about this question. We are confident that the rabbis in this program will be *better* trained for having sat in classes alongside others who disagree with them on almost every issue imaginable. If one thing characterizes the Jewish community today, it is

diversity. Two Jews not only have three opinions, as they say, but are likely these days to have different educations; childhood Jewish memories; views of law, religious beliefs, sexual orientations; and lots more. A rabbi has to minister to *all* of them. Where better to learn about how to respect and listen deeply to someone different than by sitting across the table from one another in the *beit midrash*? How better to sharpen your own understanding, to hone your own point of view, than by looking at the sources and discussing them openly, even arguing about them, in a mixed and diverse group of fellow students, where opinions and readings range across a wide spectrum?

The experiment has not always been an easy or comfortable one. Sometimes we faculty made assumptions about our students that missed the mark widely. As is true throughout American clergy education these days, classes at the Rabbinical School are peopled by individuals of a wide age range and very different in background, both professionally and in personal life experience. They do not always have an easy time listening to one another. But we have persisted in our belief that the forging of this diverse group into a community was vital to our enterprise, and the testimony of time has borne that out. By now I think it fair to say that students in our program have come to accept a certain set of values that characterize our community, even though each represents a particular blend and version of them, as we indeed hope they will. There is no single ideal type of Hebrew College rabbinical graduate, and all the values listed below are constantly up for appraisal and renewed conversation.

Common Values

The first value I would say the Rabbinical School of Hebrew College stands for is that of *klal yisrael*, the unity and wholeness of the Jewish people. We see ourselves as serving the entire Jewish community, including those who will not recognize the legitimacy of Hebrew College's rabbinic ordination. One of the great issues facing us as we look toward the Jewish future is the threat that our faculty and students will be divided in two because of differences

in halakhic praxis, especially around issues of conversion, marriage, and personal status. While concerned about this growing wedge, we in the Rabbinical School are also unhappy about driving Jews away from Jewish life because we seem cool or ambivalent in the welcome we offer to them. Because Hebrew College is transdenominational, we do not have an institutional stance on specific issues (for example, may a rabbi officiate at mixed marriages? May a rabbi lead a marriage ceremony involving a divorcee who has not had a traditional *get*? Will a rabbi welcome a gay couple—in Massachusetts or elsewhere—to celebrate an *ufruf* in his or her synagogue before their marriage?). But we work to inform our graduates fully of the implications of these decisions both for the individuals involved and for Jewish unity. Our goal is to enable each graduate to make well-informed and thoughtful decisions about his or her own rabbinic practice. We welcome and encourage dialogue with all sectors of the rabbinic community and value keeping open lines of personal cooperation and work on shared concerns, even in areas of serious disagreement. Only by self-conscious and committed efforts can world Jewry be protected from the disaster of a full split along religious lines, and we hope that our graduates, with a commitment to true diversity within *klal yisrael*, will contribute to that effort.

A commitment to *klal yisrael* also requires faith in the unity of the Jewish people across geographical distances and political borders. It especially demands involvement with the challenges facing the state of Israel on every level: political, moral, cultural, and religious, to name but a few. We in the Rabbinical School believe that Israel and its tribulations will be a major item on the agenda of every rabbi over the coming decades, and we need to educate with this in mind. A rabbi must empathize with the Israeli dilemma as our own problem, not someone else's. Again, the school does not demand a particular point of view on any issue, and our students and faculty represent a wide range of opinions. But we do expect involvement and commitment to struggle with the questions, and that is why study in Israel and learning about issues of Jewish identity and Judaism as they develop in Israel are important to our program. Happily, our student body has been enriched from the beginning with members raised in countries other than the United

States, including Israel, and that has made an important contribution to the Jewish diversity we so cherish.

The Rabbinical School is firmly committed to other values as well, despite our refusal to adhere to a denominational self-definition. Let me describe these across the traditional rubrics of *Torah*, *avodah*, and *gemilut hasadim* (learning, worship, and acts of kindness), which the most classical of sources says are Judaism's three pillars.

Ahavat Torah, the love of traditional Jewish learning, is the hallmark of Hebrew College's program. It is the value most exemplified by our faculty, scholars, and teachers of text, and the love we most want to impart to our students and in turn have them share throughout the Jewish community. We find that text learning brings us together, even as we argue over the meaning of a passage. Talmudic sages used to speak about "doing battle" with one another over the meaning of Torah. But once the argument was over, the "warriors" again saw one another as friends and fellow seekers. Jewish life needs more of that spirit today. We at Hebrew College offer and model for our students a love of Jewish texts and their interpretation. This love embraces the widest variety of Jewish sources, from the Bible and Talmud through mystical, literary, and artistic teachings, down to Jewish thought as it is being re-created in our own day. It includes the pursuit of wisdom and truth, based on the sources, but also with an integrity that acknowledges our own personal experience and the era in which we live. We read the sources critically, understand their historical settings, but then seek to reembrace them as living Torah and to interpret or rephrase them so that they may speak to seeking Jews and others today.

Key to that appreciation of the sources is our *beit midrash*, which has become the living heart of our program. In addition to formal classes, each student spends ten to twelve hours per week in this supervised study hall, poring over texts and preparing for class with the help of a special *beit midrash* staff. While the staff's emphasis is always on building skills, helping students develop the ability to master and feel at home in the texts, it is here that some of the most important conversations among these future rabbis take place. There is something here of the Lehrhaus ideology, a

sense that rabbinic education should be about access to the sources and a sharing of that access with the wider Jewish community. We are witness to a great hunger for serious Jewish learning among Jewish adults, almost all of whom are now graduates of fine university educations. The rabbi for the twenty-first century needs to have sufficient depth of text mastery (in the original Hebrew) so that she or he can select, translate, and present material on the high level that contemporary communities will demand.

Complementing a shared love of learning and the *beit midrash* is a deep commitment to the growth and development of the spiritual life as an important part of rabbinic training. Each rabbi needs to find his or her own way to an inner life of prayer, to thinking about God, to hewing out a deep inner well of empathy and caring on which he or she will draw daily throughout the rabbinic career. While these are deeply private matters, not discussed easily, rabbis know that having access to such a reservoir of faith is essential to finding and sharing the emotional strength required for the rabbinate. Rabbis who spend decades deeply involved with the lives of their congregants carry with them great burdens of personal pain. Techniques for developing the resources to deal with this aspect of the rabbinate, which are a growing focus in rabbinic education, should transcend all denominational lines. These include the Rabbinical School's prayer services, held each weekday in the *beit midrash* (attendance is required twice weekly), where a variety of approaches to prayer, ranging from the neohasidic to the very contemporary meditative, are offered. The emphasis in our worship is on *kavannah* and inwardness rather than on defending a particular prayer book or style of worship. Old techniques (hasidic *niggun* singing, and so forth) are welcome, as are new interpretations or readings, as long as they serve to open the heart and to make true prayer more accessible. Rabbinical School faculty include a number of exceptional *ba'alei tefillah* who personify and seek to teach the ability to make communal prayer an important and even transformative process.

Hebrew College also offers a voluntary program of spiritual direction to our students, one that offers them an opportunity for regular, confidential heart-to-heart conversations with a trained director, where they can share and articulate their own wrestling

with the deepest and most personal spiritual questions. This program, in effect since the second year of the Rabbinical School, has won wide appreciation and praise from students.

The same is true in the realm of *gemilut hasadim*, expanded to include a commitment to social justice and activism in areas where one feels a moral call. Little denominational difference exists among Jews when it comes to what are called *mitzvot beyn adam le-havero*, the good deeds we do toward our fellow humans. We all believe in reaching out to the poor, the sick, and the needy. We care about the elderly and the disabled and want to help. Hebrew College's rabbinical students, including those who represent all points on the observance spectrum, are attracted to programs of social and economic betterment, both those focused within the Jewish community and some that reach beyond its borders. In an era when persecution of Jews is mostly a historic memory, and when large parts of the Jewish community live amid wealth and privilege unimagined by prior generations, rabbinic moral leadership will be key in redefining the nature of a Jew's obligations and role in society. Hebrew College's programs of social justice are meant to prepare rabbis to assert that leadership and vision. In this area we also have the special privilege of being close to our neighbors at Andover-Newton Theological School, and many of our programs in this area are shared with the students of that highly activist Protestant institution.

Learning, spirituality, and social justice: the intellectual, devotional, and ethical dimensions of what it means to be a rabbi. All of these, it turns out, are areas where Hebrew College's rabbinical students, for all their diverse viewpoints, can work together and build a single Jewish community. We feel that is a lot to share, giving us a sense of strong commitments and a clear vision of the rabbinate that we faculty and students are shaping together. Yes, there will be points of divergence. Some keep *kashrut* more strictly, others are more lenient. Some drive on Shabbat, others do not. Occasionally we will even choose to go into separate rooms to pray, although we try not to do that too often. But having worked hard to build a community around those three pillars we all share, the differences between us lose their sharp edge. Respect and affection for one another come to outweigh the differences between

our chosen prayer books or specific practices. We work hard to be considerate of one another (food at communal gatherings is thus carefully labeled as to degree of kashrut, whether it was brought in on Shabbat or beforehand, for example) and try to include as wide an arc as possible within our embrace.

This emphasis on shared values across denominational lines does have its own bias. We in the Rabbinical School are indeed modeling that inwardness and sincerity in worship are more important than whether every word is said. Although kashrut is fully respected, we do model that sitting down at table with a wide variety of Jews is important. Shabbat is taught and modeled as a serious spiritual practice, which all students strive to observe in ever-growing ways, while remaining much challenged by the fact that as rabbis they indeed must look ahead to a career in which many will have to work at their jobs most fully on Shabbat. The concern is less with correct observance of each Sabbath law, which is left to the student's discretion, than with bringing the Shabbat spirit to the wide variety of communities students will lead. To do that, of course, the rabbi will need a rich well of Shabbat experience in his or her own life, and much of this has to be gained in rabbinical school. Periodic Shabbat retreats, shared meals as well as prayer services, singing and conversation long into the night are all vital parts of this rabbinic education.

We are neither so naïve nor so proud at Hebrew College to believe we have solved all the great challenges to contemporary rabbinic education. The gap between our educational ideal of mastering the rabbinic tradition and the rather different set of demands confronting rabbis in their actual careers is one we cannot resolve. The struggle with skill and language mastery and their place within the broader program plagues us as it does every program of rabbinic training. The constant competition for curricular hours (More intellectual history? More Bible? More management training? More personal growth-oriented courses?) confronts us as we shape each year's course of study. But we feel we have made some significant progress. A significant part of that lies in our seeing ourselves as an open, informal, diverse, and welcoming *beit midrash*. All the rest is commentary.

A Bigger Question

The perceptive reader will have noted a clear relationship between the two distinctive parts of this essay, the personal story and the institutional description. How could there not be? I was given the great privilege of creating a new institution for rabbinic training, defining its initial curriculum and priorities. As you would expect, these are significantly shaped by my own experiences and perceptions of Judaism and the contemporary rabbinate. As a scholar trained to study and explicate the Jewish past, I came to find greater challenge in thinking about the Jewish future and in trying to train a rabbinate appropriate to it, while still deeply rooted in the classical tradition. That rooting called for deep learning, upon which I have insisted. Openness to the diverse Jewish future has led to a nonrestrictive view with regard to personal observance and choices. I do want to show students that there are more important questions than "How much do you observe?" The maskil-hasid (outsider-insider) debate hopefully resounds louder within our walls than the Orthodox-Reform. Every rabbi today—indeed every seriously committed Jew—outside ultra-Orthodoxy has to ask the question, "How can I be honest with my own beliefs and still feel like an authentic insider to this ancient tradition?" I hope that our *beit midrash* will remain a good place to ask that question.

Report Series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01 (New York: United Jewish Communities, 2005), 14–16.

6. Jack Wertheimer, ed., *Family Matters: Jewish Education in an Age of Choice* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2007). On the larger personalization of American Jewish religious life, see Cohen and Eisen, *The Jew Within*.

7. In the last few years a renewed effort has been made to articulate the tenets of what some are calling a “common Judaism” (a reference to John Dewey’s classic work, *A Common Faith*). The philanthropist Michael Steinhardt and the scholar-teacher Rabbi Yitz Greenberg have been the most noted proponents of this effort. See Michael H. Steinhardt, “My Challenge: Towards a Post-Denominational Common Judaism,” *Contact* 7, no. 4 (Summer 2005): 14–15. See also the interview with Michael Steinhardt and Yitz Greenberg, “Jewish Movement, Jewish Renaissance: A Forum,” in *Contact* 6, no. 1 (Autumn 2003): 3–8, and the article by Rabbi David Gedzelman, “What Does the Hour Demand? Creating a New Movement in American Jewish Life,” in the same issue, pages 9–11.

8. Important work on the understanding of pluralism and its relation to particularism has been done in the Jewish-Catholic context by the team of Sara S. Lee and Mary C. Boys. They have convened several groups of Jewish and Catholic educators to work on this issue and coauthored a book on this process, *Christians and Jews in Dialogue: Learning in the Presence of the Other* (Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths, 2006). Many conceptual issues that apply to interreligious pluralism also apply within specific faith traditions such as Judaism, where ideological divisions among the denominations are pointed and not readily harmonized.

9. A modest but interesting debate is developing in the Jewish community on the relative merits of consolidated institutions like community day schools that have the potential to appeal to broad audiences (and achieve some economies of scale) versus a number of “boutique” programs that are more finely tailored to specific diverse audiences. For those interested in maximizing overall participation, the latter may have some actual advantages (by appealing to a larger number of niche markets), but also incurs potential costs related to the capacity to deliver qualitative edu-

cational excellence due to the diffusion of resources among many small programs, each of which has fixed infrastructure costs. In the day school world, at least, the tendency seems to be to push for widening the (potential) appeal of individual institutions by making them transdenominational. However, this has raised concomitant interest in finding ways to accommodate ideological diversity within umbrella institutions.

10. For an elaboration of these concepts, see the working paper of JESNA’s Lippman Kanfer Institute, *Redesigning Jewish Education for the 21st Century* (New York: JESNA, 2007).

11. See the initial list of noteworthy innovative programs in *Redesigning Jewish Education for the 21st Century*, appendix 2.

12. An example is the network of Conservative Jewish activists, lay and professional, that calls itself Shefa and whose statement of self-identification is “the Conservative Movement dreaming from within” (www.shefanetwork.org).

13. See, notably, the work on vision in Jewish education emanating from the Mandel Foundation and its associated institutions, especially Seymour Fox, Israel Scheffler, and Daniel Marom, eds., *Visions of Jewish Education* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003); and Daniel Pekarsky, *Vision at Work: The Theory and Practice of Beit Rabban* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2006).

Chapter 11

1. I do not include here reference to such communitywide functions as Jewish Federation agencies, fundraising structures, and Jewish community centers, which obviously existed long earlier, but usually under secular auspices.

Chapter 13

1. It was with this specific value in mind that the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation recently decided to develop—in partnership with the Hebrew Union College (HUC)—Jewish Institute of Religion, Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS), Synagogues: Transformation and Renewal (STAR), and the Center

Synagogues in a Time of Change

Fragmentation and Diversity in
Jewish Religious Movements

Zachary I. Heller, *Editor*

Published by the Alban Institute in cooperation with the
National Center for Jewish Policy Studies and STAR
(Synagogues: Transformation and Renewal)



Herndon, Virginia
www.alban.org