THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.
Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.
Subseries 2: Dan Pekarsky, 1981-2011, undated.

Box	Folder
76	2

Goals Project. Rabbinic education, 1998.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the American Jewish Archives website.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
513.487.3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

15 East 26th Street, New York, NY 10010-1579

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Dan Pekarsky	Jessica Holstein
PHONE NUMBER:	DATE:
608-262-1718	September 9, 1998
FAX NUMBER:	
608-262-9074	
RE:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
Conference on Rabbinic Education	12

Dan,

Attached please find rough notes and the flipcharts from the August 13th meeting on curriculum for the Conference on Rabbinic Education. We hope they reflect accurately the discussions. If you have any comments or changes, let me know.

We will call you for the meeting in your office at 12 noon (New York time) tomorrow, Thursday, September 10.

Be well.

Jessica

Telephone: (212) 532-2360, ext. 25
Fax: (212) 532-2646
E-mail: jsholstein@compuserve.com

CONFIDENTIAL - DRAFT

Notes: Conference on Rabbinic Education Curriculum Planning Meeting

Date: **August 18, 1998**

Participants: **Karen Barth**
Gail Dorph
Ellen Goldring
Cippi Harte
Jessica Holstein
Barry Holtz
Dan Pekarsky
Mike Rosenak (via telephone)
Wendy Rosov

cc: **Susan Stodolsky**

I. Brief Background, Report on May 5th Planning Committee Meeting, Previous Communications

1. Rabbinic heads have never met as a group before
2. Cummings funding
3. Planning to date – materials presented, background information, size participants

Major issues that came out of May 5 planning meeting:
1. Changing role of the rabbi
2. Rabbi as spiritual leader
3. Curriculum design

Common issues –
1. need for remedial work – students coming in with lower level of preparation to non-Orthodox institutions
2. need for professional skills
3. personal spiritual development

Research – institutional needs vs. needs in the field
Charles Liebman – Training of American Rabbis 1968, American Jewish Yearbook
Currently professor at Bar Ilan, does civil religion, interesting to ask what his questions were in 1968.

II. Goals and Messages for the Conference

Our goals for conference:
- Articulate and raise consciousness of problems and issues
- To get them to think in a new way
- To get them to think of curriculum as related to goals
- Developing rabbi as spiritual leader
- Time for interaction amongst participants
- Encouraging and developing collegiality amongst group – developing group as a working group, taking on piece of problem together

Message for them to come away with:
1. How to improved connection between needs of rabbis in field and education by use of the following:
2. Coherent educational theory and vision (good examples Alverno, Dewey)
3. Attention to adult learning (no good examples) or teaching and learning
4. Integrated approach to competencies and subject matter

What do we want to send them home with?
New ways to tackle problems, collaboratively
New ways of thinking about theory into practice

1. Connection between educational goals and what the curriculum could look like – thinking in a new way
   - Vision
   - Practice
2. Consciousness of problem that there is difference between academic approach and *limud Torah*
3. Cultivation of piety integrating with community of interpretation

Program:
1. Presenting ideas as food for thought, various new ways of thinking, interesting person who will present a framework, and
2. How can, or can this framework be applied to one's own situation – do an exercise and then look at what we learn from it

III. Issues and Questions Raised

What is it that needs to be taught in 5 years to give rabbis what they need to know?

What is the problem? Is there a problem?
- Do rabbis in the field think there is a problem?
- Do congregants think there is a problem?
- Does faculty think there is problem?

Ask institutions:
What is the institution's educational theory? How does it relate to their curriculum?
US higher education model: If you know enough, then you can do.

Ask institutions: What is the enterprise?
- Is training a rabbi like training a grad student (e.g. professor), or like training a professional (e.g. doctor)?
- Is rabbinic education about learning or is it about practice?

How does one use knowledge in practice?
- in visiting a sick person
- counseling a family
- giving a *dvar Torah*
- fundraising, manage a staff, etc

What is the relationship between knowledge of rabbis vs. knowledge of congregrants?

What are the differing needs of different communities?
Training for specialization within rabbinate – education, chaplaincy, academic

What are the institution' goals? How does it connect to what they think rabbis need to be able do?

What faculty seminars have already been done?

How much bible, talmud do we need to teach in order to be seen as authentic?
How much is relevant in world where rabbi is no longer adjudicating (ie. making legal decisions)?

What makes rabbinic education different from other kinds of education?

IV. Program strawman (annotated from flipchart)

1. Where are we?

- Changing role of the rabbi – ask rabbis in the field how their education relates or doesn't to what they do - research to show that there is a problem:
    - survey of rabbis
    - survey of congregants – has this been done? (Riv-Ellen Prell, Sam Heilman) (low expectations of rabbis by congregants, especially outside major Jewish communities)

- Current state of rabbinic education(history?) – look at institution's materials and programs

- New ideas being tried – interview heads of rabbinic schools – look at experiments in change

- Their major concerns

2. Rethinking our educational goals

- Lecture on vision – Goals Seminar, DNP on the Dewey School, Scheffler, Alverno
- Conceptions/models of leadership – e.g., Rosenak on intention, Heiffetz, Art Green on chassidic leadership
- Exercise – e.g. what does an educational (or in this case rabbinical) leader need to know and putting it up on the wall (brainstorming)? (needs thought) perhaps different groups in *chevruta* or by institution doing different exercises, thinking outside the box e.g. give them a goal and then give them an assignment related to or in pursuit of that goal
- Text study

3. Rethinking our educational theory
- What it is now
- Alverno
- Bob Keegan on adult learning
- Sharon Feiman-Nemser on mentoring
- School of thought – what makes great education
- Lee Shulman
- Emanuel Etkiss's essay on Salanter's theory of leadership
- Louie Ginsburg's work
- Educational theory vis a vis theological education (Barbara Wheeler, Auburn at UTS, Mary Boize)

Different roles of rabbis:
- Rabbi as teacher/educator
- Rabbi as leader
- Rabbi as philosopher/theologian – capacity to answer large questions (Why do bad things happen? Illness, death, etc.)
- Rabbi as counselor
- Rabbi as ritual leader
- Priestly type vs. free spirit (Lichtenstein vs. Amital at Gush)
- Take into account the "be" issue – not just what rabbis need to know and do, but what they need to be
- Different models of Jewish leadership – material (Aviel) to stimulate a conversation on this issue
  - talmid chacham – knowledgeable Jew
  - tzadik – normative Jew
  - chassid – charismatic Jew

How will the conversations at this conference be different and interesting?
1. Data will be new.
2. We need to frame/name it a new way.

Use model of the Goals Seminar to curricularize this conference including presentation of big ideas.

Changing institutions – introduce concept of how to change institutions: mindset of faculty, culture of institutions
- This would be new
- To give them hope, to give them sense of the possibilities
- But danger is that we are telling them that we have the answers and we are telling them what to do

Educational goals and educational theory are integrally related.
1. Current theory
2. Educational goals
3. Rethinking educational theory
4. Institutional change is a seminar on its own, or fold into:
5. Working together – next steps

What is the role of the rabbinical school in the development path of the rabbi? What could be part of the system for on-going support of rabbi?

Flipchart (annotated):
Look at issues through 4 different lenses with 2 or more examples:
- Coherence of goal and program (is it cohorent? is it right? is it focused?)
  - Alverno
  - Volozhin Yeshiva
  - Yeshivat Har Etzion
- Entry-level program ≠ preparation for work
  - University
  - PDS (professional development school)
  - Mentoring
- Knowledge-in-use –
  - Field
  - Learning by doing?
  - Internships?
  - What does it mean to learn?
  - How do graduates have to hold their knowledge?
  - Alverno
- Spiritual formation – but it is a different genre from the others
- Next steps – how would you (the institutions) take this process forward?

Perhaps institutions could bring their own cases – this is what we said we would do for them through the interviews. Interview them in enough detail and create composite cases to work with.

How to provide opportunities to develop collegiality and colleagues to discuss difficult issues - consider interviewing Steve Shaw (alternative rabbinic professional development retreats, knows Christian people, how to get people to engage)

Next meeting – September 23, 9am-1pm in New York

Possible Presenters
- Mike Rosenak - coming
- Mary Diez, Sister Joel Read
- Sharon Feiman-Nemser – GZD to email to ask to hold the date
- Deborah Ball
- David Cohen
- Lee Shulman – BWH to email to ask to hold the date
- David Kelsey, Princeton – theological education
- Barbara Wheeler
- Mary Elizabeth Moore – presented at UJ
- People from Christian seminary world on similar problems:
  - Father Austin Duran
  - Mary Boize – consulted already to HUC, JTS
- Someone on spiritual formation or other big ideas – names from theological seminary association
- Secular divinity school – Harvard, Yale, Chicago
- Martin Marty

INTRODUCTION

- Coherence of goal & program

  Is it coherent?

  Is it right?

  Is it focused?

  Case of what?

  - Alverno
  - Heilman/Yeshivat Ha: Etzion
  - Volozhin Yeshiva

- Entry-level program ≠ prep. for work ↘

  univ. - PDS (field)

  mentoring

- Knowledge-in-use – field

  What does it mean to learn?

  Learning by doing?

  Internships?

- How do graduates have to hold their knowledge?

- Spiritual formation

Next steps

Interviews w/ heads of schools

- Existing UJ – Gail, Karen
  HUC
  RRC
  JTS
- New

Susan, Cippi, Karen

1. Field Interviews
   - Researcher
   - Protocol
   - Plan

2. Next Meeting

3. Invitations

Mary Elizabeth Moore?

✓ - Rosenak

David Kelsey

Barbara Wheeler

- Dietz? Joel?
- Sharon – Gail
- Shulman – Barry
- Debra/David
- Keegan?

1. Is there a problem –

   What is it?

1. Connection between educational goals & what the curriculum could look like –

   <u>Thinking in a new way</u>

   - concept
   - practice

2. Consciousness of problem

   that there is a difference between academic approach & *limudei Torah*

3. Cultivation of piety - - integration with community of interpretation

- Make explicit the underlying educational theory

1. Where are we
    - Changing Role of the Rabbi
    - Current State of Rabbinic Education (History?)
    - New ideas being tried
    - Their major concerns

- survey of rabbis?
- survey of congregants?

2. Rethinking our educational goals
    - Lecture on Vision
    - Art Green, Heiffetz, Rosenak
    - Exercise
    - Study

Rabbi as
- Teacher
- Counselor
- Leader
- Ritual Leader
- Philosopher/Theologian

3. Rethinking of Educational Theory
    - What it is now
    - Alverno
    - Keegan
    - Sharon on Mentoring
    - School of Thought

- Theological Education

4. Changing our institutions
    - Institutional Δ - Synagogue Δ

5. Working Together – Next Steps

15 East 26th Street, New York, NY 10010-1579

Conference on Rabbinic Education

Tuesday, August 18, 1998
Agenda

1) Update on participants/institutions
2) Reports on meetings
3) Curriculum discussion
4) Survey
   a) Institutions
   b) Rabbis "in the field"

CONFIDENTIAL

Notes: Conference on Rabbinic Education Planning Meeting

Date:	**May 5, 1998**
Participants:	**Sami Barth** **Norman Cohen** **Rachel Cowan** **Dan Gordis** **Bill Lebeau** **Marcia Prager** **Ron Price** **Reena Spicehandler (via telephone)**
CC:	**Jonathan Magonet**
CIJE Staff :	**Karen Barth** **Cippi Harte** **Jessica Holstein**

I. Overview of the project – goals

Through CIJE's work with several rabbinic training institutions, it has become clear that there are many common issues being addressed. This project is intended to deal with the needs and issues of the participating institutions, to offer an opportunity for the exchange of ideas and for exposure to new ideas. Leadership development is a high priority area for both CIJE and for the Nathan Cummings Foundation. The idea for the conference was born out of this joint interest. The model was taken from the business and consulting world where top industry leaders come together for a retreat, putting aside competition to talk about industry-wide issues.

Orthodox participation was raised, and it was reported that Orthodox institutions have been invited.

II. Introductions

The participants introduced themselves and briefly described their backgrounds and institutions (summary attached). Institutions would like to share their literature with each other. CIJE staff will facilitate this

process and distribute the materials along with developing and distributing a contact list (attached).

III. Major issues

Two documents were distributed (attached):

- List of issues raised by participants
- Summary of the above

Other issues discussed were:

- Rabbis as change agents, as members of a team of clergy
- Transforming rabbinical schools into spiritual environments without sacrificing academic or halachic standards
- Cost of rabbinic education
- Needs assessment of the Jewish community
- Issues of recruitment to the field and instilling a sense of service
- Use of technology to foster sense of connection and community to help prevent burn-out, particularly for those serving in remote areas
- Connection of institutions to rabbinic bodies and way to use these bodies to serve as support systems and vehicles for professional development
- Medical school internship/residency model for post-ordination programs
- Use of rabbinic education as a method for personal growth, not necessarily for training for rabbinate – should *talmud Torah l'shma* (learning Torah for its own sake) not for the sake of serving the community be something rabbinical seminaries encourage or support?

IV. Program ideas

Participants agreed that the conference should focus on 3 of the 5 issues on the summary page:

- The changing Jewish community, the changing role of the rabbi and how that could effect rabbinic education
- The rabbi as spiritual leader
- Curriculum design

There was a suggestion to bring in experts from outside fields to present at the conference. There should be a balance to allow for internal networking and exchange in addition to outside presenters. It was suggested that papers from presenters could be sent out and read beforehand so that the actual presentations could be short to allow for more discussion time. Possible presenters could include:

- Ron Heifetz, Kennedy School - development of leadership
- Mandel Institute – connection between curriculum and vision

- Alverno College – curriculum development
- Janet Walton, Union Theological Seminary – spiritual development
- A Jewish sociologist, e.g. Riv Ellen Prell
- Rabbi Lionel Blue, England – "neshama formation"

There was a suggestion to have the participants prepare working papers on outstanding projects or programs which could serve as the basis for discussions. Because participants' time is limited, CIJE offered to interview participants and do some of the preparatory work for the participants in terms of compiling and writing up materials. A needs assessment with data on the changing Jewish community was also suggested as a useful tool on which to base some of the discussions. The idea of interviewing a cross-section of rabbis in the field was discussed.

V. Invitees

There was general consensus that the group should be kept small and senior to facilitate meaningful discussion, though it was also suggested that if the conference were larger, there could be parallel tracks and more discussions could take place at the same time. It was recognized that institutions with multiple locations (e.g. HUC) should have more participants, since they have more senior people and issues may also be different for different campuses.

In order to impact/affect one's own institution after the conference, having a group attend which may include faculty could help create allies for effecting real change in the institution. It was suggested that faculty could be involved in discussions on institutional change or perhaps there could be separate sessions for faculty. The issue was left for further discussion.

It was agreed the involving lay leaders is important at some point. A one-day consultation with lay people following the conference was suggested as a forum for getting their reactions to ideas presented at, and synthesized from, the conference. It was suggested that this issue be on the agenda as a topic for discussion at the conference, and then planned for a future date, but initially it probably better to let the professionals coalesce as a group.

VI. Date/location/logistics - additional planning meetings

The conference will probably be held at a conference center in the New York area, but outside of the city to encourage focus and consistent attendance.

A 3-day, 2-night conference held Sunday to Tuesday was proposed by CIJE, and participants agreed this was acceptable. Participants said that

they would like to hold the conference before next spring/summer. Sunday to Tuesday, February 7 to 9, 1999, was suggested as a possible date.

CIJE will contact participants about potential dates for one additional planning meeting and to confirm the conference date.

VII. On-going life of this group

The possibility was raised that the group could have an on-going life, doing work on more specific issues over time.

The Cummings Foundation would like to see this group continue beyond the conference and would be interested in supporting it, though the group would also require new funding.

Conference on Rabbinic Education
Planning Meeting – May 5, 1998

I. Summary of Issues

1. The changing Jewish community and the changing role of the rabbi and how that could effect rabbinic education

   - Rethinking the rabbinic role
   - Working to redefine the expectations organizations have of rabbis
   - Academic rigor vs. spiritual development vs. professional development
   - Need for specialized tracks
   - Leadership training
   - Learning how to work with intermarrieds, spiritual seekers, the uncommitted, pluralistic communities, etc.
   - What does a rabbi need to know and be able to do?

2. The rabbi as spiritual leader

   - Instilling a sense of service
   - The rabbi as someone who models a profound spiritual practice

3. Post-ordination assistance to rabbis to help with their integration into various work environments

   - On-going support system
   - On-going training
   - Supporting new graduates
   - Working with family issues
   - Dealing with burnout
   - Supporting the relationship between rabbi and cantor
   - Gender issues

4. Curriculum design

   - What it means to know a text
   - Dealing with students with a variety of backgrounds
   - Rethinking our system for teaching Hebrew that maximizes readiness to study rabbinic texts

5. The on-going life of this group

   - In what ways could the seminaries work together on addressing some of these issues?

Conference on Rabbinic Education
Planning Meeting – May 5, 1998

II. List of Major Issues Suggested by Participants

1. General, long-term goal of rabbinic "survival" – prevent burn-out and encourage continued on-going professional development through supervision and peer review and additional studies

2. Enabling rabbinic students to operate in a pluralistic world, to cross ideological barriers, to differentiate ideology and politics, and to deal with conflicts in this area

3. Relationship between what we teach and the job description of a rabbi

4. Role of the rabbi as repository of information vs. spiritual master – someone who models a profound spiritual practice – who models the effects of living a profound spiritual life and can teach it

5. Development of leadership training for rabbis

6. Do graduates need different skills given the changing nature of the community?

7. Academic rigor vs. spiritual development

8. Denominational commitments vs. pluralism

9. What things could the seminaries do together?

10. Structure of rabbinic studies/frameworks within which rabbis operate and support systems provided for them

11. Outreach to the uncommitted

12. Strategies for work with the intermarried

13. Challenges of Israel-Diaspora relations

14. How do we support our graduates in their first 2 or 3 years after ordination? Can we do more – possibly working together?

15. How specialized should training be – in preparing for one specific modality of the rabbinate – congregation, Hillel, chaplaincy, administration?

16. How are we supporting the relationship between rabbi and cantor – as being collegial and respectful? How much does each profession understand of the other?

17. How well are we working with spouses/partners of students to prepare them for the familial stresses that are part of the rabbinic life? Is our anecdotal sense of high divorce rate in the rabbinate supported by any research? If not, might we be able to commission such research and concurrently think about strategies that we might use to lessen family pressures. Parallels from medical profession.

18. Should we alert each other to potential applicants where we become aware of serious concerns about conduct, as opposed to existential/religious unsuitability for one seminary or another?

19. How do we integrate the needs of the professional work with the scholarship we would like to impart?

20. How do we respond to changing Jewish community within the educational process?

21. Essential requirements in academic studies of Judaism

22. Should we try to change the job description?

23. Is the rabbinic role too broad? What are we training rabbis for? How do we prioritize?

24. What should the academic course include?

25. Changing nature of the Jewish community

26. Integrating the academic and the professional in rabbinic training

27. Short-term vs. long-term education – where does our learning process fit in to the on-going education of a rabbi?

28. Students with a variety of backgrounds, e.g. day school/yeshiva vs. little background

29. What does it mean to "know" a text?

30. How do we help our graduates be more successful once they are in the field?

31. Developing long-term professional support system

32. Are we pleased with any current system for teaching Hebrew in a way that maximizes readiness to study primary rabbinic sources? If not, could we work together to create such a system?

33. Teaching students to create open Jewish communities that are responsive to the changing needs and demographics of the Jewish community and yet do not compromise the values and traditions of Judaism – e.g. dealing with the role of intermarried couples and their children in the synagogue

34. Instilling a sense of service to the Jewish people as opposed to viewing the rabbinate primarily as a means of self-fulfillment

35. Learning how to make Jewish spirituality accessible to those with minimal Jewish education

36. Developing strategies to protect against rabbinic burnout – how to do a good job and still make time to refill our emotional and spiritual wellsprings

37. Gender issues for men as women increasingly take on leadership roles

38. Need for de-professionalization of the rabbinate

39. Educational preparation for the human toll that accompanies the rabbinic profession

40. How can we teach rabbis to both set limits for their own protection while at the same time encouraging selflessness?

41. Relationship between the rabbi and the congregation

42. How do we successfully communicate to student and community alike the sense that the role of rabbi is not (only?) a professional role but a religious/spiritual one?

August 17, 1998

Dear :

In response to the changing realities of Jewish life in America, many institutions and agencies are engaged in a process of reimagining and reinventing themselves. This environment of change is placing new demands on rabbinic leadership. Several (if not all) of the major rabbinical schools have begun assessing their programs in light of these external changes. In our consultations with rabbinic programs and in running leadership seminars, we have seen that in spite of the very real differences in outlook and practice among the various movements many of the critical issues in training rabbis cut across the denominational spectrum.

The Nathan Cummings Foundation and CIJE have jointly agreed to sponsor a conference that will bring together leaders of rabbinic training programs from around the world to discuss some of the common issues they face as they plan for the future. This conference will be organized around a highly interactive format. Our aim is to facilitate the sharing of ideas among the various rabbinic institutions and to seed the discussion with stimulating ideas from other fields (i.e. business, general education, leadership training and political science.)

The conference will take place over 3-days and 2-nights at a retreat center. Some issues of interest we have heard in preliminary discussions with rabbinical school leaders are:

- Changing rabbinic roles and their implications for educational goals and programs
- The development of the rabbi as a spiritual/ethical person
- New findings in the field of adult learning
- The recruiting, training, development and ongoing management of rabbinical school faculty
- Improving the educational effectiveness of mentoring and field work programs
- The role of rabbinic education programs in the ongoing development of rabbis after graduation

The design of the conference will reflect the expressed needs and concerns of leaders of rabbinic programs. For this reason, we are inviting each institution to appoint a point person to serve on the planning committee. The planning group will help develop the agenda, the invitation list, the topics to be discussed, the presenters and the logistical arrangements. Planning meetings will take place in New York, but those who wish to join by phone will be welcome.

Please let us know if you are interested in attending, and, if so, who from your institution would like to participate in this conference. In general, we would like to invite up to two people from each school, but exceptions can be made where appropriate. It is our thinking to keep this group small enough to allow for maximum participation and interaction. If there is someone from your institution who can help with the planning, please send his/her name and contact information at your earliest convenience (see attached form).

The conference will be free of charge. CIJE and Nathan Cummings Foundation will underwrite all hotel and meal costs. Travel expenses will be the responsibility of individual participants, although travel stipends are available for those who need them.

We look forward to your participation and hope to hear from you soon.

B'shalom,

Karen A. Barth
Executive Director

cc: Rachel Cowan

CONFERENCE ON RABBINIC EDUCATION

The American rabbinate is in flux. With synagogue transformation in the air and the baby-boomers coming into middle age, the congregational rabbi is being called upon to fulfill new roles and to carry out old roles in new ways. At the same time, more and more rabbis are moving into careers outside of congregational settings.

The leaders of the major rabbinical schools are struggling to respond to the challenge of these changing realities. Many of the major schools are in the process of looking at how to revamp their programs. They are talking about rabbis as spiritual leaders, rabbis as change agents, rabbis as educators (in the broadest sense), rabbis as community builders, rabbis as chaplains, rabbis as pastors, rabbis as outreach workers. They are trying to define what these mean in relation to educational goals, curriculum, pedagogical approaches, campus life, role models, field experience and many other aspects of their programs. At the same time they are struggling with the reality that most incoming students need an enormous amount of basic learning in language and texts.

In the course of CIJE's consulting work with some of these institutions, it has become clear that they have much to learn from each other and that they might also gain from learning about state-of-the-art thinking from outside of the Jewish world: e.g. from the field of general education in such areas as faculty training, curriculum development, mentoring programs, models of teaching and learning, goal definition, and from approaches used to train leaders in other fields.

THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCE

We are proposing to plan and hold a conference that will bring together the leaders of rabbinic education programs from around the world. The objectives of the conference will be four-fold:

1) Reflection - To provide the leadership of rabbinic education programs with an opportunity to step outside their daily environment and reflect upon the changes happening in rabbinic roles and the implication of these changes for rabbinic education.

2) Idea Sharing - To provide a forum in which ideas can be shared and leaders can learn from each other.

3) New Perspectives - To present and discuss ideas from related fields of endeavor such as: business, general education, political science, and the training of leadership, that might stimulate new thinking about rabbinic education.

4) Discussion of ongoing needs - To encourage these leaders to think about whether they might benefit from meeting or working together in an ongoing way, and, if so, in what context this might take place.

THE CONCEPT

In the business world, conferences are occasionally organized between the top executives of an industry, bringing together corporate leaders from competitive organizations who otherwise might not ever have occasion to speak to each other. At these conferences, with the help of highly skilled facilitator, these leaders have an opportunity to discuss the big issues that the industry as a whole faces and to exchange ideas with others who are facing these same issues. Typically, such conferences include brief presentations by a select few industry analysts and thinkers. These are usually delivered in an interactive style, keeping lectures to a minimum. Senior executives find these gatherings extremely interesting and helpful, and very rarely turn down an chance to attend.

Our concept is patterned after this model. We will bring together the senior leaders of the world's rabbinic education programs in a setting conducive to roundtable discussions. The group will be a small one in order to encourage interchange of ideas during the formal program and also during the informal parts of the conference. Facilitators will help ensure that the conversation stays focused. Presenters will offer new ways of thinking that would seed the deliberations with new ideas.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

We will convene a planning meeting to which representatives of all the institutions will be invited. The international institutions and those finding it difficult to travel can join by teleconference. This planning group will decide on the agenda, the invitation list, the topics to be discussed, the presenters and the logistical arrangements. Recommendations in each of these areas will be prepared in advance of the planning meeting by CIJE staff, based on phone calls with the participants.

PROGRAM

We envision a 3-day, 2-night conference. Some of the issues that might be addressed are:

- Changes in rabbinic roles and their implications for educational goals and programs
- The development of the rabbi as a spiritual person
- Approaches to teaching and learning inside and outside the classroom
- The recruiting, training, development and ongoing management of faculty
- Improving the educational effectiveness of mentoring and field work programs

- The role of rabbinic education programs in the ongoing development of rabbis after graduation.

The program will be developed by the planning committee but will likely include some or all of the following:

- Facilitated roundtable discussions on key issues
- Brief presentations followed by discussions with leading thinkers from other relevant fields
- A panel/discussion with leading congregational rabbis
- A session devoted to sharing of specific new ideas and to discussing experiments currently underway
- Text study
- A discussion of what ongoing meetings or collaborative projects might be fruitful.

INSTITUTIONS TO BE INVITED

Our initial thoughts are that the following institutions should be invited:

- Hebrew Union College
- Jewish Theological Seminary
- University of Judaism
- Reconstructionist Rabbinical College
- Yeshiva University
- The Academy for Jewish Religion
- The Leo Baeck College
- Jews College of London
- Seminario Rabinico Latinoamericano, Argentina

♦ Any other major Orthodox seminaries interested in attending

The smaller institutions will be invited to send up to two people, the larger ones up to three. This would mean a group of roughly 25, plus presenters and CIJE staff.

LOGISTICS

Our initial thinking on the logistics is to hold the conference at the Chauncey Conference Center in Princeton, New Jersey. This conference center is 1½ hours from New York City and 1 hour from Newark Airport. It is a beautiful, secluded spot with rolling lawns, ponds and garden and modern, business-like meeting facilities. It is less "corporate" than most such facilities but still efficient and comfortable.

Kosher food can be brought into the facility from a nearby kosher caterer, heated and served by the Center's kitchen staff. A local *Mashgiach* would be hired to oversee the food service.

* * *

It is our firm belief that development of dynamic, inspiring leadership is the most important challenge in the revitalization of Jewish life in North America, and that the education of rabbis is an important place to start reexamining the way the Jewish community prepares people for leadership roles. This conference could become a catalyst for important change in the way rabbinic leaders are recruited, trained and developed, and could ultimately have far-reaching impact on the preparation of all types of leaders for Jewish organizations.

BUDGET

CIJE	
Staff	$20,000
Secretarial	5,000
Postage, Phone, Supplies	1,500
PLANNING MEETING	
Travel, Meals, Hotel	3,500
CONFERENCE	
Facility (250/day x 2½ x 35)	22,000
Travel (Participants)	15,000
Honoria and Presenters travel	10,000
PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDS	
Publication costs	5,000
TOTAL	$82,000

CIJE would contribute its staff and secretarial time, postage, phone and supplies as well as the cost of the planning meeting and publication (total $35,000). We are seeking a grant for the balance of $47,000.

J:\KAB\CORE2.WPD

CIJE Conference on Rabbinic Education
List of Invitees and Prospective Participants (March 1998)

Rabbi Norman J. Cohen, Provost
Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute for Religion, New York, NY
Attendees: Norman Cohen, Sheldon Zimmerman

Dr. Daniel Gordis, Dean of Rabbinics
Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies, University of Judaism, Bel Air, CA
Attendees: Daniel Gordis, Edward Harwitz, Aryeh Cohen

Rabbi Robert Hirt, Vice President for Administration and Professional Education
Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, Yeshiva University, New York, NY

Rabbi William H. Lebeau, Dean of Rabbinical School
Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, NY
Attendees: William Lebeau

Rabbi Professor Jonathan Magonet, Principal
The Leo Baeck College, London, England
Attendees: Jonathan Magonet

Rabbi Marcia Prager, Head of Rabbinical Program
Aleph: Alliance for Jewish Renewal, Philadephia, PA
Attendees: Marcia Prager

Professor David-Hillel Ruben
Jews College, London, UK

Dr. David Teutsch, President
Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Wyncote, PA
Attendees: David Teutsch, Reena Spicehandler

Rabbi Shohama Wiener, President
Academy for Jewish Religion, New York, NY
Attendees: Shohama Wiener, Samuel Barth

Rabbi Dr. David Weiss-Halivni, Resh Metivta
Institute of Traditional Judaism (The Metivta), Teaneck, NJ
Attendees: David Weiss-Halivni, Ron Price

Rabbi Dr. Felipe Yafe, Dean
Seminario Rabinico Latinamericano, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Attendees: Felipe Yafé, Abraham Skorka

15 East 26th Street, New York, NY 10010-1579

Conference on Rabbinic Education Planning Committee

Rabbi Samuel Barth, Dean
The Academy for Jewish Religion
15 West 86th Street, New York, NY 10024
Tel: 212-875-0540, ext. 13
Fax: 212-875-0541
E-mail: 76053.2174@compuserve.com
Internet: www.geocities.com/CollegePark/Lab/5476

Rabbi Norman Cohen, Provost
Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute for Religion
1 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012
Tel: 212-824-2215
Fax: 212-358-7752
E-mail: rnc1@is2.nyu.edu
Internet: www.huc.edu

Rabbi Rachel Cowan
Program Director, Jewish Life
Nathan Cummings Foundation
1926 Broadway, Suite 600, New York, NY 10023
Tel: 212-787-7300
Fax: 212-787-7377
E-mail: rc@cummings.ncf.org
Internet: www.ncf.org

Dr. Daniel Gordis, Dean*
Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies
University of Judaism
15600 Mulholland Drive, Bel Air, CA 90077-1599
Tel: 310-476-9777, ext. 257
Fax: 310-471-1278
E-mail: dgordis@uj.edu
Internet: www.uj.edu
*On sabbatical 1998-99:
Mandel Institute
15 Rehov Graetz, Jerusalem 93111, Israel
Tel: (972-2) 566-2832
Fax: (972-2) 566-2837
E-mail: dgordis@uj.edu

Rabbi William H. Lebeau, Dean of Rabbinical School
Jewish Theological Seminary of America
3080 Broadway, New York, NY 10027
Tel: 212-678-8067
Fax: 212-678-8947
E-mail: wilebeau@jtsa.edu
Internet: www.jtsa.edu

Rabbi Professor Jonathan Magonet, Principal
Leo Baeck College
Sternberg Centre for Judaism
80 East End Road, London N3 2SY, UK
Tel: 011 (44-181) 349-4525
Fax: 011 (44-181) 343-2558
E-mail: Leo-Baeck-College@mailbox.ulcc.ac.uk

Rabbi Marcia Prager , Head of Rabbinical Program
Aleph: Alliance for Jewish Renewal
Home/office:
228 West Hortter Street, Philadephia, PA 19119
Tel: 215-849-9227
Fax: 215-849-0945
E-mail: marciaprag@aol.com
Internet: www.aleph.org

Rabbi Ronald D. Price, Dean
Institute for Traditional Judaism (The Metivta)
811 Palisade Avenue, Teaneck, NJ 07666
Tel: 201-801-0707
Fax: 201-801-0449
E-mail: rprice@utj.org
Internet: www.utj.org/home

Rabbi Reena Spicehandler, Dean of Students
Reconstructionist Rabbinical College
Church Road & Greenwood Avenue
Wyncote, PA 19095
Tel: 215-576-0800, ext. 25
Fax: 215-576-6143
E-mail: spice@rrc.edu
Internet: (website under construction)

CIJE
15 East 26th Street, Suite 1817
New York, NY 10010
Tel: 212-532-2360
Fax: 212-532-2646

Karen Barth, Executive Director
Tel: 212-532-2360, ext. 22
E-mail: karenbarth@compuserve.com

Cippi Harte, Project Manager
Tel: 212-532-2360, ext. 21
E-mail: pcharte@compuserve.com

Jessica Holstein, Program Assistant
Tel: 212-532-2360, ext. 25
E-mail: jsholstein@compuserve.com

From: Wendy Jill Rosov <wrosov@leland.Stanford.EDU>
To: Dan Pekarsky <danpek@macc.wisc.edu>
Date: 11/17/98 11:28AM
Subject: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL HEADS OF SCHOOL

Interview Protocol for Heads of School --Final Draft: 10/23/98
1. Tell us about the three or four most exciting and important new things or changes that are going on now in your rabbinical school?
2. Could you talk a little about what is guiding these changes? Is there any specific model of education from which you are working? We are particularly curious to understand: why these changes and not others?
3. Explain how these changes connect to what is already in place -- how are they integrated into the greater whole of the total program?
4. What, if any, impediments to change are you encountering? How are you dealing with these barriers?

internal to institution

5. We are curious to know how your institution views the challenges facing the American [this will have to be different for Seminario and Leo Baeck or left out altogether] rabbinate today and in what ways the curriculum (both extant and new) is tied to trying to prepare rabbis to meet these challenges.
6. In thinking about the relationship between the challenges facing the contemporary rabbinate and how the curriculum strives to prepare future rabbis to meet these challenges, what do you identify as the most difficult problems in rabbinic education facing you today? [Are these problems different than those of 5 or 10 years ago? How?]
7. If you could make any change(s) above and beyond what you have on your plate at present, what would it/they be and why?

================

Wendy Rosov
510-558-9298
wrosov@leland.stanford.edu
fax (510) 524-4105

Filipe Yaffé

No conception of "educated rabbi"

Pool - strengths/weakness/motivation

Rabbi Yoffe –

① Background

Marshall Meyer – { Mordecai Edrès
Conservative
→ a teacher

Original goal:
for South Am. Rabbis

Produced 60 rabbis, all Conservative, w/ S/A. accents
emphases

② 24/25 students

1 year in Israel as part of program.

Need liberal/academic degree as precursor.

(3) Bible / Talmud / Thought / History / Hebrew

Emphasizes Hebrew: courses are given in Hebrew; strongly Zionistic in Argentinic Jewish identity

(4) Abarbanel — Teachers College

HS graduates

a) want to become teachers

b) Can do BA at Haifa U.

(5) Cantorial Institute

Great Library at the Seminario

- best in S.A. 50,000

= Center of Cons Movement in Latin America

3 Exciting Changes Going On

① Until 3 years ago, just took courses here;

now ⓐ they come for כיבוד (?)

b) and for a research-oriented activity

c) Lectures in Jewish Studies ~~that~~ connect to the Latin Am. reality

d) discussion

→ ↑ Informal gathering share concerns/worries

~~Opp. ...~~

② Retreat

N Need ↑ Spiritual growth of rabbis

→ Create spaces for diff. kinds of Qs/issues, conversations

[Not change, but introduce new aspects]

↑ Spiritual Devel.

① N Attend to spiritual needs of ~~students~~ clients

---

② Use Jewish calendar
e.g. - Shavuot Tikkun
study/dance/learn

N of Faculty to Informal Part of program:

① Faculty are part-time, ~~[illegible]~~ he (Ch's also a congreg. Rabbi)

Main difficulty: Economic

Very few resources
for - students
- faculty

If $↑, A) ↑ Faculty to train students,
B) ↑ Research!!

The "Research-component" of rabbinical education

~ need to get knowledge not found in course work.

Challenges of S.A. Rabbinate

1. Fundamentalism

2. Assimilation

3. Ethics/human rights/moral values

→ Respect for human dignity/Respect for Law

Unemployment

Addressing Realities

→ Some of problems are "Jewish" but, not generally.

How does curric. address these challeng's?

(1) Fundamentalism

↑Re-assert Con. Movements Values + Discuss/defend them.

e.g., in Informal Education

This goes in informal settings, but also through study.

(2) Assimilation

[Missed the answer!]

Put in practice traditional ideas

(3) Human Rights/Values

Reiterated across

context/ = Natural Bias of Institutions as a whole

Admission Requirements

1) Aboarband

2) Recommendations

3) Interviews

4) Psychoanalytic ~~test~~

There are female rabbinical students

New Challenges of rabbinic education:

- Post-modern era, not a very spiritual society: Individ. Materialis. yuppie

→ Need to develop sensitivity in Rabbin. student to human needs; readiness to represent trad/modernity, + honesty.

Most important characteristics of Rabbis for our time:

Creative / ~~Def~~ help us define our ID as Cons. movement

Meyer -- more charismatic than ideological

→ Still need to define

S. Δ. Conservative approach.

Any more changes?? What? Why?

1) More/better teachers
2) More study-time for students

Historical Trends in the Development of the Rabbinate

For my purposes I will begin my analysis of the institution of the rabbinate during the medieval period beginning in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Copies of the Talmud were becoming available to communities outside of Babylonia and many new *yeshivot*[1] were established. It was during this time that the title *ha-Rav* -- "The rabbi" -- first appears in the Rhineland region. The title and role of the rabbi itself was, according to Schwarzfuchs, an original creation of the medieval Jewish communities (Schwarzfuchs, 1993, p.12). These communities had already invested some of its judicial functions in a group of laymen who themselves had to turn to a rabbi when it came to matters where talmudic erudition was required. The need to reward the services of a rabbi and attach him to his community led to a level of professionalization of the rabbinate, the first signs of which appeared in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (ibid.).

By the beginning of the sixteenth century the institution of the rabbinate was an accepted fact; "every community of size understood that it must have the services of a rabbi and would do its best to employ one" (Schwarzfuchs, 1993 p. 50). The first modern *Semikhah* (ordination) in the form of a document proclaiming an individual's worthiness of the title *Morenu ha-Rav* (literally, "our teacher the rabbi/master") is suggestive of the primary emphasis of the ordinand's preparation:

> For years he has kept himself busy with the intensive study of the Torah. He has investigated the Talmud and its meaning until he grew to be fit and worthy to preside, judge and instruct... (ibid., p. 32-33).

A number of observations must be made here about both the means (content and process) of rabbinic training in eastern and central Europe during this period and its ends (role and

---

[1] The term *yeshivah* literally means "a place of sitting." The term has been applied to 3 historical types of institutions all of whose primary functions were dedicated to the study and exposition of Talmud. The first type was comprised of the early academies in Palestine and Babylonia during the second through fourth centuries CE. The second type, epitomized by the great Babylonian legal academies of Sura and Pumbedita flourished during the fifth through 9th centuries. The third type, the precursor of the modern *yeshivah* was comprised of local institutions devoted to the pursuit of Talmud study for its own sake.

functions of the newly ordained rabbi). First, it is clear from this passage that the emphasis of preparation for this post was mastery of classical text . These texts included Talmud with commentary, Codes[2] and, to a lesser degree, Bible. The student spent many years in a *Yeshivah* pouring over these texts, arguing with a study partner over their meanings, memorizing passages, and listening to the teachings of his master. Second, the process of ordination kept pace with its antecedent prescription; namely, ordination was conferred upon a learned candidate by an individual who himself had been ordained by a predecessor who had himself achieved a distinguished level of learning. Similarly, the ends of this training were consistent with earlier notions. Specifically, the ordinand was expected to teach his own disciples as well as adjudicate civil and religious legal proceedings.

By the early 1700's , the institutionalized rabbinate experienced its first internal schism. The internal conflict between Hasidism and Rabbinism (*mitnagdim*) grew out of the teachings of two famous rabbis of this period -- The Baal Shem Tov and the Vilna Gaon. It was Israel Baal Shem Tov, the founder of Hasidism, who was the first to challenge the hegemony of learning and the study of classical text as the sole means of achieving closeness to God. "Structurally, it was a fundamentalist movement, appealing to the emotions through ... charismatic leaders" (Helmreich, 1986, p. 3). The Vilna Gaon, on the other hand, elevated the status of Talmudic study and condemned the more experiential approach of the new Hasidic movement.

The proliferation of rabbis trained in Eastern European Yeshivot during this period, many of whom eventually moved West, led the leaders of Germany's Jewry to resolve that:

> No one shall ordain anybody in all of Germany as Morenu [our teacher], without the agreement of three teachers who are heads of a Yeshivah in Germany ... No young man shall be ordained unless two years have elapsed since his marriage, and only after this young man has come to live apart from the Yeshivah so that his

---

[2] First instituted in the 12th Century, Codes are concise summaries of legal rulings from the Talmud sorted and categorized by topic.

constitution may be known, and whether he behaves as he should in the fear of heaven and the continuation of his studies (Schwarzfuchs, 1993 p. 61-62).

Thus, in the middle of the 18th Century, came the first almost-modern set of concerns stipulating personal and professional qualifications for the rabbinate other than the sole criteria of the mastery of classical Jewish texts. But before I move to a discussion of the modern period, I must first inquire as to the impact of Emancipation and Enlightenment thought on the numerous and diverse Jewish communities throughout Europe. For it is in the aftermath of these two epoch-making events that we see the first signs of a changed institution of the rabbinate.

The Beginnings of a Modern Rabbinate:

Many religious scholars and social historians comment on the impact of Emancipation and Enlightenment on the Jewish communities throughout Europe (see Birnbaum & Katznelson, 1995; Mendez-Flohr & Reinharz, 1995 ; Meyer, 1988 ; Schwarzfuchs, 1993 ; Seltzer, 1980; Woocher, 1986). European Emancipation and Enlightenment thought brought in their wake several "patterns of religious adjustment" (Mendez-Flohr & Reinharz, 1995) and "a radical redefinition of the Jewish condition" (Birnbaum & Katznelson, 1995, p. 23).

Intellectually, the scientific revolution spawned by Copernicus' mid-sixteenth century treatise on the cosmos manifested a century later in Spinoza's *Tractatus* which championed such precepts as rational autonomy and scientific inquiry. By the middle of the eighteenth century, France and England had become centers of Enlightenment thought (Seltzer, 1980). Moses Mendelssohn's *Jerusalem* occupied a central role in the continuing development and the spread of Emancipation and Enlightenment philosophy to Germany's Jewry at the end of the century. Mendelssohn's claim that Judaism could only survive in the modern world if it was solely relegated to a religious persuasion whose truths were

rationally self-evident and universal represents, in many ways, the height of Enlightenment thought at the time.

Of equal and no less profound importance in the sphere of revolutionary intellectual change, was a resurgence of interest in linguistic, cultural and historical studies. This trend in general society was paralleled in Jewish life by the birth and growth of what Leopold Zunz coined *Die Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Literally translated as "the science of Judaism," this new intellectual approach of the early nineteenth century was devoted to "[an] investigation of the entire Jewish past by modern methods of literary and historical criticism" (Bamberger, 1957).

Politically, Emancipation championed civil and political equality for all peoples. Although emancipation of Europe's Jewish communities was neither swift nor consistent, its impact was no less than profound. The *kehillot* (self-governing, autonomous Jewish communal entities) were disbanded as ghetto walls were razed and Jews took their first small steps toward full political and economic equality and social integration.

These intellectual, political and social developments of European Emancipation and Enlightenment had ramifications for the rabbinate and for its nascent training institutions. In March of 1808 Napoleon issued a set of decrees regulating the establishment and the functions of Jewish communities in France and Italy. The impact of these decrees on the requirements and function of the rabbi was profound. A rabbi's functions were defined as follows:

> teach religion;... remind in all circumstances the duty to obey the laws, including especially those which reconnected with the defense of the fatherland... preach in the synagogues... perform marriages and pronounce divorces, without proceeding with them in any case until the contracting parties have legally and duly given proof of their civil marriage or divorce (ibid., p. 84).

As a result of the Revolution and the mixed blessing of emancipation the most important part of the rabbi's role had been removed -- the right and the obligation to judge. The

rabbi's authority was now "purely moral" (ibid.) with the rabbi having to confine himself to only the ritual problems of his constituency itself now defined more by synagogue affiliation than by the communal construct of the *kehillot*.

As a result of the post-emancipation limits placed on the judicial function of the rabbi there were some who argued that the office itself was dispensable (Karp, 1991; Schwarzfuchs, 1993). These views were counterbalanced by those who argued that the new Jewish corporate identity (namely, as a religion) created both the need and justification for the rabbi as chief spokesman and symbol of leadership for that community. "Enlightenment demanded continuous justification for Jewish existence and the 'new' rabbi provided that for the congregants and to the world" (Karp, 1991).

Given the changing functions and expectations of the rabbinate, the preparation of such individuals also was subject to change. The mastery of classical Jewish text was still a necessary prerequisite for ordination, but was no longer wholly sufficient.

> ...with the entry of Jews into general life the need became increasingly felt for the rabbis to be equipped with a wider knowledge than was regarded as necessary for the medieval rabbi... in both Jewish spheres... and in purely secular branches (Hammer, 1985).

The first modern rabbinical seminary was founded in Padua in 1829 by an "enlightened" traditionalist Isaac Samuel Reggio. Later known as the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano, it was the first rabbinical seminary in Europe to combine secular and traditional Jewish study. In turn, Germany's Jewish reformers who sought to strip away the rabbinic accretions and provincialism of traditional Judaism attempted to create a more liberal seminary in their own country. The nascent movement's first rabbinical conference took place in 1844 and was met with opposition among more traditional Jews. This opposition was consolidated into two other major schools of Jewish thought that developed in Germany at this time -- Neo- or Modern- Orthodoxy and the Positivist-Historical school.[3]

---

[3] This term was first used by Zacharias Frankel in 1845 to define a "synthesis between the historic conservative conception and contemporary needs, through gradual, organic reform" (Heller, 1971). A full

These three schools (Reform, Neo-Orthodox and Positivist -Historical), founded in Germany by Abraham Geiger, Samson Raphael Hirsch and Zacharias Frankel respectively, are the intellectual predecessors to the Reform, Modern Orthodox and Conservative Movement's seminaries that would later be established and blossom on fertile American soil.

Although the German reformers did not successfully found their rabbinic training institution until 1872 (Hochschule fur die Wissenschaft des Judentums), the Positivist-Historical school founded the Breslau Seminary in 1854 (Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar) while the Neo-Orthodox school established a modern seminary in Berlin 1873 (Rabbinerseminar fur des orthodoxe Judentum).

The "new" rabbi that emerged spoke high German, was required to take a concurrent doctorate at a secular university and received rabbinical training in these seminaries (Ellenson & Bycel, 1997; Karp, 1991). The traditional yeshivot of Eastern Europe continued to thrive (and, to this day, still thrive in Israel and the US) but remained intractable when it came to acknowledging any place for either Wissenschaft des Judentums or secular learning in their curricula. The idea of *Torah Lishma* -- the study of Torah for its own sake -- became the central feature of the *Yeshivah's* philosophy (Helmreich, 1986) in contradistinction to the modern rabbinical seminary.

Changing Ends; Changing Means

As discussed above, the changing needs of a post-Emancipation and post-Enlightenment European Jewry bore witness to a changing set of expectations of, and functions for, the leadership of these communities. These changes, in turn, necessitated

---

exposition of the term was not forthcoming and, according to Seltzer, "Positive-Historical Judaism came to apply to the non-Orthodox opponents of Reform in the Central European rabbinate (Seltzer, 1980, p. 605). The Positivist-Historical school is identified by scholars as the ideological predecessor to what is now defined in American denominationalism as the Conservative movement. This movement seeks to maintain the precarious balance between the binding nature of Halachah (Rabbinic law) on the one hand, and the historical patterns of modern development and progress on the other. From this point forward, then, I will refer to this movement by its American namesake -- Conservative.

the creation of different institutions capable of providing the means whereby which these new requirements or ends could be met. With the dissolution of the rabbi's medieval role of *dayyan* or judge, the reality of a traditional community of faith now infiltrated by western rational philosophical thought, the tide of scientific progress, and the razing of ghetto walls, the rabbinate faced new challenges.

The response of the modern Germanic rabbinical seminaries was rather typical when one considers certain historical precedents. Jewish tradition is one of accretion. Faced with the destruction of the first Temple in 586 BCE and the sacrificial cult to which it was central, Jews began to form houses of study and worship. When the Temple was rebuilt during the next century, Jews returned to sacrificial worship but kept the liturgical additions that had developed during the hiatus. Similarly, when banned from reading from the sacred scroll of the Torah at one point in history, Jews responded by reading portions from the Prophets during the appointed times on weekdays and the Sabbath. Once the ban on the former was lifted, the latter was retained as an additional part of the scriptural readings on the Sabbath and various festivals.

Taking the analogy back to the present conversation, with the onset of modernity the sine qua non of rabbinical preparation -- the mastery of classical Jewish text -- was not replaced by *Wissenschaft* , rather it was supplemented by it. And, although the rabbi was no longer permitted to act as judge in matters pertaining to civil law, he was still expected to be the *mara de-atra*, the "authority of the location" with regard to all Jewish legal, ritual and moral matters. Thus, the leadership of these modern rabbinical seminaries were faced with the challenge of providing the tremendous classical content of the yeshivah (primarily Talmud and Codes) while successfully educating their students in the scientific study of Judaism as well. All this coupled with the concurrent requirement of doctoral studies at a neighboring university. The academic model of rabbi as Judaic and secular scholar fast became the norm in the European seminaries.

The rabbinical seminary moves to America

Although it is important to recognize the 19th century European roots of what we now refer to as denominationalist American Judaism (e.g., Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox [4]), the unique features of the modern Jewish *American* experience[5] precipitated a further change in the role and functions of the rabbi which, in turn, necessitated additional considerations in the preparation of those individuals. This sentiment is perhaps best expressed in the preface to a book entitled *Problems of Jewish Ministry* written in 1927 which reads:

> It may not be a fortunate circumstance, but it is an inevitable one, that the American Rabbi of the present generation is called upon to cope with the many phases of Congregational and communal activity which do not seem to belong to the traditional sphere of the Rabbinate (New York Board of Jewish Ministers, 1927).

Each of the denominational movements founded its own rabbinical seminary on American soil at the end of the 19th century. In 1875 the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati opened its doors as the first rabbinical seminary on American soil. Unlike its modern German counterpart, this first American rabbinical seminary did not require a concurrent Ph.D. from a secular university, yet the student was then (and still is today) required to write an original research thesis as a prerequisite for graduation. Founded by Isaac Mayer Wise (1819-1900) who was convinced that American rabbis needed to be trained for American pulpits, Wise's initial vision was to create a seminary that would not

---

[4] I consciously leave out Reconstructionism, Jewish Renewal and Feminist Judaism as these are all products of the *American* Jewish experience.

[5] In commenting on the unique situation of Jews in America, Seymour Martin Lipset reminds us that "Jews won acceptance as fully equal citizens earlier here than elsewhere..." (Lipset, 1990). Unlike their previous experiences in many European countries, in every sphere of public life in America Jews have enjoyed tremendous success and integration. This has proved to be a double edge sword according to many (Eisen, 1995; Lipset, 1990; Lipset & Raab, 1995; Woocher, 1986), cutting away at disadvantage on the one hand while leading to increased assimilation on the other. Arnold Eisen comments that Jewish modernity, "...began with the dissolution of a community bound together by law ... [and] has reached its fulfillment in America with the advent of purely voluntaristic associations that most Jews do not choose to join" (Eisen, 1995).

be a sectarian or denominationally distinct Reform institution (Ellenson & Bycel, 1997). This vision was crushed early on as the famous *treife* banquet ensured that whatever fragile coalition among Reform, Conservative and even Orthodox proponents of the seminary existed, it was quickly destroyed.

In 1922 Stephen S. Wise (1874-1949) founded the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, which was also committed to providing training of rabbis from all branches of Judaism (Gottschalk, 1985, p. 567). The similar orientation of the two schools led to their merger in 1950. The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion now has campuses in Los Angeles (1954) and Jerusalem (1963) in addition to its two main campuses in New York and Cincinnati.

Wise's hope of having one seminary to train rabbis of all denominations was quickly thwarted as the Jewish Theological Seminary Association was founded by Sabato Morais in 1886. Dedicated to preserving in America "the knowledge and practice of historical Judaism..." (Seminary, 1996-97), the intent of the Association was to "release the Jewish community in the United States from dependence on European centers of Jewish learning for intellectual and spiritual leadership" (ibid.). The leaders of the Seminary (all of whom were trained in either modern European seminaries or traditional *yeshivot)* did not have to create the Jewish Theological Seminary of America from nothing. The founders looked to model of the Breslau Jewish Theological Seminary (even the name alone is indicative of influence) for guidance and structure:

> The educational ideal that directed and inspired these men [of JTS] was not that of a traditional Yeshiva on an eastern European model. Instead their aim was to construct a modern seminary patterned educationally after the ... Breslau Seminary in particular (Ellenson & Bycel, 1997, p. 4).

As discussed above, this educational pattern of the modern German rabbinical seminary afforded the study of Talmud and codes the central place in the curriculum while placing

great emphasis on the academic study of Judaism or *Wissenschaft des Judentums* and secular Jewish learning

But it was not long before the particular needs of the American Jewish community necessitated yet another shift in the function of the rabbi and hence in the preparation for the rabbinate. With Solomon Schechter's ascendance to the Presidency of the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1902 came an acknowledgment of the many roles the rabbi was expected to play in this new, American context.

Schechter talked about the rabbi as Jewish role model, social worker, "an organizer, a social agitator, an expert on all topics of the day" (Schechter, 1915). Yet, for all his talk about the changing role of the rabbi, Schechter maintained the preeminence of the rabbi as "a sound Hebrew scholar" (ibid.). Ellenson and Bycel conclude that for Schechter, "...knowledge and careful scholarship were the *sine qua non* that established the grounds for exercising legitimate rabbinical leadership" (Ellenson & Bycel, 1997).

Ultimately, Schechter was committed to the same three central tenets as the founders of the Breslau Seminary; namely, the mastery of classical Jewish text, the academic or scientific study of Judaism, and the importance of secular study. The Seminary today exhibits a remarkable sense of fidelity to the vision of the founders nearly one hundred twenty five years ago.

In contradistinction to the seminary-like nature of both HUC-JIR and JTS, the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS) founded in New York in 1897, despite its name, should really be thought of and classified as a *Yeshivah* (Charlop, 1985; Liebman, 1968). Originally modeled more on the modern incarnation of the yeshivah in 1802 by Rabbi Hayyim Volzhin (a disciple of the Gaon of Vilna) -- where ordination was secondary to being a talmudic scholar and secular learning was eschewed -- RIETS soon came to embrace the importance of both in the new American context (Helmreich, 1986). Still, "the be-all and end-all of RIETS is Talmud study" for its own sake (Karp, 1992, p. 34). Although important in understanding the overall landscape of rabbinic training in this

country at this time, I will not presently go into more detail on this institution due to its status outside the sphere of liberal rabbinic training.

The last two seminaries to round out the picture of rabbinic training institutions in this country at this time are both creations of the last 50 years of American Jewish life. Under the aegis of the Seminary's fourth president Dr. Louis Finkelstein, the University of Judaism (UJ) was founded in Los Angeles as the Seminary's West Coast affiliate. Beginning in 1971 the UJ began offering the preparatory year and year one of the Seminary's Rabbinical School curriculum on site. This collaborative relationship has since changed when, in 1995, the UJ announced a substantial gift for the purpose of creating and endowing its own full fledged ordination program. The Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies is "dedicated to training conservative rabbis who are not only deeply versed in Jewish texts and committed to Jewish traditional practice, but who are also capable of transmitting the beauty and richness to others"(Ziegler, 1997). The Ziegler School will graduate its first class in the Spring of 1999.

The last several seminaries to round out the picture of rabbinic training institutions in this country at this time are both creations of the last 50 years of American Jewish life. Under the aegis of the Seminary's fourth president Dr. Louis Finkelstein, the University of Judaism (UJ) was founded in Los Angeles as the Seminary's West Coast affiliate. Beginning in 1971 the UJ began offering the preparatory year and year one of the Seminary's Rabbinical School curriculum on site. This collaborative relationship has since changed when, in 1995, the UJ announced a substantial gift for the purpose of creating and endowing its own full fledged ordination program. The Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies is "dedicated to training conservative rabbis who are not only deeply versed in Jewish texts and committed to Jewish traditional practice, but who are also capable of transmitting the beauty and richness to others"(Ziegler, 1997). The Ziegler School will graduate its first class in the Spring of 1999.

The Reconstructionist Rabbinical College was founded by Ira Eisenstein in Philadelphia in 1968. Based on Mordechai Kaplan's philosophy of Reconstructionism, the College seeks to embody the ideal of renewal and reconstruction of tradition in all facets of Jewish civilization. The College has designed an approach to rabbinic education that "understands rabbinical studies as necessarily combining aspects of traditional and academic study -- a personal encounter equipped with a knowledge of Jewish sources, an experience of intense Jewish living, and the acquisition of skills to recreate these for others" (RRC, 1996).

Academy for Jewish Religion.

The Institute for Traditional Judaism (Metivta).

A new rabbinate for the 21st century?

Schorsch himself eloquently sums up the current condition of a rabbinate poised to enter a new millennium when he writes

> There is almost no common denominator between the profession of the modern rabbi...and the religious leadership of the Middle Ages... If earlier the rabbi served as halakhic decisor, judge, and teacher of Talmud for advanced students, today he is a member of a profession dedicated to addressing the needs of the individual (Schorsch, 1987).

Just how today's rabbi is being trained to deal with these needs, especially the growing concern over spirituality, is of explicit interest to me in my project.

Ackerman, David M. (1992). A Not Too Distant Mirror: The Seminary Rabbinical School Curriculum. <u>Conservative Judaism</u> 44 (4), pp. 47-61.

This essay, referenced extensively in Ellenson and Bycel (1997), traces the history of the Seminary's rabbinical school curriculum from 1885-1992. Ackerman understands curriculum as " a statement of applied ideology and as a blueprint for the projected role of the student/graduate" (p.47). As such, he analyzes the history of the Seminary curriculum as an example of the movement's ideology as well as its vision of a rabbi..

Ackerman argues that there is a "founding myth" which has anchored the formulation of the curriculum over the last century. This myth is made up of the following central components: a devotion to *wissenschaft* style scholarship and historical analysis, the importance placed on Hebrew language and text study in rabbinic education,, a commitment to halachah, cultural Zionism, and the efficacy of American Judaism. Ackerman identifies 6 stages in the development of the curriculum during this period: (1) from 1886-1902; (2) 1902 (Schechter) to 1948; (3) 1948 - 1959 (the postwar years); (4) 1959-1977; (5) 1977-1989; and (6) the new curriculum which was introduced during the 1989-90 academic year.

The most interesting aspects of these divisions relate to: the increased prominence of practical rabbinics courses consonant with the proliferating role of the rabbi in post-war America; the introduction of a year of study in Israel and an increased emphasis on halachah evident in the curricula of stage four; the shift in emphasis from cognitive to methodological knowledge (rabbis go from being answerers of questions, Jewish know-it-alls to being leaders of inquiry in a more democratic style of religious leadership) reflected in Gerson Cohen's 4 level curriculum (1977); and the stage 6 additions of the Rabbinical School Seminar and a more intensive rotation-based field work component (N.B. the Rabbinical School Seminar was discontinued at the end of this past academic year). Ackerman concludes the essay though by stating that "although much has changed, at least

as much has remained the same" with regard to the overall fidelity to the myth of the founders.

Alexander, H. A. (1994). <u>Educating Future Rabbis and Jewish Educators Spiritually: A Mentorship Program for Rabbinic and Education Students</u> (Grant Proposal). Los Angeles: University of Judaism.

This proposal to the Nathan Cummings Foundation sought a two-year grant to implement and evaluate a program of hevrutot for rabbinical (M.H.L.) and education (M.A.Ed./B.Lit.) students at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. This proposal was written to follow-up on issues raised in discussions during a previous planning grant from the Wexner Foundation which was implemented over the 1992-93 academic year (see next entry below for further information).

The premises of the Hevruta program are that "students entering the rabbinical and education programs are preoccupied with questions of Jewish spirituality" (p. 3) and that students "have recognized the limitations of an exclusively academic approach" (p. 6). The purpose of the Hevrutot is to "provide a format within [the] curriculum to foster spiritual growth" of students in these two programs (ibid.). Hevrutot would be heterogeneous groupings of rabbinical and education students, stratified across year in program and gender. Hevrutot would have regular scheduled meeting times, a madrikh (facilitator) chosen from among local rabbis and educators, and would engage in activities centered around the following areas: (1) prayer; (2) celebration; (3) social action; (4) theological, moral and personal discussions; and (5) Torah l'shmah.

To my knowledge, the proposal was funded at the time, although I do not believe that this program is still in existence at the University. Furthermore, it should be noted that similar proposals were submitted to the Cummings Foundation by HUC and RRC. I am not aware of the outcome of those proposals.

Alexander, H. A. (1997). Wissenschaft and its Discontents: Rabbinic Education in an Age of Disbelief. Religious Education.

In this philosophical analysis of the state of modern rabbinic education, Alexander argues for a new philosophy of religious education which emphasizes morally oriented as well as epistemically oriented conceptions of learning. Tracing the plight of biblically and rabbinically situated conceptions of Jewish learning which held God as the sole source of epistemic and moral authority, Alexander argues that medieval and later Emancipation and Enlightenment philosophy witnessed the breach of this authority into distinct entities. Alexander advocates the search for a "new sort of inquiry into religious and other sources that is less value free and more committed to cultivating visions of goodness that can serve as life's ideals." In other words, he is calling for a post-modern approach to Jewish learning that would expand the purview of critical scholarship (wissenschaft) to the prescriptive. He views the creation of the new rabbinical school as a potential catalyst for developing this new philosophy of religious education which he is advocating.

Alexander, H. A., Dorff, E., & Rothblum, L. (1994). Wexner Project Report . Unpublished Report: Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies University of Judaism.

This is a report on the work of the Wexner planning team at the University of Judaism which took place over the course of the 1992-93 academic year. The planning grant was awarded to the University for the purposes of studying rabbinic and education students' development in the areas of Hebrew language and religious formation and spiritual development. It should be noted that the work of the planning committee took place prior to the establishment of the Ziegler School's full fledged ordination program (begun in 1996-97 academic year).

The following is summary of the major issues and recommendations that emerged during the planning discussions: First, a clear mission statement for the Ziegler school

needs to be developed and become part of the ethos of the institution. This statement must define the role of the school within the broader context of the University and should explain why this school "is concerned not only with academic matters, but also with professional and religious issues" (p. 36). Second, faculty development is needed to address "the relationship between skills and content on the one hand and meaning and implications on the other. Similarly, the University may have to consider two separate sets of criteria for faculty hiring: one for the University at large that is based on more traditional models of scholarship and subject matter expertise and one for the Ziegler School in particular which also takes into account the faculty candidate's potential for being a religious and spiritual role model and mentor. Third, cultivate more opportunities for active learning and help students integrate the numerous disparate pieces of rabbinic training. Fourth, enhance the communal experience of students and faculty while being respectful of individuals' privacy. Finally, examine the often over burdened (financially and academically) and over programmed schedules of students toward the ends of increasing quality of life while in graduate school.

This report is particularly valuable for its appendices which contain substantial portions of recorded minutes from the subcommittee's meetings which included presentations by experts in the field of language acquisition as well as those engaged in programs of spiritual formation in Catholic and Protestant seminaries.

Alpert, R.T. (1985). Reconstructionist Rabbis. <u>Encyclopedia Judaica 1983-5 Yearbook</u>. Jerusalem: Keter.

The article begins with a brief overview of the history and development of the College. Alpert then discusses the new kind of rabbinate that Reconstructionism advocates and the need for a seminary to train these individuals. The movement conceives of its rabbis as guides rather than final arbiters, and to function in this role effectively "rabbis must be well educated in Jewish sources, skillful at communication and sympathetic to each

person's aspirations" vis-a-vis Judaism. Alpert cites the College's commitment to helping students synthesize their studies and acknowledges that this is one of the greatest challenges that the school faces. Similarly, Alpert references the perennial tension which rabbinical schools face in terms of the relationship between the academic and professional dimensions of the program. The remainder of the article contains an overview of the curriculum, the student body and changes undergone at the College in the early eighties when this article was written.

Bycel, L. (1995). Tradition or Renewal? Notes on a Modern Rabbinic School Curriculum. Religious Education, 90(1), 72-88.

After surveying the major curricular changes which were introduced in the other major seminaries (RIETS, JTS, RRC) in the mid to late '80's, Bycel examines the curricular changes which were submitted to the President of HUC in 1988 in a document entitled "Innovators of Torah." Specifically, Bycel reviews three aspects of this new curriculum: "(I) the social context of the curriculum review, the constituencies that assembled it, and their various priorities; (II) the key changes proposed in the curriculum; and (III) the vision of the Reform rabbi proposed in this document" (p. 75).

Concerning the first aspect, Bycel points out that the social context of the review was a kaleidoscopic array of faculty, students, laity, and alumni. Bycel asserts that each group had a particular claim on the priorities of rabbinical training, yet he does not really flesh this out other than to note the respective "political" positions of each group (e.g., the laity play an important role in the financial support of HUC as an institution and ultimately have to "live" day to day with the products of the program - their congregational rabbis). Further, Bycel notes that the task force was totally made up of faculty members who were ultimately reluctant to identify HUC as a seminary as opposed to a graduate or a professional school. Bycel concludes that the task force's decision to avoid labeling the

rabbinical school as a seminary "reveals a tension between academic and religious vocation" (78).

The key changes proposed in the curriculum fell in four distinct areas: orientation; Hebrew language program; clinical education (practical rabbinics); and spiritual development. The overall message was that more was needed in each of these areas. Finally, in summarizing the vision of the reform rabbi as presented in the task force document Bycel writes: "to be an innovator - to bring ancient texts to life, to know when and how to use them, to understand that they must be applied in different ways to different situations - this involves skills and insights which the new curriculum fails to address" (p. 85).

This article is particularly valuable for a number of reasons. First, Bycel references a fairly wide field of the major works in Christian theological education and draws clear parallels between issues raised in these works and many of the issues confronting rabbinic training today. Second, he is one of the few people writing about rabbinic education at all. Third, at the end of the article he offers a template for what he sees as the four major issues in Jewish theological education: Field education; integration of academic, professional, and spiritual development; heightened social awareness; and spiritual formation (pp. 86-87). Finally, Bycel sends out the call for Jewish theological educators to recognize how much they have in common with their Christian counterparts and how much they each would stand to learn from each other.

Cardin, N. B. (1995). The First Generation of Women's Rabbinate. <u>Conservative Judaism, 48</u>(1), pp. 15-20.

This article reflects on the first ten years of women rabbis in the Conservative movement since the 1983 decision supporting the ordination of women rabbis. Cardin highlights six themes or assumptions which have been prevalent during this time: (1) all women rabbis are the same; (2) women rabbis symbolize the "vanquishing of traditional

Judaism's subjugation of women by liberating the external value of egalitarianism;" (3) women rabbis help us distinguish the male experience from the Jewish experience; (4) women rabbis are normalizing and universalizing women's experience; (5) women rabbis are creating the rabbinate anew; and (6) women rabbis are stewards of conscience. She points out degrees to which these themes are more theory than reality (and vice versa) and offers corollaries for a couple of them. Interestingly, the article does not reference these women's experiences while in rabbinical school at the Seminary.

Cardin, N. B., & Silverman, D. W. (Eds.). (1987). The Seminary at 100: Reflections on the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Conservative Movement. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

This edited volume published in 1987 on the occasion of the Jewish Theological Seminary's centennial anniversary is comprised of three main sections. The first entitled "The Religious Center: The Seminary and its Spheres of Influence" contains articles on rabbinic training, the development of lay leadership for the movement, and the myriad of organizations and institutions affiliated with the Seminary (e.g., Ramah, the Masorti movement in Israel, the University of Judaism, etc.). The second section, a "Symposium of Scholarship and Belief," contains articles written in response to the question: "How do you reconcile *Wissenschaft* and the *Kadosh Baruch Hu?*" (p. 175). In his introduction to the section, Scheindlin points out that the papers written for the symposium deal with two different aspects of the question: (1) the theoretical problem of whether scientific thinking undermines religious belief and (2) the pedagogical consequences of this dialectic for Jewish education in general and Seminary training in particular. The third section entitled "The Self Defined" addresses questions of definition: how others see the Seminary, how the Seminary sees itself, the questions and issues raised by feminism and the decision to ordain women rabbis, and some thoughts about what the next fifty years will bring.

Important for our purposes here are a series of articles woven throughout the book which specifically address issues of concern for the Conservative rabbinate and the training of its members. Below, I include annotations for these specific sources.

Carroll, J. W., Wheeler, B. G., Aleshire, D. O., & Marler, P. L. (1997). Being There: Culture and Formation in Two Theological Schools. New York: Oxford University Press.

The authors conducted ethnographic type studies of two Protestant seminaries - one evangelical and one mainline. The goal of these studies was to understand the ways in which the institutional cultures of these seminaries "shape the beliefs, values, and perspectives of its [sic] students" (preface). Conceptual frameworks for the study are drawn from the literature on organizational cultures, adult socialization in the professions, and the history and sociology of American religion. This is a valuable book for our purposes in thinking about the import role that the "cultural scripts" of our rabbinical seminaries ("you cannot access spirituality through a steel door") play in the educational process of training student-rabbis.

Charlop, Z. (1985). Orthodox Rabbis. Encyclopedia Judaica, 1983-85 Yearbook, pp. 84-90.

This is one of 4 articles in a series entitled "The Making of American Rabbis" published in the EJ yearbook covering the years 1983-1985. The article primarily focuses on a description of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS) -- its history, its curriculum, its faculty, its students, its graduates, etc. In addition, there is an interesting discussion concerning the exact nature of the institution -- whether RIETS should be considered a rabbinical seminary in the vein of other such modern institutions, or an example of the modern incarnation of the yeshivah in the Volozhin sense of the term. Charlop opts for the latter.

Charlop, Z. (1997). Rabbinic Education: then, now and tomorrow. Sh'ma A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 27(527), pp. 1-3.

This is one of 5 articles in a series devoted to issues of rabbinic education for the 21st century published in two editions of Sh'ma during the winter of 1997 . These brief statements are written by the heads of 8 institutions in North America currently training of rabbis (RIETS, HUC, UJ, JTS, RRC, Institute of Traditional Judaism (The Metivta), ALEPH, and the Academy for Jewish Religion.

Charlop's major points are: "To be a rabbi, one must first of all strive to a be a talmid chakham (a scholar) and a yirei shamayim (pious Jew);" and RIETS will continue to do what it has done best since its inception in 1897 -- namely deepening *lomdut*, the analytical mastery of sacred text. Charlop acknowledges the changing face of North American Jewry and the impact that this has had on the RIETS program (it is important to note that in 1984, RIETS extended its residency requirements for smicha from three years to four).

Cohen, N. J. (1997). The Changing face of Rabbinic Education. Sh'ma A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 27(527), pp. 3-5.

(see Charlop entry above for introduction). Cohen identifies 5 areas of rabbinic training which need to be better tended: the spiritual formation of students (here he references the need for faculty to model their own process of personal spiritual development); developing students' skills to assist others on their spiritual journeys; training of alternate rabbinic models of service (such as Hillel, youth work, chaplaincy, etc.); increased attention to supervised field work; and continuing education opportunities and requirements for graduates.

Davidson, A. (1997). Seminary Rabbinical Students: Who Attended and Why. In J. Wertheimer (Ed.), Tradition Renewed A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary, (Vol. I, pp. 439-470). New York: JTS.

Davidson embarked on a 3-year study of Seminary graduates from 1925-1985 to find out who attended the Rabbinical School during that time and their motivation for attending. Available demographic data were reviewed and in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with forty Seminary graduates. Lists of Seminary graduates and the Rabbinical Assembly were used to identify 150 potential interviewees who reflected the distribution of rabbinical students over these years with regard to family upbringing, age, occupational choice and class year. Forty were then selected from all regions of the US. The interviews "were treated as life stories or narratives containing the interviewee's personal interpretation of their path" to the Rabbinical School (p. 443).

Much of the demographic data cited in this study is a recapitulation of what is contained in Davidson and Wertheimer (1987, see next entry). These data, for the most part, reflect broader social patterns within American society and the Jewish community. Much of the historical information about the Seminary during this period which is folded into this article can be accessed in greater depth in the Ellenson and Bycel (1997) piece contained in this two volume series (see below).

What is most valuable here is the interview data. Four dominant themes emerged around the question "what were the most compelling reasons that affected your decision to study for the rabbinate?": (1) following in the footsteps of a family member or other significant role model; (2) having a passion for study (whether it be lishma, as a means to a career in the academy, or as a means of "construct[ing] an authentic Jewish identity"); (3) searching for a meaningful Jewish life, "seeking;" and (4) Making a difference, a commitment to *tikun olam*. Narratives reflected several concurrent themes, though, in most cases, one dominant theme was evident.

Davidson, A., & Wertheimer, J. (1987). The Next Generation of Conservative Rabbis: An Empirical Study of Today's Rabbinical Students. In N. B. Cardin & D. W. Silverman (Eds.), The Seminary at 100: Reflections on the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Conservative Movement, . New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

The article presents data collected from a survey of all enrolled Seminary (including its west coast and Jerusalem affiliates) rabbinical students during the Fall of 1985. With a response rate of over 75%, this empirical study set out to accomplish two main goals: to offer a descriptive portrait of the then current cohort of JTS rabbinical students, and to make some comparisons to previous generations based on descriptive data collected in earlier studies. The current student body was described along the following characteristics: familial background, educational backgrounds, and career choices and expectations.

Three-quarters of Seminary rabbinical students in 1985 were the children of two American born parents versus 7% in 1943, 20% in 1955 and 55% in Liebman's 1967 study. There has been a decline in the percentage of students whose fathers are employed as Jewish professionals (educators or rabbis). In 1943 over 1/3 of all Seminary students were the sons of rabbis or educators, in 1967 close to one-fifth and in 1985 only 7%. Prior to 1950, most Seminary recruits grew up in Orthodox homes. In 1968, Liebman reported that 69% of that year's Seminary cohort grew up in Conservative homes, while only 19% in Orthodox. In 1985 data revealed that 2/3 of all Seminary students grew up in Conservative homes, less that 3% in Orthodox, 19% in Reform and 12% grew up in unaffiliated homes.

With regard to their educational background, 22% of Seminary rabbinical students in 1985 attended Day Schools as opposed to 41% in 1967. Only 36% of students enrolled in 1985 were USY members (the figure was nearly double in 1967) and less than 25% attended any kind of Jewish summer camp. 83% of JTS students in 1985 engaged in Jewish studies in college.

Concerning career choices and expectations, the questionnaire posed a series of questions which tried to get at students' perceptions of the rabbinic vocation. The questionnaire asked students to rate the relative importance of 17 different skills and activities commonly associated with the rabbinic profession (teaching, counseling, role model of spirituality, living in accordance with Halachah, living as a religious person, public speaking, concern for current social issues, administrative skills, actively supporting federation, promoting the study of Hebrew, promoted improved interfaith relations, understanding other religions, promoting Zionism, and supporting the policies of the Israeli government). 86% of students rated teaching as "extremely important," 77% counseling, 67% living as a religious person, and 66% identified serving as a role model of spirituality as also being extremely important. 87% of students in 1985 were most interested in the pulpit rabbinate as a career.

The authors conclude with a call for more research to be conducted in the field of rabbinic education.

Dorff, E. (1987). Training Rabbis in the Land of the Free. In N. B. Cardin & D. W. Silverman (Eds.), The Seminary at 100: Reflections on the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Conservative Movement. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

In this article, Dorff highlights the areas of convergence and divergence between Judaism and American democracy. He asserts that Conservative rabbinical students do not have the option, as most American Jews do, to ignore the binding nature of halachah and thus to comfortably integrate their Americanism and their Judaism without giving it a second thought. He further notes that this conflict for Conservative rabbinical students manifests in two distinct stages of their training. First, students must come to terms with the issues personally; namely, how should they understand themselves as American Jews who have taken on the "obligations of Jewish law in an American environment which

values maximal freedom?" (p. 20). Then, students must begin to deal with the issues professionally: how can make a compelling case for observance to their congregants?

Dorff references a number of extracurricular attempts during the 1970's and '80's, at both the Seminary and the UJ, aimed at providing students with opportunities to discuss the personal aspect of the issue. The early 70's period focused on extracurricular activities such as Sunday evening sessions in the homes of faculty, or lunches at the school. The inter-seminarians conference became part of the informal curriculum in 1973. 1983 saw the establishment of a Beit midrash, 3 days/week, one hour/day; one session was devoted to a colloquium and two sessions were devoted to Torah lishma, "The topics chosen each year are designed to speak to the students' spiritual needs ... the goal is not to cover text or to impart a skill; it is rather to discover how to relate personally to aspects of the Jewish tradition" (pp. 21-23). In terms of the formal curriculum, more attention has been given to the philosophy of Jewish law, thus aiding students in "reconciling their American, libertarian backgrounds with the theological dimensions of the obligation of Jewish law" (p. 23).

The professional aspect of the issue is equally difficult to address in rabbinic training. Internship experiences and practical rabbinics courses offer one avenue but, concludes Dorff "This is clearly not enough, but rabbinical school cannot do more...As long as rabbinical school helps students resolve their own conflicts between their Jewish and American identities and gives them some training as to how to motivate and help their congregants do the same, it has done about all that it can" (p. 24). Dorff calls on the Rabbinical Assembly to provide in-service training on this issue and on the Seminary and the UJ to sponsor philosophical, sociological and educational research on this topic.

Eilberg, A. (1995). Ministry for the Next Generation. Conservative Judaism, 48(1).

This brief article reflects many of the themes included in Green's (1987a) position. Specifically, Eilberg cites the spiritual hunger evident in today's society and Judaism's need to provide rabbinic leadership capable of responding to this need. Like Green, Eilberg emphasizes the need for what she calls a "first-person rabbinate," a rabbinate informed by the sacred texts of our tradition, but ultimately grounded in personal experience. She feels that women are particularly adept at this kind of rabbinate and thus have much to offer in cultivating this new vision.

Ellenson, D., & Bycel, L. (1997). A Seminary of Sacred Learning: The JTS Rabbinical Curriculum in Historical Perspective. In J. Wertheimer (Ed.), Tradition Renewed A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary, (Vol. 2, pp. 525-592). New York: JTS.

The focus of this essay is a historical review of the official, written curriculum of the Rabbinical School of the Jewish Theological Seminary from 1886-1986. The goal of the paper is to "...present and analyze the historical context and educational aims which guided and informed the leaders of the Seminary from its inception to the present" (p.2). Data for the study were collected from written records including speeches, media, and academic catalogues. These sources are quoted from extensively throughout the article. The self-proclaimed limitation of the study is that it does not deal in any way with the informal, unofficial curriculum of the institution during the historical period in question.

The study is extremely valuable for its remarkable and insightful summaries of the major trends and prevailing ideologies of a succession of Seminary leaders from Schechter through Schorsch. The major thrust of the article is that for all the changes to the curriculum of the Rabbinical School over the past century, the curriculum has managed to

maintain a strong sense of continuity with and fidelity to the vision of the founders. This vision has the study of Talmud and codes occupying the central place in the curriculum while placing great emphasis on the academic study of Judaism or what is commonly referred to as *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.

Gillman, N. (1991). The Changing Paradigm of the Conservative Rabbi. Conservative Judaism , 43(2), 3-11.

Gillman asserts that the "inevitable trade-off" of the Seminary's extensive focus on critical, dispassionate scholarship was that the nexus between the academic and religious dimensions of rabbinic education were "irreparably split" during the first century of the institution's existence. The "dilemma of the Conservative rabbi," according to Gillman, was that his (sic) role demanded his functioning within the tradition, as a religious Jew, but his training was ultimately located outside of the tradition. But Gillman points out that the problem with such *wissenschaft* style scholarship is not the method itself ("what other method could we use? Our intellectual integrity is at stake here..."), but rather the problems it poses for theology, for halakhah and the idea that there may be multiple structures of meaning. Gillman also accuses the Seminary of infantilizing its faculty, the faculty of infantilizing its students, and the students of infantilizing their congregants. He calls for a model of empowerment to supplant this outdated model.

Gillman references the new Rabbinical School curriculum (implemented in the 1989-90 academic year) as the vehicle by which the rabbinical student will be educated to "function as a religious Jew, without the slightest sacrifice of a modern mindset, and to educated his or her congregants to do the same" (p. 9). He specifically references the Rabbinical School Seminar as the core of this new curriculum (this Seminar, to my knowledge, has just been removed from the curriculum). (Interestingly, Gillman also references the addition of the Ph.D. degree in Jewish Studies in 1970 as a turning point for

the Seminary in being able to separate those interested in an academic career from those interested in the rabbinate.)

Gordis, D. (1997). Visions From a New Rabbinical School. Sh'ma 27(527), pp. 5-6.

Gordis asserts that the "'why be Jewish question?' reigns supreme and any rabbinical school worth its salt has to train a cadre of rabbis who take the question seriously and know how to address it" (p.5). He offers four central components of such a school: (1) focusing on what it means to know a text and what meaning the text has for us today; (2) a community that is "halakhically serious," one that recognizes that the "old vocabulary for why halakhic living is important no longer suffices" and is engaged in deliberations about the contemporary meaning of mitzvah (p. 6); (3) an institution that focuses on the "who to be" or dispositional component of rabbinic training; and (4) more of a post-denominational model (although he does not offer any thoughts as to how this connects with the vision and mission of a rabbinical school).

Gottschalk, A. (1985). Reform Rabbis. Encyclopedia Judaica, 1983-85 Yearbook, pp. 96-100.

In this short entry, Gottschalk gives an overview of the history of HUC-JIR followed by a summary of the institution's rabbinic program (admissions, curriculum, etc.). When describing the ideal rabbinic candidate Gottschalk writes, "[they] should have above average intelligence, a good memory, an aptitude for the Hebrew language, organizational and leadership qualities, skill in communicating effectively...and a willingness to assume responsibility. Good character, emotional maturity, self-confidence, initiative, empathy, tact and understanding of human nature, and a keen sense of humor...The rabbi must relate well with others and have the ability to work cooperatively with others." In a brief sub-section entitled "Task and Responsibilities" Gottschalk

describes the rabbi as scholar, teacher, preacher, counselor, administrator, programmer, spokesperson, supervisor, conductor and more. There is a brief section on women in the Reform rabbinate and the Israeli rabbinic program.

Green, A. (1987a). Authority and Autonomy in Rabbinic Education Today. In N. B. Cardin & D. W. Silverman (Eds.), The Seminary at 100: Reflections on the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Conservative Movement, (pp. 29-32). New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Writing from a Reconstructionist perspective, Green argues that the core of Jewish corporate existence is Jewish peoplehood (not Jewish law) and that the future of Judaism will be determined by the people as a whole, not by rabbinic authority. The role of the rabbi, then, is as one "who serves as a cultural resource to the Jewish community, an ambassador... from the tradition to the Jewish people" (p.31). In the voluntaristic society in which we live, in the spiritual climate of more recent times, the role of the rabbi is as a leader *within* the community, one who "*presents* the tradition in all its richness [and] *interpret*[s] it so that it is meaningful and spiritually compelling to contemporary Jews" (ibid.). For Green, the rabbi is facilitator and guide rather than decisor; the rabbi is one who must educate and, in so doing, make a good case for the community to become more deeply Jewish in whatever ways are appropriate for that community. The rabbi must teach from the example of his/her own life.

Green, A. (1987b). Scholarship is Not Enough. Tikkun, 2(3), 37-39.

In this short position statement, Green argues that Wissenschaft has not been able to create a compelling rationale for the continuation of Jewish existence or even for its own self-perpetuation. Particularly in the contemporary American context which is "little driven by the quest for historical authenticity [and] change is too permanent and accepted a

feature," Jewish scholarship must be more than critical and historically sound. Green asserts that for all the successes of Jewish scholarship in the academic and intellectual arenas, the enterprise has been spiritually vacuous. Green identifies the Jewish seminary as the place where we must not only incorporate, but move beyond *wissenschaft*, to a place of spiritual sustenance. In a powerful (and perhaps scathing critique of the contemporary situation) Green writes: "The rabbinical college that becomes a graduate school -- or a professional school for that matter -- has lost its real reason for existing."

Hammer, R. (1985). Conservative Rabbis. <u>Encyclopedia Judaica, 1983-85 Yearbook</u>, pp. 91-95.

Hammer's main point in this short essay is that, despite the introduction of a new curriculum (the four-level curriculum of the late '70's and early '80's) and the ordination of women, the Seminary retains a remarkable sense of fidelity to the vision of the founders. Hammer is careful to point out the ways in which the scholarly emphasis of the Seminary differs from the Reform movement on the one hand and the Orthodox on the other. With regard to the latter, Hammer offers six points of comparison which distinguish the modern rabbinical seminary from the eastern European Yeshivah. Hammer also cites the perennial tension between professional training and scholarship that has existed at the Seminary. Throughout the article, Hammer quotes Adler and Schechter liberally.

Helmreich, W. B. (1986). <u>The World of the Yeshiva: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox Jewry</u>. New Haven: Yale University Press.

This is a fascinating, informative and comprehensive insider look at the world of Orthodox Jewry. It is of particular interest for our purposes for its first two chapters. Chapter one offers an historical account of the survival and migration of the East European yeshivah to America's shores. Chapter two traces the founding and development of Yeshivah University and the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS).

Herring, B. (1991). ***The Rabbinate as Calling and Vocation: Models of Rabbinic Leadership.*** *Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc.*

This edited volume commissioned by RIETS is comprised of essays written by prominent Orthodox rabbis reflecting on the broad array of roles that the Modern Orthodox rabbi plays in today's society. The book is divided into the following sections and foci. Part one entitled "Rabbinic Models and Methods" is devoted to a set of essays exploring the multitude of service-oriented roles the rabbi plays. Part two, "The Rabbis Personal and Professional Life," addresses the nexus between the professional demands of the rabbinate and the personal aspects of the individual called to service. Part three, "Vision and Perspective," contains essays focusing on the rabbi as policy maker, contemporary leader, spokesman for the movement's ideological and philosophical stance, and the rabbi as spiritual leader. Each of the contributors offers practical advice concerning their area of expertise as well as more general comments. This is a fascinating and insightful look into the world of the Modern Orthodox rabbinate, and by extension, the institution of Yeshivah University and the RIETS.

Hoffman, P. (1986). A Rejoinder to Ken Katz by a Seminary Spiritualizer. ***Conservative Judaism*** *38(4), 20-27.*

In her response to Katz's paper (below), Hoffman argues that the spiritualizing activity at the Seminary is not simply an "unreflective political response;" rather, that students are reacting against " a sense of imbalance in the spiritual-intellectual language of the Seminary" (p.23). Hoffman sees this spiritualizing activity as part of a larger movement at the Seminary driven by men and women alike who are articulating their needs in this arena. Citing Borowitz, Bokser, Gillman and Gobbel (a Christian seminarian/theologian), Hoffman argues for the cultivation of a new hermeneutic at the Seminary, one which helps students "make personal sense of their Jewish living and learning" during their rabbinic training (ibid.).

Hoffnung, A. (1991). The University of Judaism at Forty - A Historical Memoir. Los Angeles: University of Judaism.

This special memoir prepared in conjunction with the University's fortieth anniversary offers the reader an insightful account of the history of the UJ as well as a look at its present-day programs. Hoffnung had access to some wonderful original sources including interviews with luminaries such as Dr. Moshe Davis, Dr. Simon Greenberg, Dr. David Lieber and Dr. Max Vorspan as well as the personal diaries of Mordecai Kaplan (it was Kaplan, after all, who first proposed the idea of a University of Judaism back in 1945). This book is important for our purposes as it allows us to better understand the milieu in which rabbinic training at the University began in 1971 and perhaps some of the background concerns that motivated the creation of a full rabbinic training program at the University in 1995.

Holtz, B. (1987). On the Training of Rabbis: Scholarship, Belief, and the Problem of Education. In N. B. Cardin & D. W. Silverman (Eds.), The Seminary at 100, . New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

In this rather provocative and thoughtful essay, Holtz confronts a number of important issues in rabbinic training today. Among these are: the need for rabbinical seminaries to go beyond *wissenschaft* and educate for personal meaning; challenging the Western notion of professional competence as defined by fulfilling curricular requirements and passing examinations; creating time for personal reflection in the overly hectic schedule of the rabbinical student; and considering deeply ways in which students would be afforded more informal and experiential opportunities to build leadership and to develop spiritual dimensions. Holtz stresses the importance of modeling at the faculty level, particularly the ability of the faculty to not only teach text but to teach rabbinical students how they might transmit that text to their constituents.

Karp, A. J. (1991). The American Rabbi in Historical Perspective. In A. J. Karp, L. Jacobs, & C. Z. Dimitrovsky (Eds.), Threescore and Ten: Essays in Honor of Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, (pp. 353-370). Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House.

According to Karp, the "American rabbinate is coextensive with the American Jewish community" and the rabbi enjoyed parallel status given to minister and priest. The middle section of this short essay is given to brief biographical sketches of America's first rabbis: Isaac Leeser, Isaac Mayer Wise, Max Lilienthal, Bernhard Felsenthal, Benjamin Szold, David Einhorn and Moshe Aronson. Karp asserts that the extraordinary careers of these men laid the foundations for American Jewry to expect their rabbis to be masters of all trades. Further, Karp, cites the growing ambiguity over a precise formulation of the rabbinic office and connects it to the emergence of the modern American synagogue with its complex conglomeration of activities which the rabbi either organizes or, at the very least, participates in.

In conclusion Karp writes: "He [the rabbi] is... also aware that he is heir to an ever-broadening 'job description'... priest, prophet, scribe, and sage; more immediately, the east European Hassidic *rebbe*, guide and counselor of his flock; the *rov*, expert in the literature of a literature-centered faith; and the west European *rabbiner*, the man of wide culture, bridge to the world outside - civic, cultural and spiritual. And living in the free and open society which is America, he is also aware that the role and functions of the Protestant minister define his own: pastor, preacher, organizer, administrator, and missionary" (p. 369).

Karp, A. J. (1992). <u>Rabbinic Training in America</u> . New Albany: Wexner Foundation (draft copy).

In this study commissioned by the Wexner Foundation, Abraham Karp identifies four "pressing contingent challenges" facing rabbinical schools today: (1) the present cultural climate; (2) the nature of today's rabbinical student body; (3) curriculum; and (4) recruitment and renewal. The bulk of the report focuses on items #2 and #3. Further, this study draws data only from the four largest seminaries, HUC-JIR, JTS, RRC and RIETS.

This report is particularly valuable for a number of reasons. First, Karp cites previous surveys of the rabbinical student body including those of Eichorn (1930), Hertzberg (1959), Liebman (1968), Davidson and Wertheimer (1987) and Heilman (1991). Some of the demographic data from these studies is included in the body of the text as well as in extensive appendices. Second, Karp had access to the essays of a large number of rabbinic Wexner finalists. The report includes excerpts which focus on students' motivation for attending rabbinical school. According to Karp, these finalists "represent the cutting edge of a trend: a student body older, with more worldly experience, more heterogeneous, academically accomplished but Jewishly less knowledgeable and experienced, viewing the pulpit rabbinate as one of a number of legitimate options... and often bringing with them primary agenda to be furthered through Judaism" (p.16). Third, especially in the case of JTS, Karp had access to internal memoranda and other informal communications concerning the curricular reforms which began in these institutions during the late 1980's. Fourth, in focusing on the final area of recruitment and renewal (continuing education for rabbis in the field), Karp is really the first to set forth this agenda as worthy of research and further programmatic development. Finally, throughout the report Karp draws comparisons between the present data and that of Liebman's seminal 1968 study. In the 25 years that have passed between the two studies, it is clear that much has changed yet much has remained the same.

Katz, K. (1986). Uninspired. Conservative Judaism 38(4), 14-19.

Written by a recent graduate of the rabbinic program at the Seminary, Katz comments on the causes, meaning and possible results of a barrage of what he calls "spiritualizing activity" at the Seminary during the mid-eighties.

Katz identifies three causes for such activity: (1) *The structure of the Rabbinical School itself* (length of time spent in classroom courses over the six years of training, distribution of requirements across so many fields, lack of systematic help in formulating personal goals for rabbinic practice, etc.); (2) *The background of the students* (coming from an American culture which is based on Protestant notions of religious pietism combined with a fascination in Buddhist practice); and (3) *The presence of women in the Rabbinical School* .

Ultimately, Katz belittles this activity as confined to a small group of rebellious students for whom "spiritualizing is an unreflective political response" (p.14). He further points out that even were this spiritualizing activity to become a trend, it would stand in opposition to the central building blocks of the Seminary's ideology. (See Pamela Hoffman above for rejoinder to this article).

Kensky, A., & Cardin, N. B. (1995). Women in the Rabbinate: The First Ten Years. Conservative Judaism, 48(1), pp. 3-6.

Picking up where Cardin's (1995, see above) article left off, Kensky and Cardin briefly reference issues relating to the presence of women studying for smikha at the Seminary. The article does not, however, offer any details - insightful or otherwise. Rather, it simply offers a short chronicle of a conference on the issue of women in the Conservative rabbinate. Cardin basically critiques the conference and further points out that, to date, no central address or educational program exists to address these issues. N.B. Women comprise over a third of the student body in the Seminary's rabbinical school and there were, as of 1995, over 40 women rabbis ordained by the Seminary.

Lebeau, W. H. (1995). The Conservative Rabbinate and the Dynamics of Change. Conservative Judaism, 48(1) pp. 61-64.

This is another in a series of articles reflecting on the first decade of women in the Conservative rabbinate. While acknowledging the differences in the personal attributes that men and women bring to their rabbinate (although nowhere in the article does he specify just what these might be), Lebeau holds fast to the notion that the nature of rabbinic leadership is the same regardless of gender. Lebeau states that the Seminary's Rabbinical School is responsible for ordaining leaders who are k'lai kodesh, leaders who will have the courage to set the boundaries for Conservative Jewish life in America. Setting such boundaries requires a style of leadership known as "self differentiation" in which the leader, in this case the Seminary trained rabbi, "must have the capacity to define clearly his or her own goals and values while trying to maintain a non-anxious presence in the face of resistance to change" (p. 63).Lebeau cites the legitimate power that comes with the title of rabbi and suggests that it must be coupled with the power of information (both knowledge beyond that of the congregant as well as knowledge **of** the congregant) and referent power (cultivated through the rabbi being present at "peak transitional moments" in people's lives) to be most effective and long-lasting.

Lebeau, W. H. (1997). Rabbinic Education for the 21st Century. Sh'ma 27(527), pp. 6-8.

Lebeau references Midrash Shmuel on the 6th chapter of Pirkei Avot as his "manual for rabbinic education" (p.7). Based on this text, he highlights five components of rabbi training he finds most salient. First, "one becomes a rabbi *b'limud* (through study), specifically, studying a blend of classical texts and commentaries with critical scholarship on those texts. Second, where one studies is as important as what one studies; a year of study in Israel is crucial. Third, small group seminars and internship experiences cultivate the important skills of being good listeners and effective speakers. Fourth, rabbinic

education must instill the value of loving kindness so students will learn that to be a rabbi is to be beloved. Finally, leadership training that prepares students to deal with the resistance and criticism they will encounter as their norms, values and beliefs inevitably cut against the grain of contemporary society.

Lieber, D. (1987). What Training for Rabbis? Judaism 36 (2), pp. 226-232.

In a remarkably straightforward way, Lieber takes as a given the inadequacy of both the Yeshivah and the western graduate school as models for rabbinic preparation in today's world. He offers a practical proposal for reforming rabbinic training which is based in large measure on the medical school model. Lieber proposes that the first three years of actual rabbinic training should consist of an MA program. At the end of the second year, students should take comprehensive examinations in Hebrew, Bible, Talmud and any other area of their choice. Students would be required to write a Master's thesis in year three. Upon completion of the MA, students would submit a brief paper outlining their theological views. The three years following the MA would be comprised of more formal coursework (focusing on homiletics, communication and management skills, writing responsa and personal devotional materials) as well as supervised on-the-job training(the final three years would be split evenly between these two foci). During the final year of training (year 6) students would serve as assistant rabbis "engaging especially in preaching, teaching and pastoral activity" (p. 231).

Lieber calls for tuition-free scholarships and living stipends subsidized through loans from Federations of national synagogue bodies. He also cites the need for seminaries to expand their faculties to include three types of people: graduate research scholars, homileticians and experts in various fields to act as work supervisors. Importantly, Lieber acknowledges the need to think carefully cultivating about what he calls the overall

"ambiance" of the school due to its formative capacity (this concern is central to Carroll, et al. in Being There above).

Liebman, C. S. (1968). The Training of American Rabbis. In M. Fine & M. Himmelfarb (Eds.), American Jewish Yearbook, (Vol. 69,). New York: The Jewish Publication Society.

This is Liebman's seminal study of the rabbinical schools of YU, JTS, and HUC-JIR. While the work is descriptive and analytical for the most part, there is definitely an evaluative component. The report itself is divided into several sections: a short historical overview of the development of the three major seminaries; a demographic look at the students in each (including age, place of birth, marital status, family background, educational background, and motivation for attending); faculty; curriculum; and some analysis of the informal socialization process at each institution.

Among the first year students at each institution, 70% were between the ages of 21-23 and an even higher percentage were single. 35% of YU students' fathers were born in the U.S. while the numbers were 55% at JTS, 69% at HUC-JIR New York and 69% in Cincinnati. 85% of YU students' fathers belonged to Orthodox synagogues (11% to Conservative); 69% of JTS students' fathers belonged to Conservative (19% to Orthodox, 10% unaffiliated, and none with Reform); 60% of HUC-JIR students' fathers affiliated with Reform (about 16% with Conservative and about the same unaffiliated, almost none with Orthodox). The pattern for both JTS and HUC-JIR was to attract students from homes which were to the left on the religious spectrum.

87% of YU students had nine years of more of Jewish education before entering college, and almost all received it in day school. 95% of YU students did their undergraduate work at YU. 74% of JTS students had at least nine years as well, but only 41% received most of that education in day schools. 30% of all JTS students had no Jewish education at the college level. About 52% of HUC-JIR students had nine years of

pre-college Jewish education, but the vast majority of these students received this education in Sunday schools. Motives for attending rabbinical school varied by seminary. Some 80% of HUC students were professionally motivated (90% expressed firm intention to enter the congregational rabbinate) while only 39% at JTS and 22% at YU shared this motivation.

One of the most interesting (and, perhaps, controversial) set of findings in Liebman's study concerns students' evaluation of their respective program vis-a-vis preparation for their expected career. Of those at YU who anticipated going into the congregational rabbinate, 43% called their preparation somewhat inadequate while 35% of those students not intending to seek placement as a pulpit rabbi found their preparation also inadequate. At JTS, the numbers were around 30% and 35% respectively. Liebman also reports nearly 85% of all JTS students felt that the academic standards of the institution were below the level they expected in a graduate program and that most students were dissatisfied with the overemphasized textual orientation of the program. Liebman identifies JTS as "the most discontented student body of any seminary, particularly with regard to the curriculum" (p. 79). The proportion of HUC students who were satisfied with their preparation was well over 50% (recall that 90% intended to enter the congregational rabbinate) although an average of about 40% of students between the two campuses felt that the academic standards were below their expectations for a graduate program.

With regard to the less formal process of socialization, Liebman's study suggests that, overall, students are dissatisfied with the quality of religious life at their seminaries and "there is no one person at any seminary who most of the students regard as an exemplary religious figure" (p. 63). Consisted with the students' dissatisfaction, Liebman writes that "the average quality of religious life at rabbinical seminaries cannot be called inspiring" (p. 111). At the end of the report Liebman offers the reader a rather scathing critique of the state of rabbinic training at that time. He highlights the fact that the seminaries are neither vocational nor professional institutions and that none of the

seminaries has consciously formulated a rabbinical model on which they base their training. Although the call implied in his critique is for one of reform, he reminds the reader that most lay people in the Jewish community are perfectly satisfied with their rabbis and that most rabbis themselves do not support recommendations for radical change. Further, Liebman points out that many of the dilemmas (particularly balancing the desire for a high quality teaching and research faculty with the requirement that the faculty members accept and model the values of the institution) of the modern rabbinical seminary are insoluble.

Marcus, J. R., & Peck, A. J. (Eds.). (1985). The American Rabbinate A Century of Continuity and Change: 1883-1983. Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.

This is the first volume devoted exclusively to the history of the American rabbinate. Contributors to this edited volume include: Jeffrey Gurock writing about Orthodox rabbis, Abraham Karp on the Conservative rabbinate, David Polish writing about the Reform rabbinate, and the distinguished historian Jonathan Sarna offering a comprehensive introduction to the work. Most notably, Sarna places the emergence of what he calls an "American rabbinic profile" in historical context by pointing out that the professionalization of the rabbinate in the form that we know it today took place concurrent with the emergence of other professions in America in the late nineteenth century. Further, Sarna explains that this process of professionalization resulted in an increased status for these American trained rabbis as they increasingly came to seen as representative Jews by both American Jews and non-Jews alike. The proliferating roles of the rabbi in this setting are well documented by each of the essayists.

Miller, G. T. (1997). Just a Little Different: The Jewish Theological Seminary and Other Forms of Ministerial Preparation. In J. Wertheimer (Ed.), Tradition Renewed A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary, (Vol. 2, pp. 633-665). New York: JTS.

This outstanding essay highlights the ways in which the Jewish Theological Seminary is similar to but ultimately different and distinctive from its counterparts in the world of American theological education. This entire article is worthy of review for our purposes, especially sections dealing with the general history of American theological education and the professionalization of the ministry at the turn of the century beginning at the turn of the century. Despite the title though, this article represents an analysis of the Seminary as an institution, and does not focus exclusively or explicitly on the rabbinical school or rabbinic training.

Price, R.D. (1997). Genuine Faith and Intellectual Integrity. Sh'ma 27(528), 3-4.

Writing on behalf of the rabbinic training program at the Institute for Traditional Judaism, Price advocates *more of both* types of training: mastery of classical text and a greater understanding what is happening in the world and the particular challenges faced by our communities. Most importantly, writes Price, rabbinical students must learn humility and must be inculcated with *mesirut*. . This is achieved, in part, through the selection of faculty role models. Price does not think the rabbinate should be viewed as a profession; rather, it should be understood as a responsibility and must change the individual forever.

Schachter-Shalomi, Z.M. (1997). Reverends Needed. ***<u>Sh'ma</u> 27(528), 4-6.***

Writing from a Renewalist perspective, Schachter-Shalomi bemoans what he calls the homogenization of the rabbinate. He advocates for a hierarchy of competence; a system of different titles for different functions in the Jewish community. The training would be commensurate in some way with the particular title and the responsibilities that accompany it. He does not spell out any specifics of this training in this position statement.

Schorsch, I. (1991). The Modern Rabbinate - Then and Now. ***<u>Conservative Judaism</u> 43(2), 12- 20.***

Schorsch offers the reader an historical analysis of the emergence of the modern rabbinate in 19th century Germany and its present-day implications. Schorsch cites the bifurcation of eastern and western Ashkenazi Jewry during this time. Enlightenment and Emancipation were welcomed in the West and with them came the birth of a new, truly modern rabbinate. Schorsch points out that this modern rabbinate spread the gamut of Jewish denominations and transformed the role of synagogues in communal life. Just as the rabbi took on the clerical trappings of the larger non-Jewish community around him (in terms of education, function and authority), so too did the synagogue as it replaced the academy in importance. According to Schorsch "the Jewish community recast the synagogue into an institution for outreach under the leadership of a rabbinic figure who now served as chief advocate for a revitalized Judaism" (p. 17). This, according to Schorsch, constituted the uneasy legacy with which the contemporary rabbinate is now faced; namely, to perpetuate outreach as the primary role of the rabbi. Schorsch concludes with a call to reorder the priorities of the contemporary Conservative rabbinate to focus more on in-reach which will make the rabbinate " a more satisfying spiritual vocation."

This is an interesting contribution to the history of the rabbinate for its focus on the split between eastern and western European Jewry during this period as well as its analysis of the legacy of the period for today's rabbinate.

Schwarzfuchs, S. (1993). A Concise History of the Rabbinate. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

This is an extremely important source as it represents the only substantial history of the rabbinate as an institution -- its appearance and subsequent evolution -- aside from more minor encyclopedic entries on the topic. Schwarzfuchs discusses the origins of the rabbinate, its affirmation and uneasy institutionalization during the Medieval period, the emergence of a modern rabbinate and the institutions devoted to its training, and the history of the American rabbinical schools.

Silberman, J.M. (1987). Clinical Pastoral Training for Rabbis. Journal of Reform Judaism 34(3), 9-13.

Silberman argues that there are two levels of need in the area of clinical pastoral training for rabbis: one is for competent, full-time professional chaplains and the other is for the "sensitive and aware community rabbi who serves the religious needs in such settings" (p. 9). Silberman offers the reader a brief history of the development of the field of Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) as well as an overview of its major objectives. Silberman points out that some of these objectives such as becoming a more reflective practitioner, and increasing and enhancing the interface between theology and behavioral sciences in understanding the human condition are not addressed in a "typical rabbinic education." Although CPE has historically been a Christian enterprise, more and more rabbinical students are enrolling in single unit CPE courses which are usually conducted over the summer (they last for 10 weeks, 40 hours per week). Most of the seminaries give either elective or field work credit for CPE. There are very few rabbis certified as CPE

supervisors, and the majority of participants in summer CPE programs are non-Jewish seminary students. Silberman urges the Jewish community to develop a certifying body and standards for rabbis doing chaplaincy work.

Silver, D. J.(1986). The Core of Our Calling: Who Is a Rabbi? What Is a Rabbi? Why Is a Rabbi? Journal of Reform Judaism 33(1), 1-14.

Silver points to the disjuncture between the way in which HUC-JIR trains its student rabbis and the self-perception of rabbis in the field. Silver asserts that "the College-Institute prepares the rabbis to be Jewish clergy" who "...is trained and hired to perform a specific set of services" (p. 3), while Rabbis think of themselves as members of a unique, learned profession (p. 2). The rub, according to Silver is that no congregation has ever listed "scholar" as its primary qualification for hiring. Like Karp, Silver identifies the first half of this century as the Golden Age of the American rabbinate and he maintains that the post-World War Two generations of rabbis have "downgraded" their pulpit role. Silver paints a pretty bleak picture for the efficacy of the liberal rabbinate if it continues to see itself as a service profession rather than as a professional of leadership. He ultimately dismisses the first two questions, Who is a rabbi? and What is rabbi?, in order to focus on the third: "Why is a rabbi? What am I a rabbi? What are my goals... what will I do and what will I not do?" In order to respond to this all important question, Silver advocates seeing the rabbinate as an art form rather than as a profession; he advocates for each rabbi to develop his or her own personal style that draws in the strengths, talents and proclivities of the individual practitioner. He does not, however, offer any ideas as to how rabbinic training might be better geared to facilitate this kind of conception. Although he briefly alludes to a "study" at the outset, it is unclear from this article whether Silver bases his global comments about the state of the liberal rabbinate on any real historical or empirical data.

Teutsch, D. (1997). Rabbis for the 21st Century. <u>Sh'ma</u> 27(528), 1-3.

Teutsch identifies the central challenge facing rabbis for the next generation as the ability to "function as leaders who can help to create and maintain communities of meaning." To meet this challenge, Teutsch advocates for rabbinical seminaries to be models of successful Jewish learning communities. The communities should be non-hierarchical, pluralistic, and supportive. Faculty need to blend traditional text study, scholarly analysis and encourage expression of subjective spiritual concerns and reflection on professional implications. "The rabbi of the future," writes Teutsch, "must know how to guide the development of community within an organization, how to teach Torah in a democratic setting, how to provide spiritual guidance that has authority without being authoritarian."

Wertheimer, J. (ed.). (1997) <u>Tradition Renewed A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary</u>, (Vol. I and II). New York: JTS.

In 1989 the newly founded Ratner Center for the Study of Conservative Judaism was awarded a grant by an affiliate of the national archives to organize the Seminary's then one hundred year old records. A subsequent grant from the Lily Foundation allowed for forty scholars to be commissioned to write essays on various aspects of the Seminary's history. This edited volume is the result of this work. According to Wertheimer, "These volumes are predicated on the assumption that the history of American Jewry in the 20th century cannot be understood properly without a sober assessment of the Seminary's role."

Of particular interest for our purposes are: Davidson's "Seminary Rabbinical Students: Who Attended and Why;" Ellenson and Bycel's exhaustive look at the history of the Seminary's Rabbinical School curriculum; and Glenn Miller's insightful work on the Seminary and other forms of ministerial preparation, all of which are annotated herein.

Wiener, S. (1997). A Rabbinate for Clal Yisrael - The Academy for Jewish Religion. Sh'ma 27(528), 6-7.

Wiener understands the seminary years as formative. She advocates for a seminary experience that is pluralistic, inclusive and that models mutual respect. Wiener cites the Academy's efforts in the last decade to pay special attention to spirituality, to the fact that it cannot be learned from books alone. Curricular courses such as Jewish meditation and healing, personal prayer, personal theology, personal Musar have been added over the past decade. The Academy is working on revisioning the role of *mashgiach ruchani* "so that it means one who has the wisdom to guide individuals with differing needs on the various pathways of Judaism." Wiener cites the importance of preparing a spiritual leader on the inside as well as on the outside.

Wilkes, P. (1990). The Hands That Would Shape Our Souls. The Atlantic Monthly, 59-88.

Wilkes' journalistic study of 15 American seminaries skillfully bobs back and forth between highlighting general trends and overviews to up-close portraits of specific institutions, faculty, administrators and students. JTS is the single Jewish theological seminary included in the study. Wilkes' article includes everything from general demographics of the student bodies of these institutions, to an analysis of ministry as a calling, to a brief history of seminary training and general theological education in America, to issues of sexuality and gender. Of particular interest are the sections referencing JTS woven throughout the article as well as the section entitled "The Education of the Soul" where Wilkes talks about the rediscovery of spirituality in seminaries today.

Zola, G. P. (1984). JTS, HUC, and Women Rabbis. <u>Journal of Reform Judaism</u>. 31(4), 39-45.

In this brief article, Zola addresses the following questions regarding how JTS' decision to ordain rabbis might directly pertain to the Reform movement: (1) Historically, how does JTS' decision to admit women compare with HUC's decision ? (2) How will the admission of women to JTS affect the admission of women to HUC? and (3) What overall impact will JTS' decision have upon the Reform movement? Concerning the first question, Zola points out that the question of women rabbis has been a recurring issue since the institution's founding and was formally taken up for discussion in the early 1920's. In contrast, Zola cites Nadich's 1974 presidential address to the Rabbinical Assembly as the first call for considering the issue at JTS. As for the impact of JTS' decision on HUC's applicant pool, Zola contends that there will be little if any impact. Finally, Zola's asserts that the Conservative movement's decision to ordain women will only serve to strengthen the movement itself and the face of Jewish life in America.

Zucker, D. (1998). <u>American Rabbis Facts and Fiction</u>. Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc.

Focusing on the American congregational rabbinate, Zucker weaves passages from novels and short stories of the last half century that deal in some way with the character of the rabbi into a fairly decent look at the history as well as the contemporary scene of the American rabbinate. Chapter 3, albeit short, is devoted exclusively to a look at rabbinic training. The book is choppy as it moves back and forth between fact and fiction and topic to topic. However, Zucker has done a phenomenal job in accessing and citing a huge amount of source material on the American rabbinate.

Conceptual Framework

My conceptual framework aims to accomplish two things. First, I stipulate definitions for the three central terms in my work: *spirituality, formation and spiritual formation in theological education*. Second, I sketch the historical tensions inherent in the nature of theological education which help explain what I expect to learn about the place of spiritual formation in the curriculum of a rabbinical seminary.

Spirituality

There is no question that spirituality has come to occupy a prominent place in the cultural lexicon of American life at the turn of the century. Yet, there is little if any agreement on a definition for the term. Spirituality for many Americans today does not even necessarily reside in the religious or theological domains; it can be situated in political, cultural, psychological, philosophical, social and other domains. While the past few years have borne witness to an increased affiliation with more traditional religious structures and institutions on the part of some, there has been an equally substantial increase in the array of "alternative" spiritualites on the part of others. A review of such diverse and far reaching conceptions of contemporary spiritualites is clearly beyond the purview of this project.

The contexts for understanding contemporary meanings of spirituality that are most relevant to my project are those of Judaism and Christianity. It is within these contexts that the work of training clergy takes place with the most regularity, within the most clearly identifiable institutional structures, namely, seminaries. In their extensive discussions[1] about spiritual formation in theological education, Christian theologians spend vast amounts of time, energy and space dealing with the object of spiritual formation -- namely,

[1] In addition to the Association of Theological Schools' flagship journal *Theological Education* which is devoted largely to discussions about Christian spirituality and spiritual formation in theological education, a plethora of books and institutional and organizational reports on the topic can be found in any decent Christian theological bookstore or library. There is no such correlate in the Jewish community.

something called "Christian spirituality." It is a testament to the complex and elusive nature of the concept that such a large group of erudite scholars stumble around in the dark trying to define the term. As one group of highly respected Christian theologians put it,

> the term "spiritual" in the title of this report will hold different meanings for different minds, and we would not wish to give the impression that we fully know of what we are speaking as we use this word, or that we can say precisely what we think we do know... while we believe we are rational men on the whole, we have found that the Spirit must dismantle one occasionally as the price of speaking truthfully about the spiritual (Babin et al., 1972, p. 167).

The above quote is representative of the approach to defining spirituality that is utilized by a broad spectrum of Christian theologians.[2] This approach is constituted by three distinct "moves": first, there is an acknowledgment that spirituality is protean ("different meanings for different minds") and context sensitive; second, there is a further acknowledgment on the part of these theologians that they do not exactly know what they mean by the word "spirituality"; and third, despite points one and two, all venture to sketch the contours of a definition replete as it is with qualifiers, caveats, contingencies and the like.

From a review of the literature published by Christian theologians on this topic, a few common themes in the definition of Christian spirituality do, however, emerge. First, Christian spirituality "cannot be understood apart from a deep sense of communion with God" (Stiver & Aleshire, 1990, p. 22). The central characteristic of Christian spirituality is to be found in "deepening the experience of God's active presence in one's own life, in the life of the church, and in the history of the world" (Amirtham & Pryor, 1989, p. 153). Second, and following directly from the first point, given the triune nature of the Christian conception of the Divine, Christ becomes the embodiment of or role model for Christian spirituality. In other words, Christ's acts, attitudes and habits become part of the fabric of

---

[2] And, there are some Christian theologians who write entire articles about spiritual formation without ever taking up a definition for what they mean by spirituality.

Christian spirituality. Third, in the literature I reviewed, there are three main expressions for Christian spirituality: scriptural study, worship and good works.[3]

When we bring the conversation to the specific interests of this project -- namely, Jewish spirituality -- the discussion is equally challenging. Jewish spirituality is a construct of many different ideas about, manifestations of, and disciplines expressing the richness and diversity of aspects of the spiritual life manifest in the history of Judaism.

Arthur Green, in his introduction to two volumes of scholarly essays on Jewish spirituality, writes

> Life in the presence of God... is perhaps as close as one can come to a definition of "spirituality" that is native to the Jewish tradition and indeed faithful to its Semitic roots. Within this definition there is room for an array of varied types, each of which gives different weight to one aspect or another of the spiritual life. For some the evocation of God's presence includes "ascent" to a higher realm and implies knowledge other than that vouchsafed to most mortals... The ultimate vision may be one of a highly anthropomorphic Deity seated on His throne, an utterly abstract sense of mystical absorption within the presence , the imminent arrival of messiah, or simply that of a life lived in the fulfillment of God's will (Green, 1986, p. xiii).

As Green suggests, the cultivation of a life of holiness in the presence of God is as close as one can come to defining spirituality in a way that is true to the richness and diversity of aspects of the spiritual life manifest in the history of Judaism. He asserts that this definition "could win the assent of biblical priest and prophet, of Pharisee and Essene sectarian, of Hellenistic contemplative and law-centered rabbi, of philosopher, of Kabbalist, *hasid*, and even moderns who seek to walk in their footsteps" (ibid.).

An extended account of the manifestations of spirituality in the history of Judaism is beyond the parameters of this project. Yet, when speaking with faculty and administrators

---

[3] One can see the remarkable similarity here to Judaism's central expressions of spirituality -- *Torah* (study), *Avodah* (worship), and *Gemillut Hasadim* (acts of kindness) -- expressed in *Pirkei Avot* (Ethics of the Fathers).

in today's rabbinical seminaries about spirituality, it is more likely that they will reference an amalgam of conceptions of spirituality which are distinct products of Judaism's encounter with modernity over the past 200 years than they would reference those conceptions found in the vast compendium of literature produced by Christian theologians on this topic.

As mentioned in the previous section of this proposal, the model of a distinctly modern rabbinical seminary upon which the American seminaries were later based was forged in the crucible of German culture and philosophy in the late 18th through 19th centuries. Modern German Jewish philosophers, historians and theologians such as Geiger (1810-1874), Holdheim (1806-1860), Frankel (1801-1875), Graetz (1817-1891), and Hirsch (1808-1888) sought, in different ways, to assimilate the major philosophical precepts of the time into the Jewish tradition while using the language of the tradition to do so. Their thought and that of those in successive generations such as Cohen (b. 1842), Buber (b. 1878), Rosenzweig (b. 1886), and Heschel (b. 1907) thus becomes a strategic locus of referential sources for today's seminarian (whether student, faculty or administrator) in thinking about Jewish spirituality today. My dissertation will include a brief review of these thinkers toward the goal of enabling me to connect emergent themes in the data to concepts and constructs already found in modern Jewish thought thus highlighting continuity as well as change.

It should now be clear that a comprehensive or final definition of Jewish spirituality has never existed nor, one could argue, will or should one ever exist. One of the important contributions that this study will make, however, will be in chronicling the variety of ways that Jewish spirituality is understood today in the context of an institution devoted, in part, to forming its members' spirituality in today's world. It is to the *process of forming* authentically Jewish forms of spirituality that we must now turn.

Formation

According to Webster's Third New International Dictionary, formation is defined as "an act of giving form or shape to something." It can be extrapolated from this definition that formation could refer to forming or giving shape to some**one** as well as to some**thing**. That this is the case is evident in the use of terms like character formation -- which clearly refers to the process of forming something that belongs to someone -- and the term of explicit interest to me in this project: spiritual formation.

Many religious educators use the term formation to connote a process different than and distinct from other like terms such as education, instruction, training, etc. In distinguishing among the three distinct yet interrelated processes of *formation*, *education* and *instruction*, John Westerhoff writes,

> *Formation* implies 'shaping' and refers to intentional, relational, experiential activities within the life of a story-formed faith community. *Education* implies 'reshaping' and refers to the critical reflective activities related to these communal experiences. And *instruction* implies 'building' and refers to the means by which knowledge and skills useful to communal life are transmitted, acquired and understood (Westerhoff, 1987 p. 581).

In a similar fashion, Iris Cully distinguishes among the terms *nurture*, *education*, and *instruction* (Cully, 1978). Nurture for Cully turns out to be nearly identical to formation for Westerhoff. George Schner (1993) uses the term "traditioning" to express similar ideas while well-known theologian Paul Tillich (1964) distinguishes between *inducting* education, *humanistic* education and *technical* education. It is clear that Cully's "nurture," Schner's "traditioning," and Tillich's "induction" essentially share the predominance of characteristics that Westerhoff delineates in his description of formation -- namely, a process of shaping that refers to the "intentional, relational, experiential activities within the life of a story-formed faith community ."

If we take Westerhoff's definition of formation and tack on spirituality as the specific content or, alternatively, goal of the formational process, we arrive at the following definition for spiritual formation: *the shaping of spirituality via the intentional, relational and experiential activities within the life of a particular faith community*. With this stipulative definition in hand, I now turn to the specific faith community of a graduate theological institution and the place of spiritual formation in the context of this community.

Spiritual Formation in Theological Education

In examining the relationship between spiritual formation and the theological school Wood (1991) asks, "[g]ranted that a certain spiritual maturity is requisite to theological education, how much of this can the school itself foster and in what ways?" (p. 560). Although he raises many more questions than he answers, Wood's work is important in helping to highlight some of the central concerns of this project; namely, in what ways, if any, does the understanding of formation provided above change in the context of shaping or forming adults who have already, to some degree, been formed prior to entering the seminary environment?

The name "seminary" comes from the Latin *seminarium* meaning "seed plot" (Carroll, Wheeler, Aleshire & Marler, 1997). The establishment of seminaries was decreed during the Council of Trent in 1563. The concern for the spiritual formation of the ministerial candidate in the Catholic church has, from the inception of these seminaries, always been an important one.[4]

Founded in 1936, the Association of Theological School's work is committed to improving theological education "by responding to the life of religious communities, higher education and the cultures of North America" (Schuth, 1996, p. 4). The journal which the

---

[4] According to Forster Freeman, spiritual direction has been practiced in the Catholic church since its early centuries and Protestant reformers provided extensive "direction of conscience" to their followers (Freeman, 1987, p. 47).

Association sponsors, *Theological Education* , has, over the years, devoted many issues to the topic of spiritual formation and theological education. I include a brief review of some of that literature below.

In 1972 the Andrew Mellon Foundation made a substantial grant to the Association to form a task force whose sole purpose was to address the concerns of professional and lay leaders in the Christian community vis a vis the issue of spiritual formation in theological education. The Association's Executive Committee wrote,

> There is a growing insistence throughout theological education that institutions must honestly face the question of spiritual formation. During the mid-sixties theological education addressed itself to concerns involved with a quality of education that would be more experientially based and related to the centers of contemporary culture as expressed in influence and expanding knowledge... But as theological education began to develop interconfessionally and was occasionally conducted in proximity to centers of higher and professional education, it became increasingly apparent that the question of spiritual formation of the individual was becoming primary. It appears to many that this will loom a priority issue...in theological education (Babin et al., 1972, p. 153).

The task force defines spiritual formation as "more than our humanity fulfilling itself, and the seminary disserves its students if it does not help them distinguish between the subjective phenomena of their historical and psychological existence, and the objective and awesome presence of God in their life. Hence spiritual development must mean ... coming to terms with God" (ibid., p.170).

One of the central concerns of the task force was the role of faculty in the formational process of the student. Over and over the report asserted that the spiritual formation of the seminary student begins with and is dependent upon the spiritual formation of the faculty. In other words, "the faculty *is* the seminary" and the job of spiritually forming seminary students "cannot be done by curriculum revision, student

evaluations, or reorganization of the board of trustees... [or] by field work supervisors... Ultimately, the responsibility belongs to the seminary faculty (p.161).

The tremendous concern regarding the role of faculty in the spiritual formation of the seminary candidate was addressed explicitly by the end if the decade. In January, 1978 ATS received a grant from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund to initiate a two-year pilot program to "better prepare faculty, clergy and lay leaders as spiritual mentors for students and others seeking spiritual guidance" (Edwards, 1980, p. 7) . The Shalem Institute for Spiritual Formation in Washington, DC was designated as responsible for staffing and development of the overall project which came to be known as the ATS Shalem Institute on Spirituality.

In attempting to clarify the terms for the report on this Institute experience, Tilden Edwards writes that "no dimension of theological education is more frustrating to define intellectually than spirituality and spiritual formation" (ibid.) Nonetheless, for the purposes of the project report, Edwards defines spiritual formation in a Christian context as "the process of allowing the liberation of the real, unique 'Christ form' within us." Practically speaking, this involves all the "intentional provisions we may have for nourishing our faith life as members of the body of Christ" (p. 10). When authentic, these intentional efforts "are not ways of trying to force or make grace happen... they are efforts that assist us in not missing, distorting or fleeing from grace as it appears" (ibid.).

Two important points must be highlighted here. First, Although Edwards' account of spiritual formation is necessarily inapplicable to a distinctly Jewish account of spiritual formation (namely, the intentional provisions for nourishing our faith life *as members of the body of Christ*) it nonetheless offers an important construct when thinking about spiritual formation in the context of rabbinic education -- that of intentionality.[5] In other words, there are any number of things that could be construed as contributing to a seminarian's spiritual formation, both intentional and unintentional "provisions" and

[5] This is, of course, consistent with Westerhoff above.

events.[6] Although I expect interviewees to refer to both of these categories of experiences, I will be looking to understand how administrators and faculty view the *intentional*, *focused* and *conscious* means of facilitating the seminarian's spiritual development (these means, however, could be formal or informal, curricular, co-curricular or extra-curricular).

This brings me to the second and final important component of Edwards' construct of spiritual formation that is important for our discussion. Edwards writes that a religious community's spiritual disciplines "make visible our spiritual values. They are specific concrete, regular means of attentiveness to grace..." (p. 10). If spiritual disciplines (classically defined as scriptural study, personal and communal prayer, and kinds of service to others -- or , in Judaism, the three central pillars of *Torah, Avodah* and *Gemillut Hasadim* respectively)[7] make visible a tradition's spiritual values then they must, by definition, also qualify as avenues for spiritual formation.

Within the context of ATS' Quality and Accreditation Project mentioned in an earlier section of this proposal, Senior and Weber (1994) offer the following definition for the term spiritual formation:

> at its core, spiritual formation means something like growing in grace becoming more like Jesus, learning to live a holy life, increasing our love for God and service to others, or practicing Christian virtues (p.24).

There is no doubt that Senior and Weber's definition is necessarily broad given the context of their work (The Association currently boasts over 250 member institutions representing more than two dozen Christian denominations). Nonetheless, it is representative of the elusive and complex nature of the construct as I have previously mentioned.

Schner perhaps best articulates the challenges inherent in advocating change in the area of spiritual formation and theological education when he writes,

---

[6] The recently published ethnography *Being There: Culture and Formation in Two Theological Schools* (Carroll et al., 1997) takes this approach (Carroll et al., 1997).

[7] See note 12.

> ...anyone who has engaged in curriculum revision, or in assessment of the content specific courses or activities related to spiritual formation, knows the danger of settling too easily for satisfying one's academic or administrative conscience with trendy solutions, no matter how topical or earnest they may be. Discussion of spiritual formation can tend to resolve itself into rhetorical flourishes and exhortations with little practical impact or resolution of specific problems (Schner, 1993, p.67).

So, given the fact that some of the Christian community's most thoughtful, knowledgeable and articulate scholars have such a difficult time defining, setting parameters for and suggesting ways to facilitate the spiritual formation of their clergy, it is no surprise that those in the Jewish community face similar challenges. Below, we will see that it is equally difficult for educators in the Jewish seminary community to come up with a more streamlined definition for themselves.

Spiritual Formation and Rabbinic Education

In 1992 the University of Judaism received a planning grant from the Wexner Foundation for the purpose of assessing and improving the rabbinic training program. One of the main areas of inquiry in the study was in the area of spiritual formation. A sub-committee was formed to deal specifically with this issue. Early on in their deliberations they wrote:

> The following is our understanding of what we mean by spirituality: (1) to give entering rabbinical students the technical tools they need for prayer; (2) for them to be able to have a sense of covenant, expression and empathy; how do prayers help you to see life; (3) to give students a general sense of piety about life, how to interact with other people, and to interact with life; (4) how do we deal with moral issues, deal with emotional and character development -- forgiveness and

responsibility, the search for meaning in life; [sic] (6) a sense of transcendence (Alexander et al., 1994).

Although the above was offered as a preliminary definition of the content of spiritual formation in a rabbinic seminary context, the subcommittee on spiritual formation spent the next year trying to define its terms more concretely. It readily became apparent that "[the] long list of responses indicated that we are dealing with something that varies almost with the individual" (Alexander et al., 1994, p. 24). It is a testament to the elusive and challenging nature of the concept that this group could not easily reach consensus on this question.

What the group was able to accomplish though was to offer a tentative distinction between the behavioral components of *religious* formation and the internal or emotional and intellectual parts which constitute spirituality. Defining and hence setting an educational agenda for the former is relatively easy according to the group; it is primarily comprised of the acquisition of knowledge about the ritual commandments of Judaism or the "how to." The latter, according to the sub-committee, is comprised of somehow communicating to students the motivations which lead some to affirming a religious form of life (p. 24). What exactly this means, how this is currently accomplished and how it might be done better seems to be up for discussion at the very least.

Joel Roth asserts that spiritual formation at the Seminary has always been a concern and has moved through three distinct historical stages: (1) Osmosis or *Shimush Talmidai Hahamim* (lit. "to be in the presence of great scholars") -- this approach emphasized role-modeling and mentoring in informal contexts such as meals and ritual celebrations at Professor's homes, etc.; (2) Synthesis courses -- these were designed to "bridge the academic with how [one] lived his life." In theory these classes were designed to provide the advanced rabbinical student with opportunities to grapple with difficult issues in a group setting with a faculty facilitator (it should be noted that, according to Roth himself, these courses never met their stated goal); and (3) The Rabbinical School Seminar --

introduced into the curriculum in 1989, the seminar takes place in years 1-3 of rabbinic training. Small groups of 10-12 students meet weekly with faculty selected on the basis of their ability to facilitate deeper theological/spiritual discussions. Overall, Roth asserts that none of the models has worked to the extent that their promulgators had planned (Alexander et al., 1994).

As is already evidenced in this scant and preliminary data, rabbinic educators are experiencing some of the same difficulties as their Christian counterparts with regard to the issue of spiritual formation in the seminary setting. The elusive and complex nature of articulating a definition for spirituality, coupled with the difficulties theological educators face in trying to engage an intentional program of formation in their institutions, creates an extremely challenging situation. Yet, there is one more important factor that helps explain the puzzle of why, in light of the genuine and substantive concern over enhancing the program of spiritual formation in rabbinical schools, it is often relegated to the margins of the curriculum at best and left unaddressed in any real way at worst.

Between Athens and Berlin [8]

When contrasting competing models of excellence in theological educational institutions, it becomes clear that the tensions surrounding the place of spiritual formation in Christian seminary education are more readily understood in light of two particular historical trends in education in general and theological education in particular -- namely, those of *Paideia* and *Wissenschaft*, or, as David Kelsey (1992; 1993) calls them , Athens and Berlin.

In two subsequent publications not more than a year apart, David Kelsey (1992; 1993), a professor of Theology at Yale Divinity School, reviews the unprecedented body of literature on the purpose and nature of Christian theological education that was produced

---

[8] The following section is indebted to David Kelsey's clear articulation of the tensions inherent in theological education found in his books *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate* (Kelsey, 1993) and *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School* (Kelsey, 1992).

in the 1980's. He suggests that two major voices representing two distinct models of excellence in theological education emerge from this literature: "Athens" and "Berlin." Kelsey's thesis is that North American Christian theological schools are located at the crossroads between what he calls the "Berlin Turnpike" (understood as the history and traditions of higher education as symbolized by the quintessential research university) and whatever "road" the tradition of organized religion the institution represents (Kelsey, 1992). As such, twentieth century theological schools in North America exhibit the strain of trying to appropriate two quite different and potentially irreconcilable models of excellent schooling: excellence as *Paideia* and excellence as *Wissenschaft* and Professionalism (ibid.).

In Greek, *Paideia* meant a process of culturing souls and schooling was understood as character formation. Paideia was the understanding of schooling dominant in the Hellenistic host culture of the earliest churches outside Palestine and thus was adopted into the foundations of organized Christianity (Kelsey, 1992; Kelsey, 1993). According to the Athens model then, theological education is understood as helping the student undergo a deep kind of formation. The study of various subject matters is "ordered to the students' own personal appropriation of wisdom about God and about themselves in relation to God" (Kelsey, 1993, p. 20). Theological education of the Athens type is inherently communal -- a theological school on the Athens model is thus defined as "a community of persons trying to understand God more truly by way of studying some other things whose study is supposed to enhance our understanding of God" (Kelsey, 1992, p. 108).

In contrast to this model of theological education, excellence in theological education according to the Berlin paradigm is constituted by "a movement from data to theory to application of theory to practice" (Kelsey, 1993, p. 22). Although Friedrich Schleiermarcher -- a theologian -- wrote the founding document of the University of Berlin, he had to make a case for including theology in the new research university. In his defense of theology's rightful place in the new institution, Schleiermarcher had to respond to two

main concerns. The first was that the goal of teaching in theology was aimed at cultivating capacities for knowing God while the goal of teaching in the research university is aimed at cultivating capabilities to do research and engage in Wissenschaft scholarship. The second was that the principles of *Lernfreiheit* and *Lehrfreiheit* which guided the essential research university were a direct rejection of theology's traditional authority to determine what could be learned and taught.

According to Kelsey, while the Athens model suggests the paradigm of formation as a central principle of theological education, the movement from data to theory to application of theory to practice inherent in the Berlin model correlates to a structure representing *two other* distinct principles of theological education: *Wissenschaft* for critical rigor in theorizing; and professional education for rigorous study of the application of theory to practice (Kelsey, 1993). Taken as a whole then, we have the foundations for the tri-partite nature of theological education which is the dominant model today: academic scholarship, professional education, and formation.

Although today's rabbinic educators do not reference Greek *Paideia* as the intellectual precursor to a commitment to spiritual formation, the three-fold curriculum -- academic scholarship, professional skills and spiritual formation -- is very much in evidence in their seminaries. However, the tensions inherent in the curricula of rabbinical seminaries are most often articulated by referencing the academic scholarship / professional skills split. This articulation of the tension in rabbinic education is different than Kelsey's paradigm above which places academic scholarship **and** professional education on one side and formation on the other.

For Judaism, the historical commitment to cultivating a "life of holiness in the presence of God" has, perhaps, been more of a "given" in the equation; either as an assumed component of a seminarian's personal background *prior* to entering formal training for the rabbinate, or as an integral, implicit part of the greater whole of the seminary experience. Current talk about the importance of spiritual formation in these

institutions suggests that the time has come to make this ever-important piece of rabbinic training a more explicit and focused endeavor.