

WHAT'S IN A WORD?

Inequality in the Reform *S'michah*

RABBI MARY ZAMORE

I was recently asked if the day of my ordination was a transformative experience or just another graduation. The answer: both, neither, a little bit of both. The multiple-hour ceremony flew by in the manner that truly moving events do; the speeches were so inspiring that I still remember snippets. I watched in curiosity as my classmates ascended the grand bimah of Temple Emanu-El of the City of New York. Blessed with the last name "Zamore," I waited and waited. Finally, it was my turn. I went up to the bimah; words were whispered in my ear, hands were laid on my head, *mazal tov* was said. I continued walking across the bimah to shake hands and collect the coveted *s'michah* for which I had labored five years. I remember none of the blessing I received; I recall being grateful that I did not trip or stray from the tight choreography. I do remember thinking about the gender-based inequalities that were evident to me but few would address openly. Foremost was my consternation that my *s'michah*, ordination certificate, would not say the same words as those bestowed to my male classmates.

This issue came to my attention the year before my ordination when my super-sharp husband, Terje, was reading a promotional brochure from Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion that featured the picture of two brand-new rabbis standing outside of Temple

Emanu-El, fresh from their ordination. Their grins are huge as they pose with their *s'michah* documents unfurled in their hands. In the photograph, one man and one woman stand side by side, liberal Judaism's gender equality at its best. However, Terje saw something different: he saw that the wording, albeit tiny in the photo, was different on the two documents.¹

I should have said something, but I did not feel empowered to make waves at that time as I faced job placement. And so, I said nothing. After ordination, I was swept into my new career. The language on my *s'michah* was secondary to trying to be a rabbi. I would periodically forget about the disparity until something would remind me, but I still said nothing.

In 2012 I was asked to contribute to the Union for Reform Judaism (URJ) blog celebrating women rabbis on the fortieth anniversary of Rabbi Sally Priesand's ordination. My article focused on the achievements I have witnessed over the course of my unfolding rabbinate (then, fifteen years) and on the types of gender discrimination that still need to be addressed. I wrote most of my article, including the story of the gender disparity in the *s'michah* and of how the document used to be unequal. I confidently wrote how fifteen years later, thank God, everything is good and equal in the language used to document that one is a rabbi. In order to finish the article, I needed to confirm the new language on the degree. Expectantly, I picked up the phone and called a younger colleague, told her my mission, and waited eagerly to learn the new wording. Sitting at her desk, she clearly read from the *s'michah* hanging on her office wall the same outdated language on my *s'michah*. Together we mused that perhaps it was the male document that had been changed. Neither of us could fathom that no change had taken place in fifteen years. Therefore, she quickly offered to call her husband, another recently ordained HUC-JIR rabbi, who could be found at that hour working at his desk, sitting near his *s'michah*. She assured me that she would call back in less than five minutes to set the record straight. She called back thirty minutes later, truly upset. The disparity was still the same. I had mistakenly made the assumption

that in this day of improved gender equality, the *s'michah* had been changed. It had not.

My discovery has sent me on a journey of asking questions and seeking answers to better understand the inequality in the Reform *s'michah*, its origin, the history of the written documentation of ordination, and how the Reform Movement compares to the other movements that ordain women. As I gathered enough background information, I finally did what I should have done so many years ago: I asked the administration of HUC-JIR to change the *s'michah* documentation.

Finding the Roots of the Problem

My first step was contacting Rabbi Sally Priesand, who graciously returned my call in the middle of the festivities celebrating her fortieth year in the rabbinate.² When I asked her about the origin of the disparity, it turned out that she did not know about it either. Rabbi Priesand recalled that on the day of her controversial ordination, the tube handed to her was empty! In 1972, the faculty could not come to agreement as to what to write on her *s'michah*. At that time the documents were hand-calligraphed on rich vellum, requiring a great deal of lead time to produce. The deadline came and went without a decision, so Rabbi Priesand received nothing but an empty tube. This explains why, despite the presence of a corps of international photographers, there is no photograph of Rabbi Priesand holding her history-making *s'michah* in full view. During our May 2012 conversation and several times since, Rabbi Priesand indicated that she was unsure of the full story behind her ordination document. However, she always believed that her male colleagues had received documents that contained the same language as the one she finally received. In fact, she thought, although with a good dose of equivocation, that perhaps the male version may have been changed to prefigure her sole female version. We agreed that I should call one of her classmates to confirm this story. A few minutes later, Rabbi Richard F. Address was reading his *s'michah*

to me over the phone. It was not the same as Rabbi Priesand's, mine, or that of any Reform woman rabbi.

Different Degrees

Since 1972, Reform woman rabbis have received *s'machot*, ordination certificates, that document their acceptance as rabbis, declaring in English (here I preserve the original text and format):

The Faculty and
Board of Governors of the
Hebrew Union College—
Jewish Institute of Religion
hereby certify that whereas
Sally Jane Priesand
has fulfilled all requirements for
Graduation she is herewith
ordained as

Rabbi

and is authorized and licensed to
perform all Rabbinical functions
in the name of God and Israel

In Hebrew, the degree declares:

אנחנו החתומים מטה
הראש וחבר המורים של
בית המדרש לרבנים
מעידים כי תלמידתנו החברה
שרה בת ישראל
למדה בבית מדרשנו תורה וחכמת ישראל
וגמרה את חק הלמודים הדרוש

לכך נמנינו וגמרנו בהסכמת מועצת הנאמנים
לסמכה ולהכתירה בתואר
רב ומורה
תורה תורה תדין תדין
תדרש תורת ה' ברבים, חפץ ה' בידה יצלת,
ויהי ה' עמה להגדיל תורה ולהאדירה

Here is my translation of the Hebrew, as it differs significantly from the English (I mimic the format of the Hebrew):

We, the undersigned
Head and faculty of the teachers of
the Rabbinical School,
Attest that our student and colleague
Sarah Bat Yisrael
Studied at our school Torah and Jewish scholarship
And she completed all of the required studies.
Therefore, we have decided, with the agreement of the Board of
Overseers
to ordain her and to bestow upon her the title
Rabbi and Teacher
She is authorized to teach; she is authorized to judge.³
May she interpret God's Torah among the people;⁴
May God's will find fulfillment through her hand;⁵
May God be with her to extol and glorify the Torah.⁶

Here is the male version:

The Faculty and
Board of Governors of the
Hebrew Union College—
Jewish Institute of Religion
hereby certify that whereas

Richard Fred Address

has fulfilled all requirements for
Graduation he is herewith
ordained as

Rabbi

and is authorized and licensed to
perform all Rabbinical functions
in the name of God and Israel

In Hebrew, the degree declares:

אנחנו החתומים מטה
הראש וחבר המורים של
בית המדרש לרבנים
מעידים כי תלמידנו החבר
ראובן בן מרדכי
למד בבית מדרשנו תורה וחכמת ישראל
וגמר את חק הלמודים הדרוש
לכך נמנינו וגמרנו בהסכמת מועצת הנאמנים
לסמכו ולהכתירו בתואר
מורנו הרב
יורה יורה ידין ידין ויהי ה' אלהיו עמו
יצלח וירכב על דבר אמת
וענוה-צדק

Here is my translation of the Hebrew, as it too differs significantly from the English:

We, the undersigned
head and faculty of the teachers of
The Rabbinical School,
Attest that our student and colleague
Reuven ben Mordechai

Studied at our school Torah and Jewish scholarship

And he completed all of the required studies.

Therefore, we have decided with the agreement of the Board of

Overseers

to ordain him and bestow upon him the title

Our Teacher the Rabbi.

He is authorized to teach; he is authorized to judge.

May Adonai his God be with him

Causing him to succeed, directing him to the path of

truth, humility, and justice.⁷

There are two notable differences between the male and female Hebrew versions of these documents. The first is small, but very significant; the second is more glaring, but less noteworthy. The more sizable, but innocuous, difference is in the last three line of the *s'machot*. The male degree declares in Hebrew, "He is authorized to teach; he is authorized to judge. May Adonai his God be with him causing him to succeed, directing him to the path of truth, humility and justice"; in contrast, the female version pronounces, "She is authorized to teach; she is authorized to judge. May she interpret God's Torah among the people; may God's will find fulfillment through her hand; may God be with her to extol and glorify the Torah."

Creating a conclusion to the degrees, both these sections begin with the ancient and auspicious declaration "יורה יורה ידין ידין," presented here with a translation more true to its original context: "May he teach? He will teach. May he judge? He will judge." This line is taken from a story in the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 5a, which is confirming and defining the bounds of rabbinic authority for the second-century CE leader Rabbah bar Chanah. Reflecting a time period in which the rabbinate and its authority is in formation, this Talmudic story uses the declaration "יורה יורה ידין ידין," "May he teach? He will teach. May he judge? He will judge," to proclaim that Rabbah had rabbinic authority even though he was about to lead the Jewish community in the Diaspora of Babylonia, far from the Land of Israel. Today these

phrases have frequent usage in Orthodox *s'machot*.⁸ A liberal seminary that often struggles for recognition in the greater Jewish world, Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion surely chose this ancient declaration of authority because of its providence, contextual message, and parity in the Orthodox world. The message is clear and unequivocal: HUC-JIR is asserting that its rabbis can take their proper place in the ongoing chain of tradition alongside all rabbis, ancient and modern. Therefore, the Talmudic phrase used, although switched into the feminine form in the women's *s'michah*, creates a strong statement concerning the authority of women rabbis.

Strangely enough the rest of the three-line conclusion differs greatly in content, but not apparently in intent. The differences neither communicate varying levels of authority nor reflect gender discrimination. The two versions simply seem to be an unneeded divergence.

The most troublesome difference between the male and female *s'machot* is that although the English declares a man or a woman to be a rabbi, the Hebrew uses the phrase **מורנו הרב**, *moreinu harav* (our teacher the rabbi), for men, but **רב ומורה**, *rav u'morah* (rabbi and teacher), for women. Subtle, yet quite troubling, the disparate appellations reflect varying authority and historical authenticity. Found in both *s'machot*, the term **רב**, *rav*, is the ancient term for a male rabbi used from the first century CE on. Found as a straightforward noun in the female *s'michah*, the term *rav* is linked to *morah*, the feminine form of “teacher.” Of course, **מורה** does not have vowels, and it is the reader who chooses to put (or not to put) the word into the feminine form. The word **רב** is clearly in the masculine form, even though the rabbi is a woman. In 1972, there was no feminine version of *rav* (rabbi) in Hebrew, a gendered language. It was only in recent years that the Academy of the Hebrew Language officially documented the word **רבה**, *rabbah*, meaning “female rabbi,” although they have not yet considered it for formal acceptance into their dictionary.⁹ Therefore, the 1972 use of the masculine language is understandable. However, the use of a much different phrase for men—the phrase **מורנו הרב**, *moreinu harav* (our teacher the rabbi)—smacks of gender inequality.

The *moreinu harav* phrase is ancient, rooted in the fourteenth century, when the French Jewish community was reinstituting the ordination ceremony after a long hiatus.¹⁰ Born out of an effort to link a 1386 ordination to the so-called unbroken chain of Jewish tradition, the phrase continues to communicate authenticity, authority, and stature. For these reasons, it is still used today in the Orthodox community as an additional honor to a learned and revered rabbi. The term *rav* is currently used as a formal form of address when referring to any man in some Jewish circles; such usage reaches back to medieval times. In contrast, *harav* gives the recognition of being a rabbi, one who has studied and been ordained. *Moreinu harav*, therefore, gives even more honor and authority to its bearer.

A Request

On May 21, 2012, after fifteen years of silence, I e-mailed Rabbi David Ellenson, then president of Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, writing:

From: Mary L. Zamore
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012, 12:03 PM
To: Pres Off Website Email
Subject: request

Dear David,

I hope this e-mail finds you well. This past week I wrote a posting for the URJ blog; they had invited me to reflect on being a woman rabbi: <http://blogs.rj.org/blog/2012/05/21/women-in-the-rabbinate-equal-leaders-in-our-community/>. My first draft actually read differently. Here is the missing paragraph:

“When I received my *s’michah* (certificate of rabbinic ordination) from HUC-JIR, it was one of the proudest days of my life. However, I have to admit, when I discovered that the Hebrew on my *s’michah*, and that of all the new women rabbis, was different from my male classmates, I was disappointed. The document declaring me a rabbi referred to me as ‘*rav u’morah*—rabbi

and teacher,' while the men's version said '*moreinu harav*—our teacher the rabbi.' The difference is subtle, but the men's version is a classic Jewish appellation for an honored rabbi. Now both men and women rabbis are referred to as 'xxx' on these important documents."

I was going to use the *s'michah* as an example of the great progress we have achieved in terms of equality in the rabbinate. So, I called a few new colleagues to ask what the new version said in order to fill in the placeholder "xxx" in my article. I had assumed this many years later things had changed. I was shocked to find there was no change. I know that is what I get for assuming and not voicing my opinion. Please know that the women and men I contacted were dismayed to learn of the difference between the men's and women's degrees.

After fifteen years of not saying anything, I would like HUC-JIR know that it was hurtful and disappointing to learn in 1997 that there were two versions of the *s'michah*. It is more hurtful to learn that it is still different. Of course, I understand the challenges of Hebrew and gender, and I would love to know the history of the present situation, as well as what language the Jerusalem campus uses.

I hope my words can open a dialogue in order to revisit the present approach to all the Hebrew throughout these documents.

In friendship and respect,

Mary L. Zamore

In less than three hours, I received a response in which Rabbi El-lenson wrote, "Assuming that most colleagues feel as you do, I am happy to initiate a process to change this distinction in the wording of our male and female colleagues' *s'michah*." Rabbi Michael Marmur, provost of HUC-JIR, was copied on this e-mail and promptly replied, "Since this issue was raised with me I have convened a group comprising faculty colleagues." He hoped to have a new text determined by the 2013 ordination season.

While the faculty committee appointed did meet, conducted research, and discussed the issue, a proposal for a new *s'michah* was not approved for the 2013 ordinations. In March 2013 Rabbi Michael

Marmur shared with me the research culled together by Kevin Proffitt,¹¹ senior archivist for Research and Collections, American Jewish Archives, by request of Rabbi Laura Baum.¹² At that time, Rabbi Marmur expected to have this issue settled by the 2014 ordinations. Proffitt's research documented part of the behind-the-scenes discussions before Rabbi Priesand's 1972 ordination. Unfortunately, the vital part of the history that would document the exact roots of the gender disparity is missing. However, the few pages that exist show the initial intent to create a female version of the *s'michah* that is very equal to the existing male one.

Behind the Scenes 1971–72

In a letter dated November 9, 1971, from Professor Alexander Guttman to Dr. Alfred Gottschalk, the president of HUC-JIR, Professor Guttman indicates that then senior student Sally Priesand has made repeated inquiry if the school has prepared the necessary changes for her unique *s'michah* degree. Professor Guttman further explains that he always studies the language of the *s'michah* document with the seniors as part of their Codes class before their ordination. In his letter, Guttman explores the options and challenges that he sees for the female version of the degree. He refers to two attached proposals for Rabbi Priesand's degree and even reports that Professor Uri Tal, a visiting professor from Israel, has "scrutinized both texts, is pleased with both, but considers version (2) superior."¹³ While this letter is missing its attachments, a later correspondence between dean Rabbi Kenneth D. Roseman and the HUC-JIR faculty¹⁴ refers to the two Guttman proposals and has them attached with another proposed text (see below). Therefore, we will assume that these proposals went unchanged and were the same as the attachments in this original letter.

In his first version, Professor Guttman uses the now familiar phrase *rav u'morah*, but in his second version he offers מְרֹתֵנוּ נִי, *morateinu*, being the female form of "our teacher" followed by two Hebrew letters,

an abbreviation that can mean נֶרוֹ יָאִיר, *nero ya-ir*, meaning “May his light shine.” Although he modifies the Hebrew of “our teacher,” Guttman does not change the gender of this classic phrase of praise. It is not clear why the key word “rabbi” is missing. Earlier in version two, the document does bestow the title *rav*, “rabbi,” but it does not appear in the large central spot on the *s’michah*. On November 16, 1971, Dr. Gottschalk acknowledges receipt of Professor Guttman’s letter and indicates that he too prefers the version above.

On January 6, 1972, dean Rabbi Kenneth D. Roseman sent a memo to the faculty announcing a meeting on January 11, 1972, to vote on the wording of Rabbi Priesand’s *s’michah*. He enclosed three possible versions—two by Professor Guttman and a third by Professor Werner Weinberg. Rabbi Roseman also warned that discussion on the issue will be limited, because the faculty has “other issues of significance... which will require substantial discussion.” Attached to Professor Weinberg’s proposal is a letter dated January 10, 1972, explaining that he and “Dr. Wacholder acted as a sub-committee of the Committee of Academic Procedures and Evaluation.” He explains that “we did not change *Moreinu HaRav* to the feminine, because we felt that it is a title comparable to ‘doctor,’ the gender of which is ambiguous.” The Weinberg/Wacholder version closely follows the original male version, creating a virtual parallel document. Guttman’s two proposals suggest many changes. However, it is important to note that in his letter of November 9, 1971, Professor Guttman says, “The wording of our *s’michah* (as well as the question of the signatures) has been a controversial issue for many years.” He even recalls that “the class of 1970 petitioned the Faculty to omit the words יורה יורה ידן ידן. Dr. Glueck and the Faculty rejected the petition. Omitting these words would make our *s’michah* appear inferior to the *Semichot* issued by Yeshivot and Jewish Theological Seminaries¹⁵ (though the latter give יורה יורה ידן ידן only exceptionally while most students receive יורה יורה only.” It is possible that Professor Guttman saw the challenge of creating a female *s’michah* as an opportunity to revisit *in toto* the ordination certificates.

Therefore, some of the new language he suggested may have had nothing to do with gender.

On January 31, 1972, Dr. Ben Zion Wacholder, now identified as chairman of the Academic Council, sent an in-house memo to Professors Alexander Guttman and Eugene Mihaly, with copies to Dr. Alfred Gottschalk and Rabbi Kenneth D. Roseman. In the memo he simply announces, "The committee to determine the wording of the diploma for Sally Priesand will meet at 12:30 p.m., Monday, February 7, 1972 in the Sisterhood Dormitory." In Weinberg's January 10, 1972, letter to the faculty, which accompanied the Weinberg/Wacholder version, they propose that "the Faculty should authorize a committee of rabbis to write a text." It seems that Wacholder is referring to such a committee. Unfortunately, the document trail ends there, and we know only of the final product, not of the discussions that produced it. Perhaps, in the future, others will uncover more of this history.

Looking Forward

In November 2015, Rabbi Michael Marmur convened a faculty task force to discuss changing the HUC-JIR *s'michah*. Faculty representatives from all four campuses were invited to weigh in on the new document which will correct the gender inequality. Rabbi Marmur invited me to serve *ex-officio* on this task force in order to share my research and to represent the voice of the Women's Rabbinic Network, the international organization of Reform Women Rabbis, which I now serve as Executive Director. In under an hour the faculty quickly came to a consensus after debating some of the options. The conversation especially centered on the problematic grammar which may be created in order to offer gender equal language. The benefits and drawbacks of using *רַבָּה*, *rabbah*, vs. *רב*, *rav*, when referring to a female rabbi were argued. In the end, the group decided to give the female ordinees the choice of which Hebrew title they want. This mirrors the approach of

HUC-JIR's Israeli rabbinical program. However, this decision led to another choice to be made, whether to follow the appropriate Hebrew grammar of the female version of the phrase "הרב מורנו *Moreinu HaRav*" or to disregard Hebrew grammar and create the phrase "מורתנו הרב *Moriteinu HaRav*" which is blatantly wrong grammatically speaking, but uses the phrase "הרב *HaRav*" in an innovatively gender-neutral case which does not exist in present day Hebrew. Ironically, this solution brings the entire argument of the female *s'michah* full circle to some of the discussions of 1972 in which the Professor Weinberg and Dr. Wacholder argue that "הרב *HaRav*" is "comparable to 'doctor,' the gender of which is ambiguous." The final decision, sealed with a follow up email shortly after the phone meeting, calls for women ordinees to be offered the choice of "מורתנו הרב *Moriteinu HaRav*" or "הרבּה מורתנו *Moriteinu HaRabba*." It should be mentioned that using the phrase "רַב וּמֹרָה *rav u'moreh/morah*" was briefly entertained for the convenience of being able to use it interchangeably for men and women, depending on how the reader fills in the vowels. This option was quickly dismissed as it does not have the historical weight of "מורנו הרב *Moreinu HaRav*." After this most important decision was made during the conference call, attention was brought to the ending lines of the document. The faculty quickly agreed that the present female ending is superior to the traditional male version since these two lines "better described the rabbinate," as one faculty member remarked. With this decision, Professor Guttman *z"l* will have a lasting impact on the *s'michah* document.

I look forward to the new *s'michah* text making its public debut at the spring 2016 ordinations, allowing HUC-JIR to join all the liberal movements of Judaism in conferring a fully equalitarian rabbinical degree. At the time of the writing of this article, the graduating female rabbinical students are excitedly engaged in discussions deciding which title they each want to choose. While the changed text was the most important goal, I also implore the administration and faculty of HUC-JIR to recognize publicly the new text to start the process of healing concerning the former gender disparity. It would be easy to

merely switch out the offending text quietly without recognizing the past. That would be unfortunate.

Do the Words Matter?

One could claim that the words on the women's *s'michah* do not matter, especially since few have vocalized objections. It is even possible that few have noticed the disparity at all. Following this train of thought, one could further argue that the piece of paper is merely a part of the pomp and circumstance and that what really matters is the acceptance and authority of women rabbis. However, I see it a different way: The disparity on the degree reflects the gender differences that exist every day for women rabbis. While we no longer, thank God, live with the constant question if we can be rabbis or with the blatant discrimination that held back women in all expressions of the rabbinate, there are still challenges. These inequalities are further compounded by the fact that many do not want to recognize them. The Jewish community wants to proudly shout that everything is equal and problem free. However, it is like that ordination photo in the HUC-JIR brochure from so many years ago. Things look equal until you carefully examine the fine print. Unless we are willing to address the challenges faced by women rabbis as loudly as we are celebrating the successes, these inequalities will remain. Women rabbis continue to face pay inequality, as well as glass ceilings. A legacy of unequal pay and job advancement leaves many women rabbis at a disadvantage during retirement. Young women rabbis face terrible struggles to secure maternity leave and career advancement, as congregations and Jewish institutions often see childbearing as a liability. Women rabbis are not equally represented in the leadership of our Reform Movement. And finally, what I consider the most insidious of all, our community uses different language when referring to women rabbis. We are frequently referred to as teachers and nurturers, not as strong leaders. We are praised for being great with the kids and the elderly, not for being inspiring role models and learned teachers.

This type of stereotyping undermines the individuality of every rabbi and does not honor the varied expressions of the rabbinate. In addition, as the liberal rabbinate becomes an increasingly feminized profession, we must ensure that it does not lose stature or pay scale. This is clearly not fair to the women or men who are devoted, hardworking rabbis who strive to be kind, compassionate leaders, helping to create a vision for the future of the Jewish community while expressing themselves as individuals with personal lives. As Judy Chicago wrote, "And then all that has divided us will merge / And then compassion will be wedded to power / And then softness will come to a world that is harsh and unkind / And then both men and women will be gentle / And then both women and men will be strong."¹⁷ I hope true equality will be reflected in our *s'machot* and will live in every rabbi's career path.¹⁸

NOTES

1. The gender disparity only applies to the degrees conferred at the three U.S. campuses of HUC-JIR, not their Jerusalem campus.

2. Personal phone interview with Rabbi Sally Priesand, May 2012.

3. This declaration comes from the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 5a. An exact translation renders it, "She will teach; she will teach. She will judge; she will judge." Taking the context of this text in account, it is better translated, "Is she authorized to teach? Yes, she is authorized to teach. Is she authorized to judge? Yes, she is authorized to judge." I have removed the question from the translation because the new context does not call for it.

4. The first half of this line is based on Ezra 7:10.

5. The second half of this line is based on Isaiah 53:10.

6. This last line is based on Isaiah 42:21.

7. This last line is based on Psalm 45:5.

8. *Yoreh yoreh, yadin yadin* (he shall teach, he shall judge). These two phrases represent two different levels of *s'michah* in the modern Orthodox community. The former is the designation for the most general form of *s'michah*, while the latter is awarded for more advanced study.

9. http://hebrew-academy.huji.ac.il/sheelot_teshuvot/MivharTeshuvot/Pages/25031003.aspx.

10. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, corrected ed., s.v. "Semikhah" (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, no date).

11. I thank Kevin Proffitt, senior archivist, as well as Elisa Ho, associate archivist, at the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, for their efforts to fulfill my many research requests for this chapter.

12. Rabbi Baum had recognized the difference between the male and female versions in 2009 when sitting in a male colleague's office. She then raised the question of the disparity's origin with HUC-JIR.

13. Alexander Guttman, letter to Alfred Gottschalk, November 9, 1971.

14. Kenneth D. Roseman, letter to the members of the faculty, HUC-JIR, January 6, 1972.

15. It should be noted that modern JTS ordination certificates do not use this phrase nor does the seminary refer to the ordination process or certificate as *s'michah*.

16. Personal conversation with Rabbi Aaron Panken, March 2014.

17. Judy Chicago, *The Dinner Party*, 1996.

18. My thanks to Rabbi Robert Scheinberg and Raziel Haimi-Cohen for being early readers of this chapter.