**Part III**

# Body and Ritual – Criticism of Jewish Rituals: Immersion in the Mikva

The breaking of taboos surrounding women’s bodies and sexuality was a pervasive theme among feminist American artists of the 1970s, who, in the words of American artist Carolee Schneemann (b. 1939), sought to “reclaim their bodies.”[[1]](#footnote-2) Feminist artists in 1970s America who dealt with their bodies as a subject offered new perspectives that subverted common patriarchal precepts and the dominance of the male gaze throughout the history of art. Their work has been received and discussed as the most significant artistic contribution to feminism.[[2]](#footnote-3) In the Jewish world, many feminist thinkers believe that the policing of women’s bodies is directly reflected in the rituals of *niddah*.[[3]](#footnote-4) These rituals, originating in Jewish biblical literature, were developed down to the smallest detail by rabbinical literature dating back to the first centuries AD. The Tractate Niddah in the Mishnah and Talmud is dedicated to the subject. Later, *niddah* laws were further developed and included in the core halakhic codices: the Mishneh Torah by Maimonides and the Shulchan Aruch*.*[[4]](#footnote-5) In the modern era, dozens of books, halakhic and otherwise, have been written on *niddah*, and recent decades have seen many books of instruction on the subject as well. The current section will examine the preoccupation with laws and rituals of *niddah* and *tevila* (immersion) among two artists from the modern-Orthodox Jewish world. The first chapter will discuss the works of Israeli artist Hagit Molgan (b. 1972), who generated far-reaching critical discourse on *niddah* laws and customs. Chapter 2 will examine the works of renowned American artist Mierle Laderman-Ukeles (b. 1939), who broke the taboo on public discussion about *tevila* and *mikva* as early as the late 1970s, becoming the first American feminist artist to address these subjects.

Contrary to widely-studied feminist art (particularly feminist American art) concerning the female body and menstruation,[[5]](#footnote-6) Jewish feminist art on *niddah* has been scantly researched. Most studies on the art of *niddah* and the *mikva* attempt to thematically characterize this art and lend it a historical narrative in their interpretations.[[6]](#footnote-7) However, studies have thus far avoided discussion on how these works were received, and have not examined them in the context of the unique discourses emerging from various feminist Jewish schools.[[7]](#footnote-8) Investigating the reception of *niddah* art in the art world and within religious Jewish communities in the US and Israel, illuminates the various discourses generated by the artists, and the ways in which the artists subverted body-policing constructs characteristic of the Orthodox Jewish world. Examining *niddah* and *mikva* art against the background of particular Jewish feminist discourses lends insight into the unique contribution this art makes to the feminist art world, and into the Orthodox Jewish feminism driving the artists themselves.

**Chapter 7.**

## Not Prepared!: Hagit Molgan

Born in 1972 into a religious Mizrahi family in Petah Tikva, Hagit Molgan graduated in 2001 from the Faculty of the Arts – “HaMidrasha” at Beit Berl College, among the leading fine arts schools in Israel. Molgan’s works are critical of the Orthodox rabbinical approach to women undergoing menstruation. In 2004, only a few years after completing her studies at HaMidrasha, Molgan showcased her work in an exhibition titled *Not Prepared* (curator: Ziva Yellin) at the Kibbutz Be’eri art gallery. The exhibition was also shown in 2006 at the Ezra and Cecile Zilkha Gallery, at Wesleyan University, Connecticut (curator: Nina Felshin). The exhibition propelled Molgan’s work into the public eye, where it caught the attention of various media platforms, leading, for instance, to a review by art critic Dana Gillerman in the daily *Haaretz* newspaper, mentions in the *Maariv* newspaper and Israeli television’s Channel One news, and an interview on Israeli radio station Reshet Bet.

Despite the public exposure and positive reviews, Molgan’s works garnered neither actual nor symbolic capital within the art worlds of Israel and the US. Though they received exposure through Israeli media, the works were never purchased and hardly exhibited in prestigious arts establishments. As mentioned above, in the last decade of the 21st century, when Molgan was showing her work, Jewish feminist artists in general and the Orthodox among them in particular, were excluded from Israel’s premiere arts spaces. It was not until 2012 and the exhibition of *Matronita: Jewish Feminist Art* at the Mishkan Le’Omanut Museum of Art in Ein Harod, that feminist art by religious and traditional Jewish artists gained significant public visibility in the Israeli art world. *Matronita* was the first museum show to widely exhibit Orthodox and traditional Jewish female artists, including Molgan.[[8]](#footnote-9)

With her exhibition, Molgan was the first artist to bring the *bedika* cloth into the public arena in Israel and to to encourage public discussion within both the art world and modern-Orthodox society on the meaning and effect of religious practices surrounding menstruation in the Orthodox world. During the period of menstruation (*niddah*), a married Jewish couple is prohibited from any act that might result in physical contact. Only when the woman’s period has ended completely, and there is no sign of blood for seven days, are couples allowed to resume intimacy. After menstruation ceases, Orthodox Jewish women must immerse in a *mikva* (ritual bath) before they can resume sexual relations with their husbands. The *bedika* napkin is a piece of cloth that an Orthodox woman uses to check whether menstruation has stopped. Following the end of her cycle, she inserts the napkin into her vagina every morning and evening for a period of seven days. If on any of those days the napkin is stained with blood, she must begin a new cycle of seven “clean” days. If the nature of a stain is unclear, it is customary to bring the napkin to a source of halakhic authority who decides whether the stain is “impure,” or in other words, whether it is menstrual blood. *My Patchwork Quilt* (2004), one of the works in Molgan’s exhibition, was made from square, serrated-edged white cotton *bedika* cloths glued together in rows. Some were stained with red drops or the artist’s fingerprints, arranged in series of five stained cloths and seven white cloths, in-line with the halakhic definition of five days of menses followed by seven ‘clean days’ (Fig. 2).

Molgan told Gillerman about the experiences that led her to create this work, and her account was published in *Haaretz* in honor of the exhibition at the gallery in Kibbutz Be’eri. Molgan underscored the gap between the religious taboo and the disruption of that taboo in her work:

“I didn’t know what it was about until I met the bridal consultant before my wedding. It is kept secret; mothers do not discuss it with their daughters. I meet young religious women at the exhibition who have no idea what *niddah* laws are. These are laws written by men according to their interpretation of the *halakha* [Jewish law], and these laws make women feel inferior and impure for half of their lives […].”[[9]](#footnote-10)

In the exhibition text, curator Ziva Jelin brought a quote by Molgan in which the artist emphasized the oppressive foundation that supports these customs, which she believes are damaging to women:

Every time I sent an envelope with a *bedika* to a rabbi, I felt injured. I felt it wrong that I was allowing a stranger to decide if I were in a state of “purity” or “impurity.” … I became anxious from the actions being imposed on me and forcing me to relinquish control and free choice over myself and my body. I felt part of a perverse and prejudicial system that allows an anonymous rabbi to decide whether I am “pure” or “impure.”[[10]](#footnote-11)

For Molgan, the *bedika* cloth represents the rabbinical establishment’s incursion into the very core of her body, into the innermost place of her being. According to her, presenting a *bedika* cloth to a rabbi forces a woman to participate in her own objectification and loss of autonomy and control.[[11]](#footnote-12)

In another work titled *Kosher* *Kosher,* Molgan used a quilt similar to the one in the former work. Molgan placed stamps with the word “kosher” on a table next to the quilt, and visitors were encouraged to stamp the quilt with red ink (Fig. 3). In so doing, she sought to challenge viewers to consider their own position regarding the policing embedded into the practice of *bedika*. Molgan’s *bedika*-cloth artworks correspond with American artist Carolee Schneemann’s (b. 1939) iconic 1972 grid-artwork *Blood Word Diary*, into which she incorporated her own menstrual blood. Contrary to Schneemann, who sought to reclaim the menstrual blood tainted by patriarchal culture,[[12]](#footnote-13) Molgan does not focus on menstrual blood as such, but rather seeks to expose the oppressive halakhic structures that impinge on the lives of religious women’ in the traditional Jewish world. According to Molgan, “What we are shocked by is not the red on the cloth, but the cloth itself.”[[13]](#footnote-14)

In another work, Molgan glued four *bedika* napkins onto a canvas (Fig. 4). In black marker, she wrote out the verse from the Mishnah that is read in the synagogue on Friday evenings: “Women die in childbirth for three transgressions: If they are not careful with [the laws] of menstruation; and if they are not careful [to separate some] dough [when baking to give to the priest]; and if they are not careful with the lighting of the [Sabbath] lamp” (Mishnah, *Shabbat*, 6, 2). Molgan explained the connection between the penalizing nature of *bedika* cloths and the text prescribing women’s’ traditional, gendered role: “I am appalled by the text of the Mishnah that relates to me, to my mother, to all the women I respect. I cover my ears because it binds me—on pain of death in childbirth—to the role of the modest and humble woman [who is] a mother, that is all, end of story. I rebel [against it].”[[14]](#footnote-15) By linking the Mishnaic text to the *bedika* cloths, the artist places the purity ritual that they embody within a broader context in which women are confined to traditional, gendered roles through the threat of terrible punishment.

Another work by Molgan that references *bedika* cloths and criticizes women’s gender roles in the traditional Jewish world, is an object in the shape of a large *bedika* cloth, which is comprised of white sugar cubes (image 5). The artist explains that sugar cubes were chosen for their strong association with rituals of serving men in her traditional family. Molgan explains the role of women in her family: “Women, who were in the kitchen all day long, would serve tea and sugar cubes throughout the day to the men sitting in the balcony or living room.” [[15]](#footnote-16) For the artist, connecting the tea and sugar ritual, a symbol of women’s oppression in the traditional Jewish world, to the *bedika-*cloth shape of her work, depicts purity practices and *niddah* laws as part of the oppressive patriarchal system that dominates the traditional Jewish world.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Molgan’s video work *Five Plus Seven* (2004) depicts seven women whose heads are not visible, wearing white dresses with a square-shaped exposure at the navel, alongside three metal towers lit in neon blue. To the ticking of a metronome, which also sounds like dripping water, the women march in a line, stepping in bowls filled alternately with red water and clear water (Fig. 6). The setting and repetitive action are reminiscent of dystopian videos such as *Another Brick in the Wall* by the band Pink Floyd. The marching women’s feet stay red even after they “immerse” them in the clean water. The “blood,” notes Haim Maor in his critique of the Be’eri exhibition, “sticks to the feet of the marching women like mud, and they cannot be rid of its impurity.” [[17]](#footnote-18)As the video ends, the camera zooms-in on one of the women, as though penetrating through her exposed stomach. A superimposed[[18]](#footnote-19) hand appears in the frame, holding a rod wrapped in a piece of cloth. It penetrates the stomach, uncovers a receptacle reminiscent of a tampon cover, and clears it out (Fig. 7). The image of the hand holding the rod is duplicated at the end of the video, filling the screen (Fig. 8). The rod suggests a halakhic instruction regarding *bedika*: “And put it deep into that place [=the vagina], deep into the holes and crevices, to the place of the *shamash* [=where the male genitalia enters during intercourse] and see if it has reddish appearance […]” (*Shulchan Aruch Yoreh Deah*, 196:6).

In the exhibition text at the Kibbutz Be’eri gallery, Jelin introduced Molgan’s work with a series of questions that interpreted it as a critical piece: “The endless repetition of the marching women raises questions. Who are they? Where are they marching to and why? What is the meaning of the ritual in which they are participating and when will it stop?”[[19]](#footnote-20) Later, in 2017, Jelin described the work as follows in her doctoral dissertation: “In this work and others, Hagit Molgan explicitly deals with menstrual blood, and attempts to break through the barrier of social taboo and the conspiracy of silence, which is particularly acute in the religious community.”[[20]](#footnote-21) In his review of the show, Maor also emphasized the critical gender references he detected in Molgan’s work:

The background for this action is three metal buildings, erect like male phalluses and lit in metallic blue. The women look small and inferior next to them. A square opening in the women’s dresses allows viewers to take a peek of the reproductive system of these anonymous birthing machines. A hand grasping a rod-shaped cleaning instrument penetrates them, a computerized image that duplicates itself and multiplies. A metronome clicks throughout the video, nagging at the viewer. [[21]](#footnote-22)

Therefore, despite its use of indirect metaphors, Molgan’s work was experienced as a troubling look into the lives of women in a system that polices their bodies through obsessive preoccupation with monthly menstruation. Similar to Molgan’s other works, this video was interpreted as a critique of *niddah* laws.

An additional work presented by Molgan, titled *Tzitzit* (images 9), is comprised of two readymade *tzitziot*.[[22]](#footnote-23) In the exhibition text at the Be’eri gallery, Jelin described it as follows: “The simple display, free of any intervention, of the two *tzitziot*, uncovers the secretly phallic shape of these religious garments, worn by men on a daily basis.”[[23]](#footnote-24) Maor similarly described the phallic shapes in the work: “A pair of male *tzitziot* hung on the wall, with the shape of their authentic openings for the head visually reminiscent of a penis and testicles.”[[24]](#footnote-25) Gillerman, on the other hand, saw both phallic and vaginal imagery in the work: “The shape of the head openings in the *talitot* is simultaneously reminiscent of male and female genitalia.”[[25]](#footnote-26) Gillerman herself interpreted the work as a depiction of male dominance in the Jewish world, describing it as “two white, pure *talitot*, a symbol of male control.”[[26]](#footnote-27)

In the Orthodox Jewish world, this work was seen as crude and blasphemous for its use of a ritual object to create a seemingly sexual image, even though it simply displayed the *tzitziot* as they were, and is open to various interpretations. The shocking effect of this work was evident in one of the discussions at the Be’eri gallery, which included women from the religious Kibbutz Sa’ad, the artist’s place of residence. One of the women at the discussion said, “The work that was most difficult for me… [is the work] with the *tzitzit* […] the genitalia is just laid out there […] there is something very crude about it, it was a very hard experience for me.”[[27]](#footnote-28) Similarly, at a conference on art and feminism that I organized in 2015 for the Gender Studies Program at Bar-Ilan University, in which Molgan lectured on her work, I used an photograph of *Tzitzit* (Fig. 10) on the invitation. Orthodox Jewish students in the program were appalled at the image, which they perceived as provocative and blasphemous. One of the women who demanded that the image on the invitation be replaced was Shlomit Hazan-Stern, then-coordinator of the program, who wrote to me: ““I think that the cut-outs in the *tzitziot* in the shape of male genitalia are crude […][[28]](#footnote-29) The shape of male genitalia? Cut out of a *tzitzit*? […] I think that this completely crosses the line of what religious people can live with, even if they are very liberal.”“[[29]](#footnote-30) Although Hazan-Stern clearly expressed her disdain for the image combining a sanctified object with a phallic shape and described it as provocative, she emphasized that the censorship, meaning her demand to remove the image from the invitation, stemmed mainly from wanting to avoid “drawing attention in a crude way.”“[[30]](#footnote-31) She explained: “We are in a conservative environment [Bar-Ilan University], where we need to repeatedly defend our principles. So to falter over this? […] We [at the Gender Studies program] have always preferred to focus on the content […] In the end, these things get in our way when we try to promote real issues […].”[[31]](#footnote-32)

Much like the high-heels work by Nechama Golan discussed in the first chapter, Molgan’s work was perceived as critical and subversive by the art world; however, like Golan’s work, its shocking effect was at play mainly in the Orthodox Jewish world and not in the art world. The negative critique of Molgan’s work affirms its direct and provocative nature, and its refusal to yield to the dominant discourse of the Orthodox Jewish world, not even to the feminist iteration to which Hazan- Stern subscribes. Molgan: “I say it out loud, but I know that to do a piece on it, and to give it representation […] comes at a price.” [[32]](#footnote-33)

Molgan views her art as an act of feminist activism aimed at making an impact beyond the walls of the art gallery, an act of generating real change in the Orthodox Jewish world: “There is an inner circle of artists in Israel that I very much respect—some were my teachers, others were fellow students at ‘HaMidrasha.’ They test the boundaries of the language of art . . . I, on the other hand, deal with elements of social art, of protest, that come from the four walls of the ‘I’.”[[33]](#footnote-34) Nonetheless, the artist stresses her commitment to the religious Orthodox world in which she was born and raised. At a 2015 conference organized by the Gender Studies Program at Bar-Ilan University, she presented her work as criticism that stems from a belief in and acceptance of the Orthodox halakhic system. Nonetheless, Molgan did note that she does not refrain from criticizing the oppressive foundations of this system.[[34]](#footnote-35) Her comments on her own work illustrate the radical nature of the discourse she promotes. She speaks frankly about “the feeling of pain and overwhelming despondence generated by these commandments, which marginalize me and say things about me that I do not accept. I do not agree that my menstruation should be seen as repellant. I will not consent to being called impure.”[[35]](#footnote-36) The artist summarizes her straightforward, radical, uncompromising stance as follows: “In the *mikva* [ritual bath], the attendant asks the woman before checking her, Are you prepared? And I answer that I am no longer prepared, that this whole procedure and the way in which it is conducted does not suit me.”[[36]](#footnote-37)

**Precedents for Molgan’s *Niddah* Works in Israeli Art**

Comparing Molgan’s work to its precedents in Israeli art elucidates its singularity and its degree of contribution to this field. The most significant precedent to Molgan’s preoccupation with *niddah* laws is a work often referred to as the “*niddah* performance” (1976) by Yocheved Weinfeld (b. 1947), one of the key figures in Israeli art during the 1970s and among the pioneers of body art in Israel.[[37]](#footnote-38) Weinfeld’s performance intertwined purity and grieving laws from the Jewish codex *Shulchan Aruch* with her own texts; it was featured at the Debel Gallery in Jerusalem in 1976 (Fig. 11), documented on film (which was later lost), and featured at the “Exhibition ‘76” event at the Artists House in Tel Aviv as well (1976, curator: Gideon Ofrat). Weinfeld’s work is a milestone in the history of Israeli art, and images of it are used in nearly every text and exhibition on the period. Weinfeld created a ceremony in which she read texts based on purity laws and laws of mourning from the *Shulchan Aruch*; despite the prevalent use of “the *niddah* performance” or “the *Shulchan Aruch* performance” (as it was referred to in the Jerusalem Post) as titles for her work, its true name is in fact “Untitled.” [[38]](#footnote-39) In actuality, apart from the *niddah* texts, Weinfeld also incorporated aspects of Jewish rituals related to banishment, elements of Christian ceremonies, and references to social constructs of beauty and regimentation in general society. [[39]](#footnote-40)

The performance depicted the artist as a passive woman, whose body endures humiliating acts, some of which border on abuse.[[40]](#footnote-41) Around the same time, Weinfeld created an 8mm film titled *Hatzitza* (intervening object), which also touched on the subjects of impurity and *tevila* laws (the film was later lost). The film included a soundtrack of a reading of definitions of *hatzitza* from the *Shulchan Aruch* in relation to the *mikva*. At a certain point in the film, three tampons appear as they are being pulled out of a vagina one after another, as well as sanitary napkins and masking tape being removed from different body parts.[[41]](#footnote-42) Similarly, in another work she exhibited by the Debel Gallery at the time, Weinfeld addressed the myth according to which Haredi couples have intercourse through a hole in a sheet.

Certain art critics saw Weinfeld’s *niddah* performance as a critique of the religious world,[[42]](#footnote-43) but the artist herself did not think of it as critical. Thirty years after the performance, Weinfeld still denies that feminism had any impact on her work, discussing it only through the prisms of formalism and conceptualism.[[43]](#footnote-44)

Weinfeld herself was married to David Weinfeld, a translator of Polish poetry who was religiously observant. Their marriage brought her into contact with the requirements and rituals associated with the practice of *niddah*. According to curator Sarah Breitberg-Semel, speaking on behalf of the Ruth Debel Gallery, “the exhibition was born of this traumatic encounter.”[[44]](#footnote-45) Conversely, in a personal correspondence in 2011, the artist herself explained to me that the exhibition attempted to create a visual expression of the myths as perceived by children: “It was an attempt to imagine things that seemed exotic, far-away, that I heard about as legends, as a child in Israel.”[[45]](#footnote-46) Weinfeld told me that she first discovered and read the *Shulchan Aruch*, the code of Jewish law, in the seventies: “The beauty of the text and its preoccupation with materials I was using in my pieces inspired by to combine them all in an installation at the Debel Gallery.”[[46]](#footnote-47) Indeed, the artist has ruled out a feminist reading of the work over the years. In 1991, she was quoted as follows in *Maariv*:

I may have addressed *niddah* as part of my preoccupation with *Shulchan Aruch*, but I would not draw the equation of woman=*niddah*. It’s too simple […] I arrived at the *Shulchan Aruch* as a way to break free from formalism—from the sweeping cultural guidelines prescribed by Raffi Lavie. I found an available text. But my choice was spontaneous. I was not seeking to submit an intellectual protocol of the woman’s status in Hebrew law. [[47]](#footnote-51)

Yael Guilat has shown that the Israeli art field also discussed Weinfeld’s work mainly through a formalistic lens, and not through the prism of feminist critique on Judaism. [[48]](#footnote-52)

The artist’s negation of possible feminist interpretations of her work is curious, considering that in 1979, she exhibited work at the A.I.R Gallery, one of the first feminist galleries in the US and the first feminist arts cooperative. Weinfeld also showcased her works at the Magers Gallery in Bonn, Germany (1976-1977), alongside prominent feminists such as Judi Chicago, (b. 1939), Marina Abramović, (b. 1946), Valie Export (b. 1940), and Gina Pane (1939-1980).[[49]](#footnote-53) The pervasive discourse of the Israeli art world until the end of the 20th century might account for Weinfeld’s denial of her work’s feminist nature in the 1970s. At the time, many Israeli women artists and curators rejected feminism, and until the 1990s there was no designated “feminist art” category in the Israeli lexicon.[[50]](#footnote-54) Curators Ilana Tenenbaum and Einat Amir sum up the issue as follows: “In the 1970s, this pairing of words [feminism and art] was not legitimate and was largely rejected even by artists who explicitly dealt in ‘feminine’ or gender-related art.”[[51]](#footnote-55) At any rate, Weinfeld’s work was largely interpreted as a personal, revealing exploration of herself, and of the materials and processes of artistic creation. This in complete contrast to Molgan’s exhibition, which was driven by critical feminist motives and was discussed and interpreted as direct criticism of *niddah* laws.

Another precedent to Molgan’s work is *Bad Tzach* (“Clean Cloth”), a solo work by Ayana Friedman (b. 1950), which also utilized *bedika* cloths (image 12). It was displayed in 1996 at a Jerusalem gallery belonging to the feminist organization Isha L’Isha (Woman to Woman) (curator: Talia Birkan). Unlike Molgan’s works, Friedman’s did not make waves. *Bad Tzach* was created as part her broader exploration of protest against religion. The work consisted of photographs of a nude figure and strips of white *bedika* cloths, sewn together with gold thread. Each row of cloths bore a stain in a different color: bronze, gold, and ivory. Friedman recounts:

The figure appears several times, fading slightly from one appearance to the next, just like the stains. The harder the woman works to preserve her good looks – the fainter she grows, fading away into religious and social demands that she prove her pureness and cleanliness, while invading the depths of her body.[[52]](#footnote-56)

Unlike Molgan’s exhibitions, which prompted discussion in the art and modern-Orthodox worlds (as further described in the following section), Friedman’s work garnered neither the attention of the art world nor served as a catalyst for communal discourse about *niddah*.[[53]](#footnote-57) The precedents to Molgan’s work underscore the uniqueness of her work and the discourse she generated, which was both public and explicit.

**The Reception of Molgan’s Works in the Modern-Orthodox Jewish World**

**in Israel**

Although the art world is Molgan’s sphere of activity, her art is, to a great extent, intended for the religious Jewish world as well. Molgan describes her work as art created within and derived from the Orthodox world in two ways, one theological and one social. In terms of the theological perspective, at a conference I organized in the Bar-Ilan Gender Studies Program in 2015, Molgan introduced her work as critique stemming from a position of faith, which accepts the Orthodox halakhic system. Nonetheless, Molgan stated that she does not refrain from criticizing the oppressive elements embedded into this system. The social-activist element of her work arose in Molgan’s 2016 interview with Ze’ela Dok-Diyuk, in which she discussed her need to criticize the religious Jewish world “from the inside,” as a strategy that might promote true change within the societal framework she inhabits.

I prefer to create my work in a way that keeps me on the inside. So that my statement remains clean and authentic. Because if I come at it from the outside, they will say “Well, she has already left the religion, she has no connection to us. It is like anyone else saying they do not like our customs, we don’t care.” That is why it’s important to me […] to stay inside […] I will keep living here [=the religious kibbutz Sa’ad]. It is important to me to do this work while I am in this community, this affiliation group. [[54]](#footnote-58)

Molgan describes her choice to remain in religious society as parallel to her commitment to her life on the kibbutz, stating that these two choices allow her to make effective criticism “from the inside.” As such, the artist underscores her fundamental position in which the Orthodox *halakha* is inherent, while also criticizing the Orthodox-Jewish institution “from the inside” in an effort to effect change.

Molgan describes her process from a time when it was difficult for her to present her *niddah* artworks in public, to the public display and discourse that exists about its significance. As I will show, her explicit preoccupation with *niddah* links her to a trend of religious-Jewish feminist criticism in various disciplines of 21st century Israeli art. In her interview with Dok-Diyuk around the time of her exhibition, Molgan stated that when she first dealt with the subject while studying at HaMidrasha, she did not explain the meaning of her work to viewers, and they were usually analyzed through a formalistic lens, or discussed as art about lesser-known esoteric rituals from the past.[[55]](#footnote-59) At first, Molgan was unwilling to publicly display her work or explain it because it dealt with taboo subjects. She recalls that Be’eri gallery curator Ziva Jelin saw her video work *Five Plus Seven* when it was playing in an editing room and contacted her. But Molgan was not interested in showing her work at the time: “I thought, I don’t feel like bringing this subject to the surface; it felt to me like revealing a secret I was not ready to tell.”[[56]](#footnote-60)

The artist connects her decision to publicly exhibit her artwork with the emergence of public discourse on the subject, which began around the time of the release of *Tehora* (“Pure”) (Anat Zuriah, Israel, 2002), a documentary film on the laws of *niddah*.[[57]](#footnote-61) *Tehora* depicts the covert and overt struggle of religious women against Jewish *halakha*, which shapes their lives, including their relationships and sexuality.[[58]](#footnote-62) The film broke the taboo around the subject and prompted a surge of discussions in various religious forums, followed by numerous articles and books on the *mikva* and women’s relationship with it.[[59]](#footnote-63) It opens with a dramatic scene: A woman (the director) is walking alone at night, her footsteps resounding loudly. In a voice-over,[[60]](#footnote-64) the director says, “Women have been going to the *mikva* for two-thousand years. Fulfilling the ritual of *tahara* [purity]. For two-thousand years, a conspiracy of silence. Always at night, in the dark, not to be seen.” Molgan’s video work *Five Plus Seven* preceded *Tehora*’s release, but before the latter came out, Molgan never thought to present her work in public; the discourse surrounding *Tehora* drove her to exhibit her work and publicly express her point of view.

Molgan’s exhibition stirred up harsh criticism within the modern-Orthodox Jewish world, due to both her public exposure of taboos and her perspective on them. Most of the criticism did not refer directly to Molgan’s work itself, but rather to her statements in the exhibition text and in gallery discussions. In fact, most of those opposed to Molgan’s work never visited the exhibition nor saw the art itself. An analysis of these critiques attests to the unique brand of discourse Molgan forged within the modern-Orthodox world and illuminates the tactics she used in her subversive endeavor, namely exposing the taboo and taking an adamant stand against the patriarchal construction of *niddah* laws.

When the exhibition opened at the Be’eri gallery in 2004, it received mixed reviews from the religious kibbutz movement and the modern-Orthodox community in Israel. Some saw it as trailblazing feminist art. Conversely, a significant portion of critiques called it blasphemous, an obscene breaking of taboos. In an interview for *Kol Yisrael* radio station, aired in parallel with the opening of the exhibition, Molgan recalled a conversation with a religious woman who said the exhibition prompted her to discuss *niddah* practices with her spouse from a female perspective for the first time.[[61]](#footnote-65) Molgan also relayed that “many types of women with many types of lifestyles really wanted to talk about it.” [[62]](#footnote-66)

In the Kibbutz Sa’ad local newspaper, a female kibbutz member described her positive experience at the opening of the exhibition:

Despite my concerns, the discussion with the artist was well-attended and fascinating. We saw a brave young woman discuss her point of view as a religious woman, and raise subjects shrouded in a conspiracy of silence. She displays objects from the religious world – which follows the laws of purity and impurity. The exhibition is surprising and bold. Her statement is felt and evokes feeling through the “whiteness” and purification obsession.[[63]](#footnote-67)

On the other hand, Molgan notes that every “gallery discussion with religious women included ‘recruited’ participants who patiently waited to say that displaying this kind of exhibition was wrong.” [[64]](#footnote-68) In the Sa’ad local newspaper, a kibbutz member by the name of Dalia Roi criticized the show, emphasizing that it was wrong to air the subject in the secular world:

The *mitzvoth* of family purity have just been presented to our secular neighbors in a critical and ironic light, and buses from Sa’ad went in droves to witness the miracle, which, forgive me, had a degree of *chillul Hashem*.[[65]](#footnote-69) I felt that such misgivings and criticism should be resolved among ourselves before depicting it as a barbaric, tribal custom to Jews who are not familiar with the deeper layers of the issue and could develop certain conclusions and strange ideas about our holy Torah.[[66]](#footnote-70)

Molgan emphasizes that most members of the religious kibbutz reacted to the exhibition in a critical and negative manner:

Most of the significant responses were admonishing and fiercely critical of me. Their primary contention was that I was guilty of *chillul Hashem*. They were angry with me for arguing with the *halakha* […] The harsh criticism came in various forms, both direct and indirect. Letters were sent to me, and critical articles were published in the local newspaper. [[67]](#footnote-71)

Criticism also came from the institutional side of the religious kibbutz. Molgan stated that, “Most are very upset by the exhibition and several articles have been written on it in the kibbutz newspaper. I had a personal conversation with them [=with the kibbutz rabbi and secretariat]; they did not really reprimand me because they are very good people, but I could feel that they were very uncomfortable, and the rabbi even said, ‘I wish you would have told me you were going to do this.’”[[68]](#footnote-72) Rabbinical objection to Molgan’s works was also expressed within the American Jewish community prior to the exhibition’s US opening.[[69]](#footnote-73) Molgan: “I remember Magda [=initiator of the US exhibition] telling me that a rabbi had called her and voiced his objection. He said that when efforts are finally made to bring an Israeli artist [to the US] – they bring one who speaks against herself, and it would be better to bring someone who speaks in favor.” [[70]](#footnote-74)

Other than responses focused on the ‘secret’ being revealed to outside eyes and the presumably blasphemous nature of the work, the exhibition also attracted direct criticism of Molgan’s standpoint. Yona Berman, editor of the *Amudim* periodical of the religious kibbutzim movement, wrote and published an article on the exhibition.[[71]](#footnote-75) Like many other critics, she admittedly had not seen it. She described the exhibition with the terminology of an art critic: “Exceptionally brave and aesthetic, it demands that the viewers engage in discussion on a subject considered taboo in religious society” [[72]](#footnote-76)0; but more so, she highlighted the opposition to the artist’s point of view. Her article quoted Tal Wiesel, a young, recently married woman from Sa’ad. In Sa’ad’s *Alim* newspaper, Wiesel described the fulfillment of *niddah* laws as a positive and uplifting experience and criticized Molgan’s perspective on the subject.[[73]](#footnote-77) Also in the local newspaper, the kibbutz rabbi, David Asulin, explained the concepts of purity and impurity from a halakhic perspective, while gently urging that Molgan’s approach to the issue be disputed.[[74]](#footnote-78) Following the exhibition, the rabbi and his wife Shifra Asulin also offered to hold meetings on the subject. In a flyer distributed in the kibbutz, they described the exhibition as one that “raises questions and thoughts” and invited female kibbutz members to “a discussion on the various subjects raised by the exhibition and as a result of it.”

A harsher response to the exhibition, published anonymously in the *Amudim* periodical, began with a quoted verse: “I will remove the unclean spirit from the land” (Zechariah 13:2). This title carried a double meaning; it referred to the subject of the exhibition (purity and impurity), while simultaneously rendering the exhibition itself an “unclean spirit” that should be “removed from the land.” The writer, who did note that, “it might not be fair to voice an opinion about an exhibition I have not seen,” stated:

[…] I wish to express my objection to the degradation of unique Jewish values. Judging by the description [=published in a previous article in *Amudim*], the exhibition uses motifs generally associated with wounds, surgery, sterilization, rape, and perhaps murder. The internal femininity is a victim, a victim of meaningless, merciless religious rites. I ask myself: Is this a personal statement, or art that extends beyond the personal into the religious life of our society? Have the waters of the purifying *mikva* indeed been sullied? Should it be our generation, in particular, which has freed itself from “antiquated” notions about the concealment and repression of sexuality, that suffers this? How have the natural acts of *bedikat tehara* and immersionin the *mikva* become so contemptible and invasive? I hope and want to believe that this is not the true state of affairs […].[[75]](#footnote-79)

The writer has amplified the subject and associated it with rape and murder, which she followed by offering an alternative to Molgan’s critical outlook. She described the ritualimmersion in the *mikva* and the distance from the male partner as powerful processes of renewal: “I say, ‘Blessed are you who has made me a woman’[[76]](#footnote-80) at every stage, and am renewed each month.” [[77]](#footnote-81)

Beyond the criticism itself, Molgan underwent a difficult process of marginalization in her kibbutz following the Be’eri show, to the point of a pseudo-excommunication: “I realized that in my home, here in the kibbutz, I was being treated differently; it was very hard for them to accept me […] I went through a slow, long process of exclusion […] because people were wary of me. Even two years after the exhibition, a senior kibbutz member told me that I have no idea just how angry they were with me […].”[[78]](#footnote-82)

In 2017, Jelin described Molgan’s exclusion in hindsight: “They would not let her take on different roles in the kibbutz. The appointing committee approached the community director when she was nominated for the kibbutz administration; they also would not allow her to go study… they were afraid. She was a threat to the status quo.” [[79]](#footnote-83) As such, Molgan fostered discourse about *niddah* in the modern-Orthodox community no less than she did in the art world. The criticism and exclusion she experienced emphasize the radical nature of her work, the public exposure of the taboo, and how it inspired acts of resistance to body-policing practices of Orthodox Judaism.

**Molgan’s *Niddah* Art and Orthodox Jewish Feminism**

Examining the reception of Molgan’s works in the feminist Orthodox-Jewish world further corroborates the unique precedent her work set by forging feminist Orthodox-Jewish thought and activism regarding *niddah*. While Molgan’s work fits into the trend of religious criticism in Israeli art of the early 2000s surrounding *niddah*,among other topics, feminist Orthodox-Jewish thought in Israel had yet to address the subject, and it remained a taboo not to be publicly discussed or disputed. At the time, feminist discussion in the Israeli Orthodox community dealt with the boundaries of *niddah* practices and attempted to advance halakhic justification for alleviating them. For instance, a collection of articles accompanying the fifth conference of the feminist Orthodox organization *Kolech* (2009), dedicated, for the first time, considerable discussion to the issue of *niddah*, but made no attempt to challenge the laws themselves or their construction by male rabbis. The discussion focused solely on the boundaries of these laws.[[80]](#footnote-84) The collection included several articles offering “friendlier” versions of bridal consultation,[[81]](#footnote-85) alongside discussions on the issue of “halakhic infertility.”[[82]](#footnote-86) The collection also touched on a subject that became a symbol of religious Jewish feminism at the time: the proposal to eliminate the custom of observing seven clean days and to base *niddah* practices on Torah law (“*de’oraita*”) alone. This would mean shortening the period of abstinence between couples to the duration of the menstrual cycle, eliminating the additional week of abstinence.[[83]](#footnote-87)

Contrary to the non-radical feminist approach of Orthodox women around the time that Molgan exhibited her work, in the art world, *niddah* and *tevila* laws were discussed from a critical perspective. Jewish historian Tali Berner notes this in her article, which was published in the *Matronita* exhibition catalogue in 2012:

In recent years, the debate over the woman’s body has grown more trenchant, mainly as it pertains to the impurity of menstruation and the primary importance of fertility in the religious community. In 2010, Kolech held a conference on the subject of religious women’s health, which seems certain to remain on the religious-feminist agenda in the years to come. Strangely enough, this subject, which remained largely unseen and unspoken throughout history, has received widespread notice in the cinema and visual arts. [[84]](#footnote-88)

The film *Tehora*, the play *Mikva* (Nurit Hadar Feuerstein [Galron], 2003), and the contemporary dance performance *NIKBA* by the Tarantula Dance Group,[[85]](#footnote-89) brought the subject into the public sphere and broke the taboo surrounding it.[[86]](#footnote-90) According to literature scholar Yael Shenkar, “One could notice the discourse developing in the national-religious community in Israel – which the movie [=*Tehora*] became a part of; a discourse on femininity, sexuality, the body, and status in the religious community of Israel.”[[87]](#footnote-91)

Indeed, in the 2000s, sexuality and the body became prevalent themes in religious cinema.[[88]](#footnote-92) For our purposes, the films *Shira* (Miryam Adler, 2009) and *Blessed* (Hadas Kahan-Schlissel, 2010), both by graduates of the Ma’aleh School of Film and Television, Jerusalem, were the first cinematic portrayals of *bedikat tahara* using the *bedika* cloth. Molgan’s work therefore fits into a dominant taboo-breaking trend in the art world at the time, which was absent from other feminist-religious discourse. However, while the above-mentioned films can be interpreted in different ways, Molgan created pointed, incisive discourse against the male construction of *niddah* laws.

Noting the distinctions between feminist Orthodox discourse on Molgan’s works around the time of her exhibition, and the direct discussion on these works a decade later, after they were displayed at *Matronita* in 2012, illuminates just how far-reaching the discourse Molgan generated in the early 2000s was—far beyond the accepted norm in Orthodox feminist thought and activism during this period. In 2004, when the exhibition opened at the Be’eri gallery, it was primarily discussed within the religious kibbutz movement. An article by Lea Shakdiel, among the pioneers of Orthodox feminism in Israel, was written around the time of the exhibition and published in *Deot*,the journal of the modern Orthodox movement “Ne’emanei Torah Va’Avoda” and the Ya’acov Herzog Center of the religious kibbutz movement. It extended discussion on the exhibition into wider circles of the modern-Orthodox world in Israel. However, in-line with the pervasive feminist discourse in the modern-Orthodox world at the time, the article framed the exhibition in the discourse of “female empowerment,” and effectively dampened its radical nature. Seven years later, in 2012, after Molgan’s works had been presented at *Matronita* and discourse on sexuality and the body became far more public and explicit in the modern-Orthodox world, [[89]](#footnote-93)Ayelet Wieder-Cohen, chair of the religious-feminist Kolech organization, honed her radical criticism of *niddah* laws and the religious institution through her discussion of Molgan’s work.

Under the title “A Free Woman” and the subheading “Women’s empowerment must take place: Reflections on the exhibition *Not Prepared* by Hagit Molgan,”[[90]](#footnote-94) Shakdiel discussed the exhibition through a Marxist-feminist lens, which invited an examination of feminine existence within a patriarchal world. Shakdiel focused on analyzing the text Molgan had written for the exhibition, in which she described her childhood experience in the men’s section of the synagogue and her banishment from it as soon as she reached puberty. Shakdiel presented Molgan’s rebellion as associated with the insight that it is the male gaze that constitutes social reality. According to Shakdiel, this gaze “purports to include her [the woman’s] perspective but also excludes and fixes her in a position that is subordinate to his.”[[91]](#footnote-95) Shakdiel asks, “When will man stop being the representative of the human race while woman represents only the female?”[[92]](#footnote-96) Shakdiel emphasizes, “Molgan does not offer us a solution that will silence the cry and this is just as well . . . pioneering artists like Molgan sit on the fence for us all . . . so that we may take note of the problem.”[[93]](#footnote-97) Shakdiel’s conclusion is that it is imperative to develop awareness-raising groups that will help reposition women in a more central place within religious society. The article thus presented the exhibition through the lens of women’s empowerment’, but in the spirit of the time, did not relate whatsoever to the taboo issues Molgan exposed, such as the *bedika* cloths.

About a decade later, when radical religious feminist discourse on the issue of *niddah* had become more widespread, Ayelet Wieder-Cohen presented Molgan’s works in a more straightforward and critical way, and directly addressed the taboo subjects she had publicly exposed. At the closing ceremony of the *Matronita* exhibition, held at the Ein Harod Arts Center, Weider-Cohen discussed the work through her own personal experience in facing the patriarchal institution’s control of the *mikva*. Weider-Cohen described *Matronita* as “A collection of works made with blood, created and emerging out of a deep wound, a wound inflicted by thousands of years of oppression, silencing, and control, of invasiveness and erasure.” [[94]](#footnote-98) In this context, she discussed her personal acts of resistance: “Every month I fight with the *mikva* attendant for the right to immerse myself without supervision or a *kashrut* certificate from the religious council […] and each time more women join the struggle who voice issues that I did not see or did not want to see […] Anger and bitterness are overflowing.”[[95]](#footnote-99) Weider-Cohen associated her actions with Molgan’s brave work: “I was amazed by Hagit’s courage in presenting a solo show, the courage to step forward alone, without an organization, without a *hevrutah*, without a group, and to stand exposed with her trenchant message.”[[96]](#footnote-100) Like Molgan, Weider-Cohen used radical language, concluding with words aimed to subvert the patriarchal framework she believes controls and enforces *niddah* laws: “Can men continue to set emotional and social frameworks for us that affect our basic lives as women? […] Women should be involved in the rewriting of halakhic laws pertaining specifically to them.” [[97]](#footnote-101) Later, in a debate that took place in the pages of the *Makor Rishon* newspaper regarding immersion in the *mikva*, Wieder-Cohen used descriptions of Molgan’s works in order to present the challenges engendered by these religious laws. Wieder-Cohen stated, “Whoever wishes to understand the difficulties faced by a woman with regard to the laws of *niddah* is invited to listen to the artistic and feminist discourse in this context.”[[98]](#footnote-102) Wieder-Cohen honed Molgan’s radical critique, but as befits an activist, also put it into a practical context, claiming that, “changing religious law apparently necessitates breaking through a steel wall.”[[99]](#footnote-103) She concluded that it is therefore safe to assume Molgan’s radical demand is still far from being realized.

Thus, two prominent Orthodox feminists in Israel directly addressed Molgan’s exhibition, their responses separated by nearly a decade. Shakdiel positioned Molgan’s exhibition in the framework of feminist critique regarding power relations characteristic of Jewish patriarchal society, but she did so in accord with the Orthodox feminist discourse of the time, which did not propose a radical shakeup of *niddah* laws. She did not address the works themselves nor the artist’s radical stance on the laws of *niddah*. About a decade later, using Molgan’s works as a point of departure, Wieder-Cohen offered direct criticism of male domination over women’s bodies, as expressed in the laws of *niddah* and the *mikva*. The transformation in religious feminist discourse on *niddah* laws over the second decade of the 21st century—from a topic rarely discussed in public to a direct, radical discourse critical of religious laws and the rabbinical establishments—accounts for the different attitudes of feminist leaders to Molgan’s work. The difference between the restrained, limited nature of Orthodox feminist discussions on Molgan’s works around the time of the exhibition, and the direct and radical discussions held approximately ten years later, indicates the extent to which the radical discourse prompted by Molgan’s work at the beginning of the new millennium went beyond customary Orthodox feminist thought and activism at the time. Moreover, Wieder-Cohen’s discussion of Molgan’s works underscores the importance of art in the context of feminist discourse within the Orthodox Jewish world. Even in the second decade of the new millennium, when an Orthodox feminist leader wishes to discuss the topic of *niddah* and voice the critical discourse of Orthodox women on the subject, she finds critical treatment of the issue precisely, and predominantly, in the arts.

Molgan’s critical preoccupation with *niddah* laws in the early 2000s and the discourse she generated, preceded the critical approach characteristic of feminist Orthodox thought and activism in the second decade of the 21st century. It therefore seems appropriate to offer some explanation of Molgan’s precedence to intellectual, political, and halakhic discourses of the Jewish Orthodox world in Israel. Since the 1960s, arts scholarship has proposed institutional theories that examine art as an object within an institutional framework characterized by a set of internal rules and driven by certain “agents.” Significant among them are the “art world” theory by art critic Arthur Danto, [[100]](#footnote-104) the institutional theory of art developed by aesthete George Dickie,[[101]](#footnote-105) and the field theory by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu.[[102]](#footnote-106) Unlike Dickie and Danto, who emphasized the influence of the art world on the sanctification and isolation of the aesthetic space, Bourdieu developed concepts relating to the dynamics of the art field, its laws, structure, and logic, and addressed the ideological and status-related aspects of defining art. Bourdieu suggested that the sphere of artistic production be analyzed as a field comprised of social factors that make an impression on the artist and the art. Such dynamics promote certain values, impose certain meanings onto the artwork, and construct its cultural value, while concealing the power relations that enable these actions in the first place. Bourdieu found that innovation and rebellion are the primary producers of value in the art field.[[103]](#footnote-107) Israeli art theoretician Sara Chinski insisted that the term “rebellion” was the main pillar of early art discourse in Israel.[[104]](#footnote-108) Curator Tami Katz-Freiman noted the critical tendency of Israeli artists who dealt with Judaism as a subject in the 1990s:

It seems that nostalgic, yearning attitudes toward tradition are totally nonexistent in Israeli art of the nineties. If there appear, from time to time, symbols originating in Jewish tradition or the Bible, it is always from a critical perspective, rather than a consecrating or nostalgic one.[[105]](#footnote-109)

Israeli art historian Dalia Manor also points to Israeli art writers’ common use of terms such as contradiction, confrontation, revolution, avant-garde, and rebellion, emphasizing that these are not necessarily accurate descriptions of artistic activity in Israel. According to Manor, the use of these terms attests to writing that is steeped in modernist ideology, and an attempt to anchor artistic trends in Israel in the progressive narrative of West.[[106]](#footnote-110) Though Chinski and Manor criticize this approach, it seems that this institutional perspective is what encourages artists like Molgan to generate subversive and critical work, and is undoubtedly what allows such subversive voices to be heard. This fact emphasizes the significance of the art world, which serves as a hub of subversiveness and creates a school of cultural criticism, giving a platform to voices absent from hegemonic religious discourse.

To summarize, studying the reception of Molgan’s work indicates that the artist brought into the Israeli art world direct, critical feminist discourse on the policing of sexuality and the body in the Orthodox Jewish world. To this day, feminist Orthodox discourse on *niddah* laws largely eschews direct criticism of halakhic laws written from a patriarchal perspective, and focuses mainly on attempts to break away from the rabbinical grasp on *mikvas* in Israel.[[107]](#footnote-111) In contrast to this environment, which she inhabits, Molgan offered critique that disputed the patriarchal construction of these laws, and her work elucidates the unique ability of the art world to project a radical feminist voice within the Orthodox Jewish world.

**Chapter 8.**

**Mikva Dreams: Mierle Laderman-Ukeles**

The “maintenance art” created by Mierle Laderman-Ukeles (b. 1939) in the 1970s and 80s—in which she performed maintenance tasks as works of art—dealt with institutional critique and the subversion of accepted norms regarding private and public spaces. Alongside these works, for which she is best known, the artist also related to her own Orthodox Jewish world by bringing the ritual of Jewish Women’s immersion in the *mikva* (ritual bath) into the art world. This essay examines the *mikva* works of Laderman-Ukeles, which have remained unrecognized by the art world, in light of the American feminist spirituality movement that emerged during those decades, and in relation to her canonical maintenance art. By investigating Laderman-Ukeles’s feminist Jewish art from the 1970s and 1980s against the background of her maintenance art from the same period, I argue that along with reclaiming Jewish women’s rituals, she also offered a critique of the Orthodox Jewish world. At the crucial moment of the second wave of the feminist movement in the United States, Laderman-Ukeles’s reclaiming of women’s rituals constituted a powerful call for women to be “reborn” as Jewish feminists.

**The Reception of Laderman-Ukeles’s *Jewish Art* and her *Maintenance Art***

Laderman-Ukeles is one of the only Orthodox Jewish artists who was active in the feminist art movement in the United States during the 1970s. Most of her work focused on creating public and environmental art, and she became a prominent figure in the American art world due to her maintenance art. Although her main focus in the 1970s and 1980s was on conceptual environmental art (eco-feminist art), some of her works during those years dealt with the *mikva* . Her maintenance art and her “Jewish” art were received very differently in the American art world: whereas the first was exhibited in major art institutions and became part of the American and feminist art canon,[[108]](#footnote-112) her Jewish art, created in the same time period, did not have a broad impact and has been the subject of little critical study.[[109]](#footnote-113)

The exclusion of art that concerns religion, which is characteristic of the American art world, might account for the fact that while her maintenance art garnered institutional recognition, Laderman-Ukeles’s Jewish art did not. Samantha Baskind investigated the reception of notable American Jewish artists in the US and found that works by them which did not explicitly deal with subjects from the Jewish world were accepted into the canon of American art, while works dealing with their Jewish identity and sensibility were excluded from it.[[110]](#footnote-114) Baskind’s findings are illuminated by Sally M. Promey’s claim that until the 1990s, the American art world was controlled by the modern secularization thesis, and art with religious content was therefore expelled from it.[[111]](#footnote-115) Furthermore, Promey showed that until the 1990s, religion-centric art was discussed in scholarly studies only when it could be classified in secular terms.[[112]](#footnote-116) In 2004, art scholar James Elkins published his book *On the Strange Place of Religion in Contemporary Art*, in which he directly pointed to the exclusion and repression of the link between art and religion in contemporary art discourse.[[113]](#footnote-117) However, this state of affairs shifted slightly over time, as art scholars began to explore the connection between art and religion. Promey herself indicated that since the 1990s, more discussion has been dedicated to religion in studies on American art. [[114]](#footnote-118)

Indeed, the Jewish and religious content present in the work of Laderman-Ukeles has received greater visibility recently in the American art discourse. For example, the *New York Times* art critic Holland Cotter, writing in 2016 about the artist’s retrospective exhibition that was then on view at the Queens Museum in New York, explicitly remarked on the Jewish context of her work.[[115]](#footnote-119) Similarly, the art critic and curator Lucy Lippard, in her essay in the book that accompanied the exhibition, wrote that, “For all her avant-garde flair and eventual art world recognition, she has maintained her traditional Jewish faith.”[[116]](#footnote-120) As a matter of fact, the book’s main essay, written by the exhibition curator Patricia C. Phillips also surveys Laderman-Ukeles’s Jewish art and even points to the Jewish and religious connections of her maintenance art, which had not been discussed in the art discourse in the past.[[117]](#footnote-121)

**The Mikva Works of Laderman-Ukeles in the 1970s and the 1980s**

The treatment of ritual immersion and the *mikva* formed the basis of Laderman-Ukeles’s Jewish art in the 1970s and 1980s. She depicted *tevila* as an uplifting feminine ritual, contrary to the bleakness of Yocheved Weinfeld’s (b. 1947) *niddah* exhibition, which was showcased in Israel around the same period, or to Hagit Molgan’s (b. 1972) fervent criticism in her work, presented in Israel in the 2000s (see Chapter 5).

In Orthodox Judaism, the *mikva* serves to achieve ritual purity after the *nidda* (menstrual flow), during which a woman is considered impure and a Jewish couple is forbidden from having physical contact or any act that might lead to physical intimacy. After the cessation of their menstrual period, Orthodox Jewish women are obligated to immerse in a *mikva* before they can resume sexual relations with their husbands. The *mikva* is constructed like a small bathing pool into which rain water collected from a cistern is passed by gravity via a duct.[[118]](#footnote-122) Laderman-Ukeles’s performance “Mikva Dreams,” which dealt with the immersion in the *mikva*, was the first time the subject had been addressed directly in the American art world. It was presented in 1977 at the Franklin Furnace Gallery in New York. During the performance, the artist read aloud a text she had written, while covering herself with a white sheet, just as a member of the Jewish priestly caste (kohen) would cover himself in a *tallit* (a fringed garment traditionally worn by religious Jews) during a special prayer in the synagogue (Fig. 1). In a second version of the performance in 1978, Laderman-Ukeles again covered herself in a white sheet and read the text aloud, this time standing on the banks of the Hudson River in New York (Fig. 2). [[119]](#footnote-123)

The performance began with a declaration by the artist: “Sisters! In this new time for all of us, I take this time to tell you of these private things.”[[120]](#footnote-124) Laderman-Ukeles then read a detailed description of the technical aspects of constructing a *mikva*, which demands using naturally occurring water as its source. Her methodical description of the *mikva* was followed by a depiction ofher own personal experience of the ritual immersion—the preparations before it and the act itself—and the feeling of joy it gave her. She described the immersion ias an act of rebirth and a return to the Garden of Eden, extolling it as a ritual that connects a woman with her own self: “She goes in, naked, all dead edges removed [...] The Mikva is for her intrinsic self. Her self-self […] The blood stopped flowing a week ago. She is the moon.”[[121]](#footnote-125) The artist also presented the practical aspects of the immersion as a ritual with erotic characteristics:

In all the gentleness of continuing love, she goes to the Mikva. The Mikva water hit above her breasts when she is standing up. The waters have pressure in them. She pushes into it as she comes down the steps. When she leaves, it seems as if the waters softly bulge her out, back to the world. No she doesn't want to tell you about it. It is a secret between her and herself. […] The water is warm, body temperature. […] a square womb of living waters.[[122]](#footnote-126)

The performance concluded with a meditation, during which the artist repeated the words “immerse again” two hundred and ten times, the precise number of times she immersed in the *mikva* during her reproductive years. “Mikva Dreams” portrayed the *mikva* and immersion in it as an elevated ritual that connects feminist consciousness with Jewish ritual.[[123]](#footnote-127) Laderman-Ukeles presented immersion as a personal and intimate act, though at the same time her performance includes the public and indeed political call to her “sisters” – to “choose life” and to be reborn as both Jewish and feminist women.[[124]](#footnote-128)

In 1986, Laderman-Ukeles exhibited another *mikva* work, this time in the form of an installation piece that she constructed at the Jewish Museum, New York.[[125]](#footnote-129) Her installation, which consisted essentially in building a *mikva* within the museum, dealt with the structure of the *mikva* and the experience of transition that immersion is meant to generate (Fig. 3). In the installation, the ordinary *mikva* staircase was replaced with a very unusual set of stairs in which each step faces a different direction, a structure designed to connote the idea of immersion as a transition from onestate of consciousness to another. Laderman-Ukeles explained that with every step a woman takes down the stairs that lead to her immersion, she must consciously choose to move from one condition to the next.[[126]](#footnote-130) Echoing her claim that the essence of Jewish thought lies in the idea of transformation and cyclical rebirth, she placed two doors in the work – one an entrance and the other an exit – which symbolized for her the two circumstances necessary for creating the transformation. The entrance door represented the woman’s willingness for rebirth, and the exit door – society’s readiness to accept the rebirth she has undergone.[[127]](#footnote-131) As in her performance nearly ten years earlier, in the installation immersion was presented as an act of recreation connecting a renewed feminist consciousness with women’s rituals in the Jewish world. [[128]](#footnote-132)

Despite the explicit Jewish context of her *mikva* art, and despite the artist’s desire to be active in her Orthodox Jewish community as well, her work was not discussed by it whatsoever. In hindsight, in a 2006 interview with gallerist and curator Marisa Newman, she spoke about the complete disregard for her works in the Jewish community and voiced her disappointment about that fact.[[129]](#footnote-133) Laderman-Ukeles’s works were also disregarded by the feminist Jewish world in the US at the time they were presented. It was only later, in the 1990s, that the text of *Mikva Dreams* was included in the feminist Jewish anthology *Four Centuries of Jewish Women’s Spirituality: A Sourcebook* (1992), edited by Dianne Ashton and Ellen M. Umansky.

**“Mikva Dreams” and the Feminist Spirituality Movement**

The feminist spirituality movement, and in particular the Great Goddess discourse, played a significant role in American feminist art of the 1970s.[[130]](#footnote-134) Artists like Carolee Schneemann (b. 1939), Mary Beth Adelson (b. 1933), Ana Mendieta (1948–1985), Betsy Damon (b. 1940), and Donna Henes (b. 1945), turned to the goddesses of ancient times as their source of inspiration,[[131]](#footnote-135) and adopted matriarchal ideas from the past to enrich the feminist experience and discourse of the present.[[132]](#footnote-136) Though Laderman-Ukeles did not explicitly partake in the Goddess discourse, her Jewish works analogously commented on the present-day feminist experience by exalting women’s religious ritual. The “Mikva Dreams” performance was reminiscent of the feminist meetings common in the 1970s, whose enactment was intended to reinvigorate the Great Goddess religions. During these gatherings, a self-described priestess or witch held a public ceremony that combined discussion of “femininity” with a critique of the patriarchal religions.[[133]](#footnote-137) In a similar way, Laderman-Ukeles used her performance to praise the act of ritual immersion with language comparable to that used in the Great Goddess discourse: “Like most goddess traditions, Matronit-Shechina, the Jew’s female divinity, has been pictured from ancient times as magically combining all these aspects: eternal renewed virgin, and eternal passionate lover, and eternal creating mother. Mikva is the site-intersection of all these holy energies.”[[134]](#footnote-138)

Laderman-Ukeles’s“Mikva Dreams” clearly echoed Schneemann’s earlier *Interior Scroll*, a performance in which she pulled a scroll out of her vagina and read it aloud to her audience. Schneemann first performed the piece in 1975.[[135]](#footnote-139) At the start of the performance, Schneemann covered herself with a white sheet, as did Laderman-Ukeles. She began by telling the viewers that during the performance she would read from her book *Cezanne, She was a Great Painter*.[[136]](#footnote-140) Laderman-Ukeles similarly read her own writings during her performance. Schneemann linked her artistic activity to the Great Goddess and feminist spirituality, seeing in its forms and images the source of the sacred feminine knowledge connected to birth and transformation.[[137]](#footnote-141) Laderman-Ukeles likewise sought to connect herself and the viewers of her performance to the ceremony of Jewish ritual immersion, which she saw as a source of holy energies handed down by women from generation to generation. The artist clearly designed the “Mikva Dreams” performance in the spirit of the Great Goddesses, and indeed the text she read in the performance was published in the feminist magazine *Heresies* in a 1978 issue devoted entirely to the Great Goddess feminist discourse (Fig. 4).[[138]](#footnote-142)

Despite the evident connection between “Mikva Dreams” and the feminist Goddess performances, this work is also distinct from it. The dominant feminist exchanges in the United States during the 1970s linked Jewish law regarding menstruation with the patriarchal view that menstrual blood is impure, which led feminists to critique the Jewish laws of purity. In an interview in the book *Performance Artists Talking in the Eighties* by Linda Montano, published in 2000, Laderman-Ukeles explained that many feminist women at the time objected to the ritual of the *mikva* and viewed it as primitive,[[139]](#footnote-143) whereas she herself saw it as a continuation of the matriarchal religion of the past.[[140]](#footnote-144) This position she also clarified in the performance itself, saying: “[…] misunderstandings have adhered to the concept and power of the Mikva. No. Mikva is not about women as dirty.”[[141]](#footnote-145) As opposed to the dominant American feminist deliberations of the 1970s, the works of Laderman-Ukeles were consistent with the approach that aimed to reclaim the immersion practices as empowering rituals for women, an approach that, as I show below, was prevalent in American Orthodox Jewish feminism at the time.

Laderman-Ukeles’s appropriation of the ritual of immersion is brought into relief by considering the gap that separated the feminist criticism emerging from the Christian world and feminist theology that was developed in the Jewish world in the United States. Whereas the Christian discussions were divided between those who sought to fix the religion[[142]](#footnote-146) and those who sought to disconnect from the church institutions and found a new religion of sorts based on feminine spirituality,[[143]](#footnote-147) in the various religious branches of Jewish feminism there was almost never a demand to permanently split from tradition nor was there a dominant call to establish a post-Judaism religion.[[144]](#footnote-148) Jewish theologians dealt with criticism of the Jewish rituals and texts through acts of interpretation and reclaiming of elements from within Jewish tradition, which they viewed as feminine. Despite these feminist thinkers’ critique of the tradition, they never sought to disengage from it, but chose instead to criticize it in order to reinvent it.[[145]](#footnote-149) In the same vein, Laderman-Ukeles connected feminist speech with the feminist thought of the Orthodox Jewish world of the time, which proposed a reinterpretation of the laws of *nidda* with the intention of freeing them from the dichotomy of pure and impure that shaped them in the rabbinic tradition. Jewish Orthodox feminists acted to reinvent these laws as empowering practices for women. In the Jewish religious discourse of the period, women’s ritual immersion was perceived as taboo for public discussion. Laderman-Ukeles argued that this suppression and concealment of the immersion ritual was itself a patriarchal construction. In her performance she announced that the menstrual ritual barely survived “these centuries of cultural hang-ups toward menstruation itself: superstitions which are really fear and loathing of a woman’s body itself, woman’s deep mysterious fertile magic body and her times.”[[146]](#footnote-150)

It was in this spirit that Laderman-Ukeles presented an alternative to the accepted perception that marks menstrual blood as dirty, and stressed that the Jewish ritual of immersion was not based on these distinctions. In her performance, she quoted Rachel Adler, the foremost Jewish American feminist theologian who, in the 1970s, presented a feminist critique of Jewish thought and *Halakha* (Jewish law), but regarded the laws of *nidda* positively. At that time, Adler held a sympathetic view of ritual bathing and the *mivka* as a place of immersion from hallowed days of yore.[[147]](#footnote-151) Similarly, the contemporaneous Jewish Orthodox feminist thinker Blu Greenberg wrote a poem in which she praised the experience of immersing in the *mikva* and in particular the cooperation between the immersing womanand the *mikva* attendant. Indeed, Laderman-Ukeles’s text in *Mikva Dream* is reminiscent of Greenberg’s poem in its exaltation of the practice of purification and of the ritual bath attendant.[[148]](#footnote-152) Hence, Laderman-Ukeles’s work echoes the line of thought that draws a connection between feminism and Judaism and in particular reclaims the ritual immersion practice as an empowering rite for Jewish women.

Yet while Laderman-Ukeles expressed notions that were typical of the American Orthodox Jewish feminist discourse of the day, among Jewish feminist artists she was exceptional. Most of the American feminist artists of Jewish origin working in the 1970s did not deal overtly with aspects of Jewish religion in their art—Schneemann, Judy Chicago, (b. 1939), Hannah Wilke (1940–1993), Miriam Schapiro (1923–2015), Joan Semmel (b. 1932), Nancy Fried (b. 1945), Eleanor Antin (b. 1935), and Rachel Rosenthal (1926–2015).[[149]](#footnote-153) By contrast, Laderman-Ukeles dealt with her heritage and religion directly.[[150]](#footnote-154)

Moreover, as I described above, in the wider, non-Jewish feminist context of the 1970s, her performance was remarkable. In the general feminist debateof the 1970s, Judaism was commonly regarded as a patriarchal religion, an anti-feminist sphere that oppressed women through, among other ways, the religious laws of *nidda*. Religious Jewish feminists rejected this approach. Describing the negative attitude of American feminists in the 1970s toward Judaism, feminist scholar Susan Gubar observed that at that time in American feminist discourse, to be Jewish and a feminist was perceived as an oxymoron.[[151]](#footnote-155) More generally, in the United States of the 1970s, Jews were still regarded as “others” in relation to the majority American society.[[152]](#footnote-156) Ellen M. Umansky notes that there were clear anti-Semitic undertones in the American feminist talk of the 1970s and argues that it was these anti-Semitic voices that led some Jewish feminist women to turn their focus directly to their Jewish world, and to reclaim it. In a parallel process, Jewish women working within the Jewish communities began to introduce feminism into their own community with the aim of importing the feminist achievements from the American majority culture into their particular Jewish world.[[153]](#footnote-157) According to art historian Edna Kantorovitz, who further refines the unique aspect of Laderman-Ukeles’s “Mikva Dreams” performance in the 1970s, religious Jewish women were viewed at the time as out of touch with their bodies and sexually repressed by the laws of *nidda*. Kantorovitz argues that Laderman-Ukeles challenged these assumptions and aimed to reveal the unknown face of the Jewish world.[[154]](#footnote-158) Thus, her positive approach to ritual immersion went against the grain of the predominant feminist discourse of the 1970s but shared the oppositional spirit of religious Jewish feminists of those years. Furthermore, unlike most 1970s feminist artists of Jewish origin, who were secular and did not directly address Jewish religious themes in their art, and like the religious Jewish feminist discourse, which sought to connect Judaism and feminism, Laderman-Ukeles dealt with her religious Judaism in public, while being conscious of the rift between her own work and the mainstream feminist debate. She offered the art world a unique perspective that celebrated religion and specifically the *mikva* and its laws.

**“Mikva Dreams” and Jewish Feminist Art in the United States during the 1970s**

The nature of the connection that Laderman-Ukeles forges in her art between Judaism and feminism can be further drawn out through a comparison with the works of two other Jewish American artists whose art dealt with immersion: Ruth Weisberg (b. 1942), who created art works on this theme between the 1970s and the 2000s, and Helène Aylon (b. 1931), whose works on immersion date from the 2000s. Like Laderman-Ukeles, Weisberg dealt

with immersion in the framework of the feminist discourse of rebirth. Aylon, however, unlike Laderman-Ukeles and Weisberg, criticized the laws of ritual immersion, albeit in a minor way. Beginning in the early 1970s, Weisberg created works in which a naked woman is seen dipping in a pool of water. In one work, the woman is viewed from the side as she curls up in a fetal pose. Above her, a reflection of light in warm oranges and reds serves to exalt the scene (Fig. 5). Matthew Baigell connects these works by Weisberg, who was active in the feminist art movement of the 1970s and 80s in Los Angeles, with the art of the first generation of feminist artists who dealt with birth:[[155]](#footnote-159) Chicago, who in the 1980s created images of women giving birth as part of *The Birth Project*;[[156]](#footnote-160) and the feminist art collective that worked with Chicago and Schapiro in *Womanhouse* in Los Angeles (Judy Huddleston, Jan Oxenburg, Shawnee Wollenman, and Nancy Youdelman), which in 1972 created the performance *Birth Trilogy*. Baigell claims that like these artists, Weisberg dealt with birth as part of an attempt to reestablish women’s connection to themselves and as a metaphor for their own rebirth as feminist women.[[157]](#footnote-161) Yet unlike the *Womanhouse* artists’treatment of birth, Weisberg (like Laderman-Ukeles) dealt with immersion.[[158]](#footnote-162) Moreover, and again like Laderman-Ukeles, Weisberg distinguished herself from her fellow American feminist artists by dealing with religious Jewish subjects.[[159]](#footnote-163) Yet despite Weisberg’s straightforward handling of the theme of bathing, when these particular works were created she did not interpret them in the context of Jewish ritual immersion; they were presented by the artist only as depicting a woman submerging herself in water and as an act of rebirth, with an emphasis on the scene’s sensuality. Only later, in the 2000s, did she openly discuss these works in the context of the Jewish ritual of immersion and connect them to the biblical Genesis myths.[[160]](#footnote-164) Thus, while Laderman-Ukeles presented ritual bathing in a Jewish context during the 1970s, clearly and openly connecting feminism with Judaism, Weisberg at the time left the Jewish context of her immersion works implicit.

Aylon’s later work, from the early 2000s, corresponds with Laderman-Ukeles’s *mikva* works by dealing directly with the laws of ritual immersion.[[161]](#footnote-165) However, whereas Laderman-Ukeles refrained from direct criticism of the Jewish world, Aylon presented a more ambivalent view. Her installation *My Bridal Chamber* (2000-2001) featured a number of works by the artist, among them *My Marriage Bed* (2001), and *My Clean Days* (Fig. 6). In *My Marriage Bed* the artist covered a bed with white cloths like the ones she had used in the past as a *bedika* napkin (a piece of cloth used by Orthodox women to check if their monthly bleeding has stopped) and projected onto them images from the adjacent installation *My Clean Days*. *My Clean Days* was comprised of panels representing the ten years of Aylon’s marriage, on which the artist marked all the days throughout that decade in which she was “pure” and thus permitted, according to *Halakha*, to engage in sexual relations with her husband. Echoing Laderman-Ukeles’s repetition of the words “immerse again” in her performance, Aylon stressed the repetitive aspect of the practice of ritual purification by concretizing it in the form of a calendar that marked the days of her “impurity” and “purity” over the course of her married life.[[162]](#footnote-166) Like Laderman-Ukeles’s reading in “Mikva Dreams,” in a text that accompanied the installation Aylon described the purification acts in the *mikva* as an ancient female ritual connecting women to the lunar cycle. And like Lederman Ukeles, she opposed portraying the practice of immersion in terms of the pure-impure dichotomy. But Aylon’s view of the laws of purity contained also a critical note. In her text, Aylon noted that “immersion […] was an idea that had to come from a woman, not from those who do not bleed”[[163]](#footnote-167) – but added that “the term ‘unclean’ came from those who do not bleed.”[[164]](#footnote-168) Alongside her description of the immersion as an ancient and exalted feminine ritual, she pointed to the patriarchal rabbinical system’s regulation of women. As she explained in reference to this installation, “It is my contention that ancient women founded the traditional bath long before Leviticus, but were never credited for this. Instead, the concept of the bath was distorted by patriarchal rulings.”[[165]](#footnote-169) Aylon’s critical approach recalls that of Adler, who in the 1970s presented the rituals of immersion with sympathy but later, in 1993, recanted and criticized the laws of *nidda*.[[166]](#footnote-170) While Aylon did not stake a firmly critical position on the *mikva*, she was, like Adler’s late stance, critical of the regimentation of purification within the patriarchal Jewish world. Comparing Lederman Ukeles’s works with those of Jewish American feminist artists thus clarifies the sympathetic, non-critical nature of her approach to the Jewish ritual of purification and the uniqueness of her manner of reclaiming this practice.[[167]](#footnote-171)

**“The Personal is Political”: Laderman-Ukeles’s *Mikva* Works in Light of her Maintenance Art**

Laderman-Ukeles’s *mikva* works have received only a marginal place in the art world and remain in the shadow of her much better known maintenance art. But examining these two groups of works in juxtaposition sheds new light on her *mikva* works. In particular, as I will argue, it suggests that in spite of and alongside their celebratory and seemingly non-critical point of departure, her *mikva* works in fact also shattered religious taboos by undermining the patriarchal structures of Orthodox Jewish society. Laderman-Ukeles developed maintenance art after the birth of her first daughter, in 1968. In response to the tension she experienced between being an artist and a mother, she composed the *Manifesto for Maintenance Art 1969!*,[[168]](#footnote-172) in which she declared that she would henceforth perform all housework as art. She saw housework as a type of “maintenance work,” a category that society viewed as inferior to other forms of work.[[169]](#footnote-173) Following the manifesto, Laderman-Ukeles produced the *Maintenance Art Performance* *Series* (1973-1974), which included washing the museum floors and cleaning the works on exhibition (Fig. 7). The artist placed the daily drudgery of motherhood and managing a household at the center of her maintenance art. But she also expanded her feminist approach to maintenance to encompass all service jobs, including those typically performed by men, whom society then viewed as “women” that is, as second-class citizens.[[170]](#footnote-174) So, for example, the *Touch Sanitation* performance project (1978-1980) was designed to give voice to working people in this devalued profession. In the performance, Laderman-Ukeles set out to shake the hand of every single worker of the New York City Department of Sanitation as a gesture of thanks for the work they do for the city (Fig. 8).

Maintenance art is rooted in the Marxist feminism of the 1970s,[[171]](#footnote-175) which claimed that women’s inferior economic status was responsible for their dependency on men and effectively rendered them non-autonomous beings. The solution that liberalism had offered in the 1960s was seemingly simple: women would gain independence by going out to work.[[172]](#footnote-176) And indeed, many feminists embraced and developed this idea, eventually demanding equality for women in the work force. However, the Marxist feminism that developed in the 1970s demanded that the “transparent” labor of women (their various kinds of “care”) be recognized and validated by income.[[173]](#footnote-177) In this spirit, Laderman-Ukeles did not rebel against the “women’s work” that was designated as her share, but rather argued that the private sphere should be seen as no less important as the public one and therefore that housework should be considered work worthy of symbolic remuneration. Accordingly, the second part of her manifesto was a proposal for an exhibition entitled *CARE*.[[174]](#footnote-178)

Miwon Kwon and Helen Molesworth have proposed that the central thesis of maintenance art is institutional critique.[[175]](#footnote-179) Kwon argued that maintenance art publicly exposed the invisible work that is the basis of, and the condition that enables, the existence of works of art, and that by doing so it undermined the dichotomies between public and private, high and low, and art and everyday life.[[176]](#footnote-180) According to her, unlike works of art or other works that receive visibility and prestige, maintenance work is best done out of sight. And yet, in practice, despite its transparency, maintenance work is that which makes possible the works of art. Molesworth claimed that maintenance art undermined the distinction between “private” and “public” spaces as they are structured in art institutions.[[177]](#footnote-181) According to this approach, transforming maintenance tasks into art awards maintenance visibility and prestige, for example through the fact that these tasks are displayed in the public spaces of museums and through the respectful attitude they receive from curators, critics and audiences when they are displayed as works of art. The project underscored the inferior status typically accorded to maintenance work in all domains and in museums and galleries in particular, and challenged the common practice of relegating maintenance work to the “invisible” realm. Similarly, Shannon Jackson claimed that the premise underlying maintenance art was to expose the societal establishment that created meaning and prestige.[[178]](#footnote-182) According to Jackson, when Laderman-Ukeles transferred maintenance work to museums and reconstructed it as art, she was effectively indicating the institutional aspect of imbuing certain social practices with value. Later, Helena Reckitt situated maintenance art as a critical feminist endeavor, and pointed out that it was based on the insight that “art” and “work” always operate within strict power relations and social structures. Reckitt criticized the exclusion of Laderman-Ukeles’s maintenance art from the artistic approach defined by curator Nicholas Bourriaud as “relational aesthetics.”[[179]](#footnote-183) Reckitt pointed out that Laderman-Ukeles preceded the relational aesthetics practices of the 1990s, but was entirely unacknowledged by Bourriaud, receiving no credit in his analysis of this influential category of art.[[180]](#footnote-184) She argued that while Bourriaud’s description of relational aesthetics cast the artist as a universal figure whose art entered into no particular relation with race, class or gender, maintenance art addressed particular social contexts and relations with a heightened awareness of the power relations and social structures that shape society. In other words, whereas Bourriaud’s thesis avoided the political, maintenance art operated in light of the distinctly political feminist theories that view “art” and “work” as always created in relation to the questions of who does what to whom and under what conditions.[[181]](#footnote-185)

Looking at Laderman-Ukeles’s *mikva* works in light of her maintenance art shows how very interconnected they are. In fact, Laderman-Ukeles herself saw them as forming part of a single cohesive artistic corpus. Unlike her later “Jewish” works, which she exhibited in Jewish institutions,[[182]](#footnote-186) she performed “Mikva Dreams” at the Franklin Furnace Gallery as part of a performance series entitled *Maintenance Art Tales*. Lisa E. Bloom argues that, like the artist’s maintenance work, which aimed to challenge the hierarchies separating art and maintenance and the prevailing perception that housework and cleaning were lowly despicable domains, so too the artist’s treatment of the theme of ritual immersion underscored the sanctity of this practice and imbued it with prestige. According to Bloom, in contrast to the prevalent contemporary perception of ritual immersion as an activity designed simply to cleanse a woman of her sexual impurities and allow her to resume marital relations, Laderman-Ukeles presented immersion as an exalted ritual act. In doing so, contends Bloom, the artist sought to situate immersion within the realm of the sacred.[[183]](#footnote-187)

Going beyond Bloom’s analysis, it is important to note that in the *Halakha*, the significance of women’s immersion is indeed discussed primarily in terms of physical purity and impurity. In Judaism there are two types of immersions: one, designed for women, is performed for the sake of purification in the legal Halakhic sense; the other is a symbolic immersion for the sake of *kedusha* (holiness), and is a custom performed by men, typically on the eve of the High Holidays (Rosh Hashanna and Yom Kippur).[[184]](#footnote-188) Whereas the Biblical law did apply the terms of purity and impurity to men (indeed primarily to them), the later rabbinic law freed men of the pure/impure categories and made these laws applicable only to women.[[185]](#footnote-189) Therefore, male immersion in the *mikva* is viewed in the rabbinic discourse as optional and portrayed in terms of an addition to sanctity, whereas a woman’s immersion is deemed obligatory and discussed mainly in terms of the technical aspects of purification from the impurity of menstruation. Thus, in exalting the sacred aspects of women’s immersion in the *mikva*, Laderman-Ukeles was challenging the marginalization and devaluation of women’s rituals just as her maintenance art challenged the construction of women’s labor as lacking symbolic value.

Moreover, it is essential to connect Laderman-Ukeles’s works on the *mikva* with her broader preoccupation with institutional critique and the undermining of accepted relations between the public and the private. Most importantly in my view, in the *mikva* works Laderman-Ukeles took a subject viewed by the Jewish world as private and discreet and recast it as public. Presenting ritual immersion in the public domain represented a radical departure from the Jewish religious discourse and practice of the period, which saw women’s ritual immersion as a personal and intimate act that should remain invisible and was, moreover, taboo for public discussion. When in the year 2000 Laderman-Ukeles looked back on the work, she stressed the taboo surrounding *nidda* in the Jewish world and described her own work as set in sharp opposition to it: “You do not tell your family, you do not tell your children, you do not say where you are going [when going to the Mikva]. [...] and yet here’s the artwork, which gives me the permission to talk about anything,”[[186]](#footnote-190)

Furthermore, for many generations, not only *nidda* and immersion but the many different customs and traditions of women in the Jewish world were perceived as belonging to the private sphere alone. Hence, they were excluded from Jewish history and, consequently, many have even been forgotten. As late as the 1990s, some historians still expressed the patriarchal view that the religious life of women in traditional Jewish society was not a significant issue since women in that world did not play an active part in shaping the realm of culture, and thus that they could be justifiably excluded from historical research.[[187]](#footnote-191) But the general intellectual tide began to shift already in the 1980s, with forceful feministcritiques of the historical narratives that are written from a patriarchal perspective and ignore the place of women and the significance of gender (a prominent example is Joan Scott’s groundbreaking article “Gender as a Category of Historical Analysis”).[[188]](#footnote-192) In the same spirit, beginning in the early years of the twenty-first century, feminist Jewish scholars have shown that Jewish women in past centuries led rich religious and spiritual lives, and that their religious activities had communal characteristics.[[189]](#footnote-193) In fact, women’s religious activities formed a kind of religion of their own, with its unique rituals, distinct from those of the men. By reclaiming women’s rituals and customs, these feminist scholars sought to grant them a more central role in contemporary Jewish culture. Laderman-Ukeles preceded this important intellectual shift in the art she made. For this reason I have argued that by shifting the laws of ritual purity from the private sphere to the public sphere of art, she undermined the patriarchal regulatory power structure of the Jewish Orthodox world, a power structure that had eliminated women’s *mikva* rituals from the visible public domain.

The breaking of taboos about women’s bodies and sexuality was widespread in the 1970s in the work of American feminist artists, who in the words of Schneemann attempted “to bring our bodies back to ourselves.”[[190]](#footnote-194) Their art undermined the accepted patriarchal perceptions and the dominance of the masculine view of women in general and of women’s bodies in particular throughout the history of art. Their work was accepted and discussed as the most significant contribution of art to feminism.[[191]](#footnote-195) In the same way, the work of Laderman-Ukeles shattered the taboo in the Jewish religious community on public discussion of ritual immersion and the *mikva*, and she was the first American feminist artist to deal with these subjects.

The radical American feminist discourse of the 1970s objected to the favoring of the public over the private in almost every aspect of the creation of economic, social, and symbolic capital, and argued that the very distinction between these two realms created problematic hierarchies. As feminist thinkers demonstrated, associating men with the public domain and women with the private effectively marginalized women and maintained their positions of subordination.[[192]](#footnote-196) In the same way, the *mikva* artworks of Laderman-Ukeles rejected the relegation of the act of purification to the private, invisible realm and instead presented it in public and exalted it as an empowering female rite. In transferring the laws of purification and women’s ritual from the private to the public space, the artist undermined the regimented structure of the Orthodox Jewish world, which posits a hierarchy between men and women by placing women’s rituals in the private realm. Indeed, already at the end of the 1970s, and preceding parallel moves in feminist scholarship, Laderman-Ukeles’s *mikva* performance offered a thorough challenge of the patriarchal structure of Jewish traditional society with the aim of linking Judaism and feminism. At a crucial moment of second-wave feminism in the United States, her appropriation of women’s rituals of purity constituted a powerful call for women to be “reborn” as Jewish feminists.

**Chapter 9.**

**Between the US and Israel – Breaking Taboos: The Art Worlds, Feminist Discourses, and Modern Orthodox Society**

Hagit Molgan (b. 1972) in Israel and Mierle Laderman-Ukeles (b. 1939) in the United States, were raised within the modern-Orthodox Jewish world and associate themselves with it to this day. Despite geographical distance and the different communities in which they work, both artists have illuminated the gap between the dominant discourse in their society and that of the art world in which they create. The art world provides them a space in which to openly express issues that are unspoken and deemed taboo in the religious Jewish world. For instance, in an interview conducted several years following her exhibition, Molgan touched on the challenge of discussing *niddah* laws in the Orthodox Jewish world. At the other end of the spectrum, she placed the art world, an arena that allows her to break through the boundaries of the society in which she lives. She recounted the process which led her to address *niddah* laws in her art, stating, “I suppose I began thinking about it a long time ago, before actually doing it [=the *niddah* art], but the art allowed me to get it out.” [[193]](#footnote-197) In retrospect, Molgan deepened the dissonance in the 2000s: “Religious society’s demands on a woman inhibit her from leading the life of an artist, from creating, for bringing up subjects for open debate.”[[194]](#footnote-198) Molgan explained that despite how difficult it was to create in a religious society, she “could not give it up, it [=religious society] is a part of me. I cannot cut off my arm just to go there [=to the art world]. On the other hand, when I go to the religious side, I have to give up my art.” [[195]](#footnote-199) The artist describes her condition as one of a split identity: “The split identity is the most painful aspect of creating in this field. In order to live in religious society, I have to give up my art. […] I will not, I say it out loud. But I know that making art about it and representing it in the secular sphere comes at a price.”[[196]](#footnote-200) Similarly, as previously discussed, Laderman-Ukeles came to understand the distinction between what the art world allowed and what the Jewish Orthodox world allowed. Like Molgan, Laderman-Ukeles focused on the taboo of *mikva* immersion. In an interview with Lisa E. Bloom in the 2000s, Laderman-Ukeles described a dual existence in which, on the one hand, she inhabits the modern Orthodox world, and on the other, she works within the art world. In her religious world, she cannot discuss *tevila*, which is considered a taboo subject that demands a modest approach; the art world, however, allows her to deal with the subject openly.[[197]](#footnote-201) Regardless of their distinct geographical locations and communities, Molgan and Laderman-Ukeles are linked by their use of the art world to break religious taboos.

Despite the similarity between the two artists in terms of their taboo-breaking work, their respective positions on *niddah* laws are polar opposites: Laderman-Ukeles praised *niddah* rituals and worked in the spirit of the feminist spirituality movement, while Molgan was blatantly and uncompromisingly critical of them. This distinction reflects the differences between the art worlds in Israel and the US. In the Israeli art world, a critical or apprehensive approach to *niddah* is very common. As previously noted in chapter 7, Weinfeld shed a somber light on the subject as early as the 1970s, before Molgan. In fact, since the 2000s, several modern-Orthodox Israeli women took a critical approach to *niddah* laws and *mikva* immersion. For instance, Ayelet Weil-Nebensal (b. 1976) printed images of well-known, prominent women from various fields (Golda Meir, Ilana Dayan, and Gila Almagor) onto *bedika* cloths. The cloths were sewn into small pillows that had images of ants printed on the other side (Fig. 12). She explained the work as follows: “I see the customary self-examination with the cloths as a minimization and reduction of the woman’s essence. […] With this work, I wanted to draw attention to the way the rituals associated with the *mitzvoth* of *niddah* minimize and diminish the woman.” [[198]](#footnote-202) Unlike the critical art generated within the Israeli modern-Orthodox world, almost no Jewish-American artwork deals with *tevila* from a critical perspective. Already in the 1970s, when Yocheved Weinfeld (b. 1947) presented her disconcerting exhibition in Israel, Laderman-Ukeles praised the *tevila*. Later Jewish-American artists shed a similarly positive light on *tevila* and the *mikva*. Since the early 2000s, the works of American artists such as Janice Rubin (b. 1932) and Shari Rothfarb-Mekonen (b. 1968) portrayed the *mikva* as part of a separate “feminine religion” which operates in an arena safe from male infiltration, unrelated to the *mikva*’sassociation with authorizing martial relations.[[199]](#footnote-203) These works reflect the religious eroticism of the *mikva* and depict *tevila* as an exhilarating moment, a connective channel to the days of genesis. *The Mikva Project* (2002, Fig. 12) by Rubin, which displays photos of women in the *mikva,* lends the ceremony a broad range of possible meanings, from a monthly act of halakhic purification to a declaration of lesbian Jewish identity.[[200]](#footnote-204) Similarly, in 1999, Rothfarb-Mekonen presented a documentary video installation at the New York Jewish Museum titled *Water Rites*. The installation video showed interviews with Jewish women from different worlds, including Haredi, feminist, and lesbian women, who positively discuss their feelings about the *mikva* and the place it has in their lives.

Interpretive discourse on *niddah* art in Israel is also distinct from its US counterpart. While American discourse does not tend to interpret *mikva* art as critical even when it carries critical aspects, Israeli discourse adopts a radical interpretation of this art even when on its surface, it is not so.[[201]](#footnote-205) I will demonstrate this briefly: *My Marriage Bed* and *My Clean Days* by Helène Aylon (U.S., b. 1931) (discussed in Chapter 8) were not interpreted as critiques in the US, despite the critical aspects of the ritual that she displayed as part of the installation.[[202]](#footnote-206) In Israel, on the other hand, in light of Weinfeld’s precedent and much like Molgan’s works, Aylon’s art was interpreted as being critical of *niddah* laws. In the exhibition catalogue of *Matronita: Jewish Feminist Art* at the Mishkan Le’Omanut, Museum of Art in Ein Harod, I wrote, “Aylon exposes the repression’s implications for the lifestyle of women’ in the traditional Jewish world.” [[203]](#footnote-207) Art critic Smadar Sheffi also perceived *My Clean Days* as a pessimistic documentation: “What stings here is the policing of intimacy, the dichotomous division between pure and impure applied to the woman’s body. The calendars look like charts of desperation, tracking spans of time that in the end yield no release.”[[204]](#footnote-208) In similar fashion, the works of Hila Karabelnikov-Paz (b. 1981) and Ruth Kestenbaum Ben-Dov (b. 1961), which dealt with the *mikva*, were perceived as critical in Israel, even though the artists’ themselves never intended them to be so. Karabelnikov-Paz described her *mikva* works not as a critique of *niddah* laws, but rather as an attempt to take ownership of the *mikva* space and transform it from one of alienation to one of intimacy.[[205]](#footnote-209) Orna Oryan, however, described them as works of “internal” criticism: “The artist portrays her experience of *niddah* as one of objectification, loneliness, and passivity. […] It seems that the artist’s criticism stems from a meaningful bond and connection to the *mitzvoth* of *tehara*.” [[206]](#footnote-210) Likewise, though Kestenbaum Ben-Dov described her paintings of women in the act of immersion as an attempt to test the boundaries of depicting nude figures in a Jewish religious context (Figs. 14–15),[[207]](#footnote-211) Oryan referred to them as a direct critique of *niddah* laws, as well.[[208]](#footnote-212) This tendency of Israeli discourse on art to interpret Jewish feminist works as critical and rebellious coincides with the common characteristics of Israeli texts on art, whose interpretation places such works in opposition to religion.[[209]](#footnote-213)

Despite the widespread tendency in Israel to categorize creative works as critical, and despite Oryan’s imposed interpretation of Karabelnikov-Paz and Kestenbaum Ben-Dov’s works, one cannot ignore the distinct chasm between the critical approach to *niddah* and *mikva* characteristic of Molgan, Weil-Nebensal, and others, and the approach of American artists’ on these same subjects, which is characterized by a sense of “taking ownership”. The chasm I have noted corroborates claims by Oryan, who also asserted these distinctions.[[210]](#footnote-214) According to Oryan, the works originating in the US deliver an affirming message that centralizes the “positive.” These works focus on the spiritual aspect of the *mikva* and depict the positive transformation women undergo during *tevila*. In contrast, claims Oryan, in Israel the issue is more multifaceted and complex: On one hand, much like Jewish-American artists, Israel-based Varda Polak-Sahm (b. 1953) and Shuli Nachshon (b. 1951) present the *mikva* as a source of female empowerment. For instance, in Nachshon’s 2006 video work *Tevila*, she is seen at the *mikva* with her mother and sisters, and the *tevila* is depicted as part of a transformation and a connection with the spiritual-ritual world and *Sephardic* Jewish tradition (Figs. 16).[[211]](#footnote-215) On the other hand, works by Molgan and other modern-Orthodox women focus on reflecting the “negative”—the woman experiencing *niddah* rituals as bereft of her sovereignty, whose body has been hijacked by an oppressive social regime.

The clear distinction between Jewish-Israeli and Jewish-American depictions of the *mikva* begs a broader cultural explanation for this phenomenon, one that draws upon existing knowledge of the social, cultural, and religious differences between Jewish worlds in Israel and the various Jewish communities in the US. However, comparative studies on the subject are quite scarce, and almost none have been conducted on Jewish feminism in the US versus Israel.[[212]](#footnote-216) I will therefore offer an explanation of this chasm using the minimal research that is available on the development of Jewish feminist schools in both locations. I will position the artists’ different stances in the context of their respective feminist discourses and art fields. Laderman-Ukeles is unique and unusual among feminist Jewish artists of 1970s America; while her peers did not incorporate Jewish religion into their art, she dealt with the subject directly. Her work on the Jewish religious world and her positive outlook on the *mikva* were an exception in the broader feminist context, but was typical of the pervasive feminist Orthodox Jewish discourse of her time. As discussed in Chapter 8, in the 1970s, general feminist discourse largely regarded Judaism as a patriarchal religion and an anti-feminist sphere that oppresses women, partly through *niddah* laws. Jewish feminists challenged this perspective. Laderman-Ukeles’s positive outlook on *tevila* aligns with the oppositional and combative spirit of Jewish feminists in the US during the 1970s. Her direct preoccupation with Judaism alone, not to mention her positive approach to *tevila*, differed greatly from the pervasive feminist discourse in America at the time. The artist herself underscores the gulf between her work and the dominant anti-Jewish feminist discourse of the period. In the early 2000’s, while discussing the publication of the *Mikva Dreams* exhibition text in *Heresies* magazine in the late 1970s, Laderman-Ukeles emphasized that its inclusion in a feminist publication was quite unusual at the time: “I was apprehensive about the piece being accepted by the [*Heresies*] collective, because there was a lot of anger against patriarchy in Judaism and in religion generally. But it was also very well received.”[[213]](#footnote-217) Therefore, contrary to most feminist Jewish artists working in the US during the 1970s, who did not address Jewish religion directly, and in-line with Jewish feminist discourses that sought to connect Judaism and feminism, Laderman-Ukeles explored her Judaism openly, while maintaining an awareness of the chasm between her own work and dominant feminist discourse.

At the same time, in Israel, Weinfeld shed a somber light on *niddah*, representing the polar opposite of Laderman-Ukeles’s approach. While Laderman-Ukeles’s *mikva* works were unusual in the context of 1970s American art, Weinfeld’s canonic “*niddah* performance” in Israel was hardly an exception. In the 1970s, Israeli artists who were accepted into the canon of Israeli art directly and blatantly dealt with Judaism as a subject, expressing a grim or at least ambivalent approach toward it. Many works around this time portrayed a physical entity engaged in the use of Jewish symbols, such as works by Michal Na’aman (b. 1951), Haim Maor (b. 1951), Michael Druks (b. 1940), Moshe Gershuni (b. 1936), and Motti Mizrachi (b. 1946).[[214]](#footnote-218) Curator Adam Baruch attributed a restrained critical approach to these works, one that deconstructs religious symbols and experiences, scatters them, and reconnects them in conceptual-formalist contexts. According to Baruch, the works used Jewish symbols as raw material for the purpose of personal-creative “exorcism.”[[215]](#footnote-219)

The differences between Laderman-Ukeles’s work in the US and Weinfeld’s work in Israel should therefore be considered in light of their respective communal and cultural contexts. Weinfeld worked in Israel and generated art in the spirit of the Israeli art world, which adopted an apprehensive approach to religion. Laderman-Ukeles on the other hand, worked in the context of an oppositional Jewish minority discourse within an American majority. She offered an alternative to the dominant feminist and art discourses in the US, while seeking to empower her own identity as a Jewish and religious woman.

Critical preoccupation with *niddah* among modern-Orthodox Jewish women working in Israel since the early 2000s is highly distinct from the positive perspective on the *mikva* commonly expressed by secular or traditional artists. As previously mentioned, while non-Orthodox Jewish artists such as Polak-Sahm and Nachshon adopted an empathic perspective on the *mikva*, Orthodox artists like Molgan and Weil-Nebensal took a critical approach to the act of *tahara*. Similarly, Yael Guilat found that since the early 2000s, video works by non-Orthodox Jewish artists in Israel do not focus on criticizing tradition but rather on the relationship between the *halakha* (Jewish law) and religious custom, and the influence these have on shared culture and space in Israel. In Guilat’s words, “The works affirm the tradition and its rituals, or at least explore them according to the halakhaand the custom […].”[[216]](#footnote-220)

The pervasive criticism of *niddah* laws among modern-Orthodox Jewish women in Israel is consistent with the central role these women perform in the fight against rabbinical authority, which operates under the wing of the Government of Israel. Although any woman planning to legally marry in Israel is exposed to *niddah* laws through the “bridal consultation” provided by the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, and is obligated to immerse in the *mikva*, it is modern-Orthodox women who spearhead the opposition to Israel’s rabbinical institution.[[217]](#footnote-221) In 2012, Tali Berner described the issue as follows:

[…] in recent years, a great deal of feminist activity and creative endeavor in Israel has been taking place in the religious arena. Many of the challenges faced by feminism in Israel relate to this arena, and several of the more prominent feminists come from the religious world. All of this activity proves that it is not only possible to build a bridge between traditional religiosity and feminist commitment, but that tremendous potential lies in the encounter between them, in the realms of politics, society, and art.[[218]](#footnote-222)

Furthermore, Orna Sasson-Levy and Chen Misgav noted that, “[…] the religious feminist movement is the most important feminist movement in Israel due to its vigorous activity, the plethora of subjects it addresses, the diverse spheres in which it operates, and the many women who participate in its various activities.”[[219]](#footnote-223) Molgan, like other Israeli Orthodox women engaged in criticizing the laws of *niddah*, weaves her critique of the Jewish Orthodox world and its customs into her critique of the rabbinical institution in Israel. Her critical work is illuminated by the particular context in which she works, one in which modern-Orthodox Jewish women spearhead the feminist struggle against the male rabbinical institution’s control over individual status in general, and the *mikvas* in particular.

Contrary to the critical outlook of Israeli women artists who associate themselves with modern-Orthodox society, the positive nature of Laderman-Ukeles’s work is characteristic of several non-Orthodox US artists (Rubin, Rothfarb-Mekonen), as well as certain secular and traditional female artists in Israel (Polak-Sahm, Nachshon). However, despite the affinity between these artists’ contemporary works and Laderman-Ukeles’s past work, they effectively operate within a different feminist discourse. Unlike the subversive discourse of Laderman-Ukeles, which offered an alternative to the dominant feminist discourse of her time, contemporary women artists who share her approach are now part of mainstream feminist discourse. Third-wave feminism aims at diversity and the empowerment of women from varying groups and cultures.[[220]](#footnote-224) Moreover, post-secularism has brought many feminist scholars to the conclusion that religious identity in particular can develop a female subject who fights for liberation. These scholars lament the automatic adoption of secularism by western feminism.[[221]](#footnote-225) Contemporary feminist Jewish discourse in the US and Israel expresses a less definitive approach to *tevila* laws, as well. Several scholars have questioned approaches that regard *niddah* laws strictly as regulations of female sexuality. Tova Hartman and Naomi Marmon claim that, while feminist women criticize *niddah* laws as patriarchal practices, they rarely address the fact that many women find them empowering. They therefore suggest that women’s perspectives be investigated and represented for their diversity, without surrendering to the simple oppressor–oppressed dichotomy. [[222]](#footnote-226) In the spirit of the new postmodern feminist discourse, recent decades have seen a trend of women’s return to the *tevila* ritual unrelated to *niddah* laws. Jewish women in non-Orthodox American communities, formerly opposed to *tevila* rituals, have built *mikvas* in their communities.[[223]](#footnote-227) Therefore, one could conclude that it is precisely the dominance of such “ownership” discourse that emboldens the subversive perspective and oppositional activism of both Molgan and Laderman-Ukeles, despite their differences.

Moreover, the clear distinction between the subversive *niddah* art of Orthodox Israeli women artists, and the “ownership art” of US-based Orthodox artists can be explained in light of an argument made by Tamar Ross, scholar of Judaism and gender. Ross pointed to the radical nature of Orthodox feminist discourse developed in Israel since the 1980s, and claimed that contrary to it, Orthodox Jewish feminism in the US usually operates in the spirit of liberal feminism. According to Ross, in the modern-Orthodox American community, the potential invasion of secular values associated with the non-Jewish majority is a centralized issue, one developed by dominant theological discourse aimed to mitigate and prevent the infiltration of such values into Jewish society, or to dismiss the dilemmas arising from gaps between traditional Judaism and modernity. In the modern-Orthodox Israeli community, on the other hand, the pervasive approach is more holistic, and seeks to connect between the *kodesh* (holy, sanctified) and the *chol* (mundane, ordinary) within the framework of non-oppositional national Jewish discourse. This approach, claims Ross, is reflected by the tendency of Israeli Orthodox-Jewish discourse to operate in the spirit of radical feminism.[[224]](#footnote-228) The reverence for *tahara* and *niddah* laws as foundational values of the Jewish people [[225]](#footnote-229) illustrates their significance within American-Jewish society. This might be the root cause behind the non-critical approach typical of Jewish-American artists. On the other hand, the social reality of modern-Orthodox Judaism in Israel is that of a minority within a Jewish majority society, in which feminist Orthodox women work to repair injustices perpetuated by the marriage of religion and state, and where religious artists adopt critical views of *niddah* and *tevila*.

To summarize, this chapter showed that critical art on *niddah* and *tevila* in the Jewish-American and Jewish-Israeli worlds expresses more radical feminist ideas than those visible in religious Jewish spheres, or even feminist religious spheres. I have demonstrated how feminist-Jewish art in the US and Israel uncovers dominant taboos in religious Jewish communities, and how, through their work, women artists seek to spotlight issues that rarely garner public attention; these then become part of religious feminist discourse and sometimes a part of mainstream discourse in religious societies. Indeed, various scholars have noted that in the Orthodox world in Israel, art, literature, poetry, and cinema often deals with taboo subjects and lends them visibility.[[226]](#footnote-230) For instance, the scholar of Jewish thought Dov Schwartz claims that in the Israeli modern-Orthodox world, the exploration of sexuality and the body in different cultural and creative fields (poetry, literature, cinema, television, and dance) has allowed religious discourses on these subjects to evolve.[[227]](#footnote-231) Schwartz argues that art and *halakhic* rulings are linked; he supports this by referencing halakhic discussions about LGBT individuals after they appeared in novels by Orthodox authors.[[228]](#footnote-232) Valeria Seigelshifer also found that films by religious directors in Israel served significant step in initiating the process of changing the discourse on sexuality in Israeli religious society, which is now undergoing a revolution around the issue.[[229]](#footnote-233) Likewise, Molgan and Laderman-Ukeles’s works on *niddah* and *tevila* in Israel and the US, respectively, exposed the dominant taboo in their Orthodox-Jewish worlds, with Molgan’s work preceding intellectual and activist discourses on *niddah* and *tevila* in Israel’s feminist Orthodox community by roughly a decade.

**Chapter 10. Conclusions**

The artists discussed in this book engage in feminist critique of Jewish tradition, *halakha* (Jewish law), and religious institutions in various ways. Helène Aylon (b. 1931) and Nechama Golan (b. 1947) target regulatory religious Jewish texts; Nurit Jacobs-Yinon (b. 1972), Hila Karabelnikov-Paz (b. 1984), Hagit Molgan (b. 1972), and Andi Arnovitz (b. 1959) critique the Jewish *halakha* (*mikva* for conversion, modesty, and *niddah*), and Mierle Laderman-Ukeles (b. 1939) focuses on the relegation of female rituals in the symbolic order of religious Jewish worlds. The artists’ methods differ as well: Aylon follows the strategies of contemporary activist art—using her privileged social status and symbolic capital as an artist in order to foster dialogue with rabbis that may effect change. Jacobs-Yinon on the other hand, operates in the spirit of feminist activist art originating in 1970s America, which garnered visibility through the media. Jacobs-Yinon also uses camouflaging tactics typical of Orthodox Jewish feminism. In contrast, Golan, Laderman-Ukeles, Molgan, and Arnovitz, do not subscribe to the characteristic camouflaging practices of Orthodox feminism, but rather expose taboos and offer direct criticism of Jewish tradition, *halakha*, and religious institutions. Golan uses shock effect to engage viewers, and is denounced and labeled blasphemous by religious critique; Molgan and Laderman-Ukeles publicly expose taboos concerning women’s bodies, sexuality, and rituals; and Arnovitz provocatively employs images of breasts and pubic hair, thereby revealing to the public the pornographic dimension of the rabbinical radicalization of modesty laws.

**The Contribution of Jewish Feminist Art to the Feminist Art Worlds in the US and Israel**

All artists discussed in this book generate socially engaged and activist art that criticizes rabbinical institutions—given that textual interpretation, *halakhic* law, and the formation of religious rituals are primarily institutional constructs. Feminist art is one of the significant fields of activist art, and merges research, creative output, and social activism. Since its inception in 1970s America, such art has played a significant role in the social change prompted by feminism.[[230]](#footnote-234) It continues to combine creative activity, social activism, and political thought. Jewish feminist artists enact this approach, adding current rabbinical institutions and their patriarchal foundations as subjects of criticism.

The critical feminist Jewish art discussed in this study is not concerned with the **validity** of tradition, but rather with its **formation**.[[231]](#footnote-235) Its use of “tempered radicalism,” “ which is dominant in religious feminist schools, is an innovation within the field of feminist art. The ideology at the core of tempered radicalism does not fundamentally reject the institution and its laws, but rather criticizes them in efforts to advance reform. The artists discussed in this book are radical in the criticism they direct against the patriarchal foundations that underpin the Jewish religious world. At the same time, their radicalism is tempered by their commitment to Jewish religious tradition: although Golan criticizes and challenges the patriarchal values reflected by religious texts (such as the acquisition of women through marriage), she simultaneously emphasizes its sanctity by using the *genizah* stamp (used to mark holy texts whose disposal is religiously prohibited) on photographs of her “high-heel” work. Aylon did not erase the biblical text or even mark the *chumashim* (printed editions of the Torah) she used in her work. Instead, she highlighted the misogynist and anti-humanist verses on transparent paper laid over the holy books. In so doing, she positioned her work within the borders of the traditional Jewish interpretive community that attributes sanctity to these texts. Jacobs-Yinon, too, does not attempt to dismantle or devalue the judicial Orthodox institution but rather to expand it, so that it may include female rabbinical judges as well. Arnovitz similarly emphasized that she does not question the necessity or significance of modesty regulations, but rather objects to male rabbis constructing them and generating pornographic discourse through them. Furthermore, Arnovitz does not reject the Orthodox Jewish *halakha*, but demands that women be included in the formation of religious law, and that *halakhic* discourse thereby include their point of view, which it has thus far omitted. In fact, throughout this book, I have shown how the criticism of feminist Jewish artists in the US and Israel always manifests as the re-enforcement of tradition rather than a departure from it. This approach indeed coincides with dominant feminist-Jewish attitudes in the US and Israel that value **subversive** activity over **revolutionary** activity. Their tactic, also referred to as “devoted resistance,” is to express critique in the name of the religion and culture with which they identify while working to repair their patriarchal tendencies.

My findings regarding the nature of feminist criticism by Jewish artists align with the conclusions of art critic Eleanor Heartney, art historian Gannit Ankori, Israel-based scholar of visual culture Yael Guilat, and art scholar Tal Dekel. Heartney investigated depictions of the Catholic image of the Virgin Mary in the art of American women artists during the end of the 20th century; [[232]](#footnote-236) Ankori studied the works of Palestinian artists who interact with their traditional environment (Christian or Muslim); [[233]](#footnote-237) Guilat discussed video art by secular and traditional Israeli artists who explore the *halakhic* approach to gender issues; [[234]](#footnote-238) and Dekel examined the works of Ethiopian women artists in Israel who criticize the rabbinical institution while seeking to foster a sense of communal belonging for themselves and their community.[[235]](#footnote-239) Through their respective fields, these scholars have shown that contemporary artists in various geographical and cultural spheres do not reject their culture, but rather affirm it by challenging the oppressive patriarchal dictation that excludes them as women.

The work of feminist Jewish artists also coincides with these findings, as they remain deeply connected to their culture of origin despite rejecting its patriarchal foundations. However, their work is also distinct from that of artists discussed by the above-mentioned scholars, and is unique in its effect not only within the art world, but also within the religious communities to which they belong. The commitment of feminist Jewish artists to the rituals, texts, and customs of their religious worlds is expressed precisely in the incisive criticism of their works, i.e. in their endeavor to shake up male control of religious Jewish institutions. Indeed, religious feminist Jewish women in general, and feminist Jewish artists in particular, are critical of the religious world, their approach rooted in the prevalent theological outlook of religious Jewish feminism, which regards critical discourse as a truly religious act.

Throughout this book, I have shown that critical feminist Jewish art in the US and Israel has had a reciprocal relationship with the general feminist and activist art in the US since the 1970s. According to art scholars Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, American feminist artists of the 1970s were significant in inserting the female voice into works of art, and using art to express their experience.[[236]](#footnote-240) The feminist Jewish art discussed in this book follows in the footsteps of feminist American art of the 1970s in its subject matter, iconography, the critical discourse it strives to foster, and its combined use of activism and aesthetics. Like feminist American artists who worked during the 1970s, Aylon, Jacobs-Yinon, and Molgan are not content to exhibit objects in galleries or museums, but use their art to be active outside of the art world, as well, and therefore work within the religious Jewish worlds. Art by Molgan, Laderman-Ukeles, and Arnovitz is reminiscent of works by feminist American artists of the 1970s, which introduced a new outlook that subverted common patriarchal attitudes and challenged the male gaze. More explicitly, the *niddah* art by Aylon, Laderman-Ukeles, and Molgan directly corresponds with the 1972 work by feminist American Jewish artist Carolee Schneemann (b. 1939), and *Mikva Dreams* by Laderman-Ukeles echoes Schneemann’s work *Interior Scroll*, presented in 1975.

Works by feminist Jewish artists brought a direct, critical preoccupation with the religious Jewish establishment—including religious texts, *halakha*, and institutions—into the fields of feminist art in the US and Israel; therein lies their uniqueness. Laderman-Ukeles’s work was unusual in the context of feminist American art during the 1970s and 1980s, as it dealt with Jewish subjects otherwise omitted from it. Works by Aylon from the early 1990s on, are unique for marking the leap of feminist Jewish American art toward critical preoccupation with religious subjects. In Israel, modern-Orthodox artists Golan, Molgan, Arnovitz, and Jacobs-Yinon, have, since the 1990s, generated within the art world a subversive Jewish feminist critique, which had previously been absent from Israeli art, and therein lies their significance.

**The Contribution of Jewish Feminist Art to the Jewish Religious Worlds in the US and in Israel**

The artists discussed in this study work to incite reform within religious Jewish worlds via the art world, which allows them to foster public and political discourses that may inspire change in their religious environments. The *toenet rabbanit* (rabbinical court advocate) Rivkah Lubitch, whose feminist *midrash*  (a form of traditional Rabbinic commentary) was presented at the exhibition *A Tale of a Woman and a Robe* (2013),discussed in Chapter 4,[[237]](#footnote-241) offered her own explanation on the significance of religious criticism in the media and art world. On the exhibitions’ closing day, Lubitch explained that art by feminist Orthodox women in various artistic disciplines is acutely important, as these women are still excluded from involvement in the h*alakha* and their influence within religious communities remains limited. In 2017, the rabbinical leadership of the OU (Union of Jewish Orthodox Congregations of America) published a policy document regarding the integration of women into community leadership roles. The document, which aims to pave the way for all modern-Orthodox US synagogues, allows women to provide social services within their community such as spiritual guidance, but restricts them from becoming leaders of religious life in the synagogue.[[238]](#footnote-242) In fact, even when women do engage in *halakhic* or Torah study, their low symbolic status as religious leaders keeps them from promoting significant change. Therefore, claims Lubitch, the worlds of media and art serve as an alternative sphere of activity for change: “If we think a halakhic change should be made […] we need to do more than write halakhic articles […] we will make paintings, and create artwork, and write *midrashim* […] only this can successfully effect change.” In her exhibition catalogue, Jacobs-Yinon also described the significance of the art world as an alternative sphere of feminist activity to those of the Orthodox Jewish world—namely, feminist activism in the areas of Torah study, *halakhic* law, and religious thought, which, though it does exist, still rests in the margins of rabbinical discourse. The artist noted her ineligibility to serve as a witness or judge in rabbinical courts; in this context, she described the art world as a unique space that allows her to submit her “testimony” and make her voice heard: “The work of art is the only witness I am permitted to bear, from **without** and not **within**” [author’s emphasis].[[239]](#footnote-243) Molgan and Laderman-Ukeles, too, stated that it is the art world which allows them to openly address subjects that are considered taboo in their religious worlds.[[240]](#footnote-244) Therefore, feminist Orthodox artists work to cultivate reform specifically through the worlds of art and media, which allow them to generate public and political discourse that can effect change within their religious worlds.

Through this study, I found that when the artists actively cooperated with other agents in the field to foment meaningful discourse on their works and the issues they raise, within the religious communities, they succeeded. This is a significant finding given the marginality of the arts in religious Jewish communities in Israel and the US.[[241]](#footnote-245) Throughout the book, I have shown how Jewish feminist artists in the US and Israel interact with different fields agents, including those outside of the art world. I contended that the activism of the artists and other field agents is that which generates discourse around these works: Aylon cultivated discourse not only with curator Norman Kleeblatt, who showcased her work in Jewish museums around the US, but also with rabbis whom she invited to museum discussions, which were very fruitful. Jacobs-Yinon was active within the art world but also stimulated discourse outside of it; she engaged the media and screened her film in numerous religious communities and on many public stages, her artwork challenging even the religious establishment itself. Hagit Molgan’s work was widely discussed by Israeli art critics, but the engagement of the Israeli Orthodox community with her art was prompted by the gallery discussions she organized for male and female members of her religious kibbutz, which eventually caught the attention of feminist Orthodox women leaders. Disseminating images of the artwork through the media played a central role in generating discourse on them within religious communities, as was the case for both Nechama Golan and Karabelnikov-Paz. On the other hand, works by Arnovitz and Laderman-Ukeles, who did not make a concerted, active effort to create visibility for their work in religious Jewish communities, did not emerge beyond the art world, although the artists themselves wished to be active within their religious communities, as well.[[242]](#footnote-246) The agency of the artists and the efforts of various field agents to cultivate discourse outside of the art world is therefore of acute importance.[[243]](#footnote-247) Without these, the artwork remains an object that may be discussed in public, but does not evolve into the kind of ongoing discourse that extends beyond the confines of the art world and inspires religious discourse that could lead to change.

**Between the US and Israel**

Comparing the nature of feminist criticism emerging from feminist Jewish art in Israel to its US counterpart, suggests no substantial difference between the two. Both US-based Aylon and Israel-based Golan engaged in tempered radical critique of Jewish religious practices. Both Jacobs-Yinon, born in Israel, and Arnovitz, who immigrated to Israel from the US, were critical of the rabbinical establishment in Israel, and in this perspective, their works share more commonalities than differences. Indeed, contrary to earlier decades, since the 1990s the two feminist Jewish worlds have operated in parallel, with much resemblance between activity in the US and Israel,[[244]](#footnote-248) and this has largely applied to feminist art, as well.

In one case, I did find a clear distinction between the spheres of significance put forth by Israel-based works and the feminist criticism of US-based works. In the Israeli art world, criticism or at least ambivalence regarding *niddah* laws has been widespread since the 1970s. In the US on the other hand, it is nearly impossible to find artwork that deals with *tevila* from an explicitly critical perspective. It is therefore in Israel, where state law assigns exclusive authority over Jewish religious affairs to the Chief Rabbinate, and grants Orthodox institutions control of the *mikvas*, that criticism on these subjects prevails. In the US, on the other hand, where religion is separate from state, Jewish artists employ a free minority discourse that operates within an American majority society and in relationship to it, and seek to empower their identity as Jewish, feminist women.

The most significant differences between Jewish feminist art in Israel and its US equivalent can be found in its reception and in the nature of the discourse surrounding it. Jewish art, including feminist Jewish art, and art by religious women in particular, does not earn recognition in the art world and is rarely displayed or collected by prestigious museums in the US or Israel. Yet, while in Israel there is no designated Jewish art field and women producing Jewish art therefore attempt acceptance into the general Israeli art field from which they are excluded, in the US Jewish art is an established field that operates through museums, Jewish cultural institutions, curators, private collectors, artists’ organizations, and artists’ *beit midrash* groups. The Jewish art field in the US enables women artists who deal with Judaism to gain visibility and recognition in this niche field, which is not an option for women artists in Israel.

The reception and social impact of artistic work in the two Jewish worlds is culture-specific and is influenced by the artistic fields in which the artists operate; it is also influenced by the social and theological foundations that distinguish various contemporary Jewish sects and Jewish societies in the US and Israel. Throughout this book, I have argued the influence of dominant discourse in religious Jewish communities and different Jewish sects in the US and Israel on interpretations of the artists’ works. I have shown that, in fact, the various dominant theological outlooks in these communities produce different interpretations of the art, prompting either its acceptance or rejection. For instance, Golan’s works were accepted in the world of Jewish art in the US and Israel but did not penetrate the Israeli art world, and were harshly criticized by the Orthodox community in Israel. Aylon’s works on the other hand, which are no less radical than Golan’s, were embraced by the Jewish art world in the US and managed to penetrate the non-Orthodox Jewish world, a center of gravity in the American Jewish community. In the US, Aylon’s works were interpreted based on a theological foundation that carries weight in the non-Orthodox American community. In contrast, Golan’s works in Israel were not supported by a broad, established theological platform that could channel them into the conservative mainstream of the dominant Orthodox community, and were therefore rejected by it. In addition, critical theological American discourse is foreign to the Orthodox world in Israel, so much so that Aylon’s *My Notebooks* was dismissed as an example of “victimhood discourse,” and her entreaty for *tikkun olam* (repair of the world)was not understood.

Interpretive discourse on *niddah* and *mikva* art in the US is also distinct from its Israeli counterpart. While the Jewish art field in the US tends not to interpret *mikva* and *niddah* art as subversive even when it incorporates critical elements, Israeli discourse favors a radical interpretation of it.[[245]](#footnote-249) For instance, Aylon’s *My Marriage Bed* (2001) and *My Clean Days* (2001) were not perceived as critical in the US. In Israel, on the other hand, in light of the precedent Weinfeld set in the 1970s and in-line with the critical discourse Molgan generated in the 2000s, Aylon’s art was interpreted as a bleak, despondent, and critical perspective on the laws of *niddah*.

In summary, critical feminist Jewish art in the US and Israel serves as a subversive workshop for the persistent scrutiny of tradition; it subverts its regimenting constructions in an attempt to reform it. Despite the artists’ critical approach, acts that seem like provocation, anti-*halakhic*, or anti-religious, are upon closer examination revealed to be religious acts that aim for *tikkun olam*. German sociologist Ulrich Beck begins his book *A God of One’s Own* with an explanation of the book’s title,[[246]](#footnote-250) which draws from *A Room of One’s Own* (1929), the title of a book by feminist English writer Virginia Woolf. Woolf asserted the woman’s need for a room of her own in order to discover her creativity. Beck adds to her words, stating that a woman who is able to close the door behind her has the opportunity to break conventions. The lock on the door means freedom to develop independent ideas.[[247]](#footnote-251) At the core of Beck’s theory, which responds to the collapse of the secularization thesis, is the claim that Orthodoxy today manages to grip modern individuals due to the freedom they have to create a “God of one’s own” in a way that aligns both with religious ideas and modern liberal outlooks that place the individual at the center. [[248]](#footnote-252) The different spheres of meaning that the artists engage in, and the “third spaces” they create for themselves, allow them to generate art that is both critical and traditional without any contradiction. In Beck’s terms, their ability to “close the door behind them” and disconnect from the authority of the religious establishment allows them to break its conventions. Once they do so, the art world becomes a sphere in which they can reshape their Jewish world, and thereby redeem it.
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