Tikkun Olam: Particular or Universal?

Vernon H. Kurtz

The phrase *tikkun olam* is a very popular one today, which has become part and parcel of Jewish vocabulary. A story is told, for example, about an American Jew traveling to Israel for the first time. Greeted at the airport by his Israeli cousin, his first question is: "How do you say *tikkun olam* in Hebrew?[1] Remarkably, the phrase has moved beyond Jewish parlance and has become accepted as appropriate terminology in our society at large. Even the President of the United States has mentioned it many times: in his speeches to the Union of Reform Judaism, the American–Israel Public Affairs Committee, and in a Passover message to the Jewish community at large, President Barack Obama has either used the term *tikkun olam* in its original Hebrew form or has referred to the concept of "repairing the world," which is seen by most as the normative translation of the term. In fact, President Obama has been termed by some as the "*tikkun olam* President."[2]

Why does this phrase enjoy such popular and widespread use? It is understood by most people, including the President of the United States, in its present parlance, as a synonym for social action—that is, it is a call for taking personal action to make the world a better place, to improve the lot of all humanity. Even in the Jewish world it is often seen as such. However, if one examines the term as it is found in Jewish sources, one will see that this is not necessarily the meaning it has always had. The phrase has been used differently in different contexts and at different points in time. More specifically: we will see that the concept of *tikkun olam* has reflected different

underlying definitions and conceptions in rabbinic literature, in kabbalistic literature, and in the liturgy.

At the same time that we examine the concept of *tikkun*, "repair," we must also examine what the word *olam*, "world," suggests. This latter word raises a question: are we referring to a better world for Jews in particular, or for all humanity? I believe that the latter understanding is assumed by most people, whether they are Jewish or not. But is this the true meaning of the concept? Where does the idea originate, and how did it become a synonym for social action, making the world a better place for all?

The phrase is first used in the Mishnah in tractate Gittin, edited in the early third century C.E. In the fourth chapter and in the beginning of the fifth, there appear a number of laws that are justified with the phrase *mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam*, "because of *tikkun ha-olam*." Many of these laws refer to social policy legislation providing extra protection to those potentially at a disadvantage—for example, legislating conditions for the writing of divorce decrees and for the freeing of slaves. In these cases, it seems that the rabbinic legislation is meant to articulate rules and regulations that might not have risen to a state of obligation, but were made obligatory because of the concept of mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam. Herbert Danby, a classic translator of the Mishnah, renders the phrase as "a precaution for the general good."[3] As these laws specifically deal with Jewish society, he sees this legislation as bettering the Jewish world.

One example of such legislation concerns protocols surrounding divorce. In Jewish law a husband may divorce his wife by granting her a *get*, a divorce document, either delivered in person or by means of a messenger. As soon as the woman accepts the *get*, she is divorced and free to marry another man. The Mishnah suggests that men may change their minds about whether to divorce their wives and therefore, after sending a messenger, they could annul the *get* (albeit in the presence of a court) without the woman knowing that it has already been cancelled. The woman might then assume that she is

divorced and she may thereupon marry another man, even though she was still officially married to her first husband (since the divorce had been nullified). This would be unfair to her and any children produced from this new union. M. Gittin 4:2 relates that Rabban Gamliel the Elder established that annulling the *get* in this fashion should not be done, *mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam*.

Perhaps the most famous mishnaic example of justifying rabbinic innovation by invoking the concept *mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam* is Hillel's institution of the *prozbul* (M. Gittin 4:3). According to the Torah, every seven years all debts owed by Jews to other Jews are forgiven. Hillel was concerned that people would refrain from lending money to each other, because they would fear that they would not be repaid as the Sabbatical Year approached. He therefore established the *prozbul*,[4] a legal maneuver whereby lenders authorize the court to collect all debts owed to them. This effectively circumvented the legislation of the Torah and allowed for the collection of loans even after the *sh'mittah*, the Sabbatical Year, when all loans are to be forgiven. In this way no debts are cancelled by the sabbatical year, and the economic well-being of the community could thus be maintained.

It seems from these two examples (as well as the others mentioned in the Mishnah) that the phrase *mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam* is used to solidify the social order and to take care of those—whether it be women, the poor, or (in other examples) slaves—who are less able to take care of themselves. According to Jill Jacobs, "preserving this current social order might sound like a politically conservative move. It is worth noting, however, that the majority of these rabbinic cases involve the protection of a person or set of people who typically found themselves toward the bottom of the social order."[5] The concept thus seems to protect the most vulnerable members of society.

The phrase *tikkun ha-olam* is found some fifteen times in the Mishnah, thirty-odd times in the Babylonian Talmud, eight times in the Yerushalmi, and a handful of times in the the halakhic *midrashim*

and the Tosefta. Gilbert Rosenthal suggests that we should translate *tikkun ha-olam* as "the improvement of society."[6] Byron Sherwin quotes a Ph.D. thesis written by Sagit Mor: "After its initial application to divorce law, the use of the term *tikkun ha-olam* was expanded to include various other types of halakhic legislation which establish conditions aimed at supporting and sustaining various types of Jewish communal and individual needs."[7] David Widzer suggests that *mi-p'nei tikkun ha-olam* is used to justify the rabbinic enactment to promote social welfare; he writes: "maintaining the community's well-being may require an amendment to an existing law, often (but not exclusively) in financial affairs and interpersonal relationships."[8] Elliot Dorff writes: "In these first usages, the term probably means, as the Reuben Alcalay and the Even-Shoshan dictionaries suggest as their first definitions, 'guarding the established order in the physical or social world."[9] Jane Kanarek suggests that it be understood as "a recalibration of the world, a recognition that the world is out of balance and that legal remedies are needed in order to readjust the world to a better balance."[10]

If , in today's world, the concept of *tikkun olam* is understood to mean "repairing the world" in a more universal sense, it is clear that in its rabbinic understanding, the world that the Mishnah, Talmuds, and Midrash are referring to is solely a Jewish one. Eugene Lipman writes that *olam* literally means "world," meaning the whole world: "That certainly is the way the phrase is used in our time as a major *mitzvah* for contemporary Jews and for the Jewish community: to move the entire world toward our messianic goals. It is universalistic." However, he continues, "It was not so in the Talmud. None of the material which has been adduced here could serve to bring me to the conclusion that the talmudic sages were speaking of all humanity in their enactments."[11] As an example, he brings a comment of Rashi in which he clearly understands the concept of the world (*olam*) as denoting solely "all of Israel."[12]

Sherwin agrees with this understanding as he, too, believes that the concept of *olam* refers to maintaining the social order in the Jewish world rather than seeing it in universal terms. Quoting Mor, he writes: "The earliest appearance of the term *olam* refers to 'Jewish culture and civilization' rather than to universal humankind."[13] In fact, if one examines the mishnaic passages and the terminology as it appears there, it is quite clear that both Rabban Gamliel and Hillel are referring to the ordered society of a Jewish community—whether in regard to the laws of divorce or to the laws of lending money. In both cases, they are concerned with Jewish law only as it pertains to the Jewish community, and not as some universal approach that might be more in line with "repairing the world"—as understood in the common parlance of either President Barack Obama or most of the modern Jewish community at large.

Most people who are familiar with the concept know it from the liturgy, as it appears in the Aleinu. This prayer may have been written as early as the second century and was originally part of the liturgy for Rosh Hashanah. Probably around the thirteenth century, it was moved to the daily liturgy and it is now recited three times daily, toward the conclusion of the morning, afternoon, and evening services. The prayer itself consists of two paragraphs. The first speaks of the greatness of God and of the particular relationship between God and the Jewish people, while the second is much more universalistic in tone, suggesting that divine sovereignty will encompass the entire world. The second paragraph of Aleinu includes the phrase *l'takkein olam b'malkhut Shaddai*, which has been variously translated as "perfecting the earth by Your kingship" (Siddur Sim Shalom),[14] "to perfect the universe through the Almighty's sovereignty" (ArtScroll),[15] "when the world will be perfected under the sovereignty of the Almighty" (Koren Sacks Siddur),[16] and "when the world will be perfected under the kingdom of the Almighty" (Hertz Siddur).[17] But in order to understand the phrase, it is important to look beyond the words themselves to the larger context in which they appear.

Clearly, the focus of the first paragraph of the Aleinu is on the Jewish people. They are the ones, in contrast to all other peoples, who bow down to the Sovereign of sovereigns, the blessed Holy One. However, the second paragraph (in which the line about *tikkun olam* appears) is not only about the Jewish people. According to Levi Cooper, the universalistic theme of the second paragraph of the Aleinu "has its eyes set on repairing society in general, both Jewish and non-Jewish."[18] Jacobs suggests that this section focuses on the promise of God's ultimate sovereignty, as the text speaks of a time "when all the people of the world will call out God's name."[19] The triumph of divine sovereignty, according to the text, requires the elimination of any pockets of resistance to God's exclusive rule. Alyssa Gray writes that "the Aleinu thus takes a concept that denoted only certain, but not all, rabbinic enactments and expands it to mean God's ultimate repair of the world."[20] While we commonly think of *tikkun olam* as a human project, here it is presented as God's responsibility: it is God who is to repair the world in this case, not humans. And it is clear that the concept of *olam*, in this context, is not merely the Jewish world, but the entire world—as God is understood here to be the sovereign of all humanity.

In the Middle Ages, at least in kabbalistic circles, the term *tikkun olam* was understood differently. Daniel Matt suggests the Zohar, the mystical text ascribed by most scholars to Moses de Leon of Spain near the end of the thirteenth century, understands the idea of *tikkun* in many different ways. For example, Daniel Matt's dictionary of the Zohar includes the following in its definition of *tikkun*: "social order; welfare; rearranged the world for them; working the earth; preparing the soil."[21] In the kabbalistic understanding of the term, we thus move to an entirely new concept, quite different from the valence it held in earlier rabbinic sources.

Isaac Luria (1534–1572) takes the kabbalistic concept of *tikkun* to yet another level. He describes creation as a process by which God contracted the Divine Self in order to make room for the world. In this

creation story, God then emanated into the world through ten *s'firot*, aspects of the Divine Presence. Luria conceptualized the divine *s'firot* as vessels of divine essence, then went on to imaging some of the vessels becoming too weak to actually contain the stuff of Divinity assigned to them. The vessels shattered, resulting in the mixture of divine light with the *k'lipot*, or shells, of the vessels themselves. This process resulted in the introduction of evil into the world.[22] Luria understood the concept of tikkun as the idea that human actions can have an effect far beyond the action itself. He maintained that as Jews fulfill their obligations under God's commandments, they literally help to fix the shattered world.[23] For Luria, Jews observing the commandments would, quite audaciously, fix God. According to Sherwin, for the kabbalists, the goal of *tikkun ha-olam* was to restore harmony, balance, and oneness among the forces that constitute the manifested aspects of God—that is, the *s'firot*.[24]

This understanding takes the concept of *tikkun* to a level not envisioned by the rabbinic sages. Rosenthal suggests: "The great novelty of the Lurianic approach to *tikkun* is that it elevates the role of human beings far beyond that envisioned by the Talmudic sages who devised the concept. It is now in the hands of every man and woman to lift the sparks and redeem the supernal and lower worlds by our own actions."[25] The ancient rabbis had been interested in "repairing" their own contemporary Jewish society. The kabbalistic notion of *tikkun*, however, went far beyond that concept, suggesting that human behavior can have an effect—positive or negative—on the world; and that *mitzvot*, Jewish ethical and ritual commandments, have an impact even beyond the immediate effect of a particular action.

To what *olam* was Luria referring? Did he believe that our actions would have an impact on the entire cosmos, or was the *tikkun* that he envisioned more limited in scope? Lawrence Fine suggests that "while it is true that by its nature Lurianic myth spoke in cosmic, and thus in some sense, 'universal' terms, the Lurianists were not curtailed

by any sense of 'shared fate' with humanity at large."[26] According to Fine, sixteenth-century Jews were not concerned with the entire human condition. In a similar vein, Byron Sherwin writes that "the focus of the kabbalistic view is not primarily the social sphere, the terrestrial realm, but the divine realm. The kabbalistic approach is blatantly and unabashedly theocentric."[27] And Gilbert Rosenthal, in assessing the use of the term by other medieval kabbalists, suggests that "*Tikkun* is directed toward three goals: the repair of the flaws in the world from creation, the perfection of humans, and the repair of the primordial sin of Adam and purging of the pollution injected by the serpent into Eve in Eden." Thus, the kabbalistic understanding of the phrase *tikkun olam* is clearly quite different from how it was used in rabbinic literature and in the liturgy. For the kabbalists, it has become a term referring to individual self-improvement, by which process an individual can also have an effect on the world—and "the world" in this usage refers both to the inner world of the person doing the *mitzvot* and also to the expanded world of the Jewish people.

With this background, it is now possible to explore how we understand *tikkun olam* in our own day. Lawrence Fine writes that the originators of the new meaning of this term in the United States—Shlomo Bardin, Leonard Fine, and Michael Lerner, for example—surely consciously based themselves on the way the term was used in ancient times, as they created its modern meaning.[29] I would like to suggest that the term today is an amalgam of all these understandings. From the rabbinic sphere, we have taken the concept of helping the most vulnerable in society, repairing the world, readjusting its balance, and consolidating the social order. From the Aleinu prayer, we have embraced the concept of repairing the world—moving from a particularistic formulation about Jewish society to a universalistic one, making us responsible for humanity at large. And from the mystical Lurianic approach, we have added the concept of human activity improving the self, and thus perhaps even the world above.

There are some who believe that we have gone beyond the limits of what the historical understanding of the term should allow for. Byron Sherwin, for example, writes: "The contemporary use of tikkun olam is an example of the semantic displacement of American Jewry, an expression of verbal abuse. It is a metamorphosed version of 'Prophetic Judaism,' which like 'Prophetic Judaism' has come to be understood as being synonymous with Judaism."[30] And Arnold J. Wolf believes that popular modern usage has distorted the concept of *tikkun olam*: "A teaching about compromise, sharpening, trimming, and humanizing rabbinic law, a mystical doctrine of putting God's world back together again, this strange and half-understood notion becomes a huge umbrella under which our petty moral concerns and political panaceas can come in out of the rain."[31]

But others, like Jonathan Sacks,[32] are more sanguine with the current usage of the term, and seize the opportunity to appreciate the possibility of human beings creating a better world order. And this is especially true of the many modern writers for whom *tikkun olam* has become a synonym for social action and repairing the world, and who lack an understanding of the term's historical background. Levi Cooper suggests that for these people, "it is most commonly heard as a catch cry for activism, political involvement, and social justice. As a banner, *tikkun olam* helps people rally around a value that sounds like it is drawing on traditional Jewish sources, while at the same time championing contemporary liberal values."[33]

No matter what the particular historical usage of the term may be, it has now become part of our modern lexicon. But when we moderns use the phrase, whose *olam* are we referring to? Are we talking about the world of rabbinic society, the universe under God's dominion as portrayed in the Aleinu, or about the inner self as defined by the mystical tradition? It seems to me that the real understanding of the definition of our modern-day term is best captured by a confluence of these three understandings.

Tikkun olam, in its modern parlance, is seen as a human activity. Whether the term is used by youth groups, synagogues, communal organizations, or even non-Jewish organizations, the imperative of *tikkun olam* is invoked in order to motivate human beings to repair society, to create a better social order, and to support the vulnerable—much as it was understood in rabbinic times. At the same time, it has also been universalized to refer to the entire world order. While most people are not familiar with Lurianic Kabbalah and might not feel comfortable with some of its tenets, many of those for whom tikkun olam is a live concept do appreciate some deeper theological or spiritual meaning, perhaps emanating from the mystical approach of the Lurianic kabbalists.[34] Doing social action in this world bears with it the theological imprint of the person doing the action, whether or not it has an effect upon the unification of God's self. And finally, the universal approach found in the second paragraph of Aleinu seems to have moved the concept of *tikkun olam* from a Jewish-centric societal and communal formula to one that is much more universal. In this day and age, it seems to be much more fashionable to think in terms of universal values rather than in particularistic Jewish ones. If we find a Jewish value that allows universal thinking and action, how much better would that be? *Tikkun olam* is just such a value.

In Jewish life there are sometimes conflicts between responsibilities to the Jewish community and to the non-Jewish world, and these conflicts exist in many different realms. Where, for example, should we donate our limited philanthropic dollars: to Jewish or non-Jewish causes? In working toward creating a better community and society, should we prioritize our efforts on behalf of Jewish or non-Jewish institutions? The question has been aptly put by Elliot J. Cosgrove: "Embedded deep within the foundation of Judaism exists a tension—an anxiety wrought by an unresolved question that has been with us since our very beginning. Is our faith, our Judaism, universal or particular in its orientation? To put it another way, is our greatest concern as Jews the condition of our collective and shared humanity, or are we meant to focus on the particulars of our own peoplehood?"

For some, this is a real conflict. It is the responsibility of Jews, they feel, to care for their own and not to be involved in society at large. For such people, isolation is not necessarily a negation of responsibilities toward humanity; rather, one's first responsibility is simply to one's own family. On the other hand, there are those who believe that since we are part of humanity at large, global issues should come even before our own particular ones—for as members of humanity we have a responsibility toward all. And there are still others who believe that there really is no conflict between the two concerns. For example, Yosef Green writes: "I am an incurable universalist precisely because of my Jewish particularity, which emphasizes the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."[36] His views are also those of Jonathan Sacks and a number of others, who see no real conflict between being a member of the Jewish people and a member of the family of humanity.[37]

We live today as members of both families: both our Jewish family and our greater human family. As it is currently understood, tikkun olam allows us to take a Jewish concept as it has evolved through the ages and use it to anchor our actions in ancient values as we strive to contribute in a Jewish fashion not merely to our immediate family, but to our larger family: the family of all humanity. "Repairing the world," doing *tikkun olam*, is simply assumed to be a part of what it means to be a responsible Jew today. Organizations such as The American Jewish World Service, Project TEN of the Jewish Agency for Israel, and others encourage Jews to focus on this value of their heritage, as they partake of social action activities in the world at large.[38]

If President Barack Obama can use the term *tikkun olam* in Hebrew and know that it is compatible with his own philosophy of attempting to create a better world order, then surely the term has now become totally universalized. On the one hand, this is good: as Jewish tradition teaches, it is our responsibility to create a better world order. On the other hand, to universalize so totally the concept

detracts from its specifically Jewish meaning, as understood by Jewish sources and sages throughout history. This is a representation of one of the major challenges of the modern Jewish world.

Gerald J. Blidstein suggests that "*tikkun olam* assumes that the acting party—whether it be an individual or a community—is one with the *olam*, or the society, whose benefit he seeks. At times, this society is the Jewish community itself; in other instances, it is the general community."[39] He continues: "Perhaps the point is that the Jew must answer to the human imperative both as an individual and as a community, that both aspects of this imperative are to be heard and answered."[40]

Today, as the American tourist understood it, *tikkun olam* has simply become part of the American Jewish vocabulary; and repairing the world is not confined to the Jewish community alone, but it has become a universal concept. The danger, though, is that if Jews let it remain that way, without being concerned with their own immediate family, then the term itself will have morphed into a concept far beyond its original rabbinic meaning. It seems to me that this is one of the challenges of both being a Jew and being a citizen of the world today—that is, being both particular and universal at the same time, being supportive of the Jewish community while still being an active citizen of the world.

The challenge today in understanding the concept of *tikkun olam* is to frame it within its Jewish context and at, the very same time, to use it appropriately to convey responsibility both to the Jewish world and the world at large—motivating us to act to create a better world order for the Jewish world and the non-Jewish world alike.

NOTES

[1] Byron L. Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement," in *Jewish Political Studies Review* 25:3–4 (Fall 2013), available online at http://jcpa.org/jewish-political-studies-review-home.

[2] See: Jodi Rudoren, "Shalom, Mr. President: Obama Tries to Charm Israelis With Hebrew," *New York Times* (March 23, 2013), at www.nytimes.com/2013/03/23/world/middleeast/obama-tries-to-charm-israelis-with-hebrew.html?_r=0; Avraham Infeld, "Obama's 'Tikkun Olam': Lost in Translation?" in *The Times of Israel* (March 10, 2012) at http://blogs.timesofisrael.com/obamas-tikkun-olam-lost-in-translation; Steven M. Bob, "The 'Tikkun Olam' President," in *The Jerusalem Post* (August, 11, 2013).

[3] Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).

[4] Explained more fully in M. Sheviit 10:3.

[5] Jill Jacobs, "The History of 'Tikkun Olam,'" in *Zeek* (June 2007), at www.zeek.net/706tohu.

[6] Gilbert S. Rosenthal, "*Tikkun Ha-Olam*: The Metamorphosis of a Concept," in The Journal of Religion 85:2 (April 2005), p. 217.

[7] In Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement."

[8] David S. Widzer, "The Use of *Mipnei Tikkun Ha'Olam* in the Babylonian Talmud," *CCAR Journal* 56 (Spring 2008), p. 38.

[9] Elliot N. Dorff, *The Way Into Tikkun Olam: Repairing the World* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2005), p. 7.

[10] Jane Kanarek, "What Does *Tikkun Olam* Actually Mean?" in *Righteous Indignation*, eds. Or. N. Rose, Jo Ellen Green Kaiser, and Margie Klein (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2008), p. 19.

[11] Eugene J. Lipman, "*Mipnei Tikkun Ha'Olam* in the Talmud: A Preliminary Exploration," in *The Life of Covenant: The Challenge of Contemporary Judaism—Essays in Honor of Herman E. Schaalman*, ed. Joseph Edelheit (Chicago: Spertus College of Judaica Press, 1986), p.108.

[12] Rashi on B. Shabbat 54b, s.v. *b'khol ha-olam kullo*.

[13] Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement."

[14] Siddur Sim Shalom, ed. Rabbi Jules Harlow (New York: The Rabbinical Assembly and United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, 1985), p. 161.

[15] *The Complete ArtScroll Siddur*, trans. Rabbi Nosson Scherman (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications Ltd., 1984), p. 161.

[16] *The Koren Siddur*, ed. Rabbi Sir Jonathan Sacks (Jerusalem: Koren Publishing, 2009), p. 180.

[17] *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, ed. Rabbi Dr. Joseph H. Hertz (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1961), p. 211.

[18] Levi Cooper, "*The Tikkun Olam* Catch-All," in *Jewish Educational Leadership* 11:1 (Winter 2013), p. 47.

[19] Jacobs, "The History of *Tikkun Olam*."

[20] Alyssa Gray, in *My People's Prayer Book: Traditional Prayers, Modern Commentaries*, vol. 6, *Tachanun and Concluding Prayers*, ed. Lawrence A. Hoffman (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2002), p. 142.
[21] Matt's dictionary of Zoharic vocabulary is not yet published; the definition cited here reflects his understanding of *tikkun olam* at Zohar I 38a.
[22] Jacobs, "The History of *Tikkun Olam*."
[23] Dorff, *The Way Into Tikkun Olam*, p. 10.
[24] Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement."
[25] Rosenthal, "*Tikkun Ha-Olam*: The Metamorphosis of a Concept," p. 226.
[26] Lawrence Fine, "*Tikkun*: A Lurianic Motif in Contemporary Jewish Thought," in *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism, Intellect in Quest of Understanding: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox*, eds. Jacob Neusner, Ernest S. Frerichs, and Nahum M. Sarna (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) ,vol. 4, p. 43.
[27] Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement."
[28] Rosenthal, "*Tikkun Ha-Olam*: The Metamorphosis of a Concept," p.228.
[29] Fine, "*Tikkun*: A Lurianic Motif," pp. 50–51.
[30] Sherwin, "*Tikkun Olam*: A Case of Semantic Displacement."
[31] Arnold Jacob Wolf, "Repairing *Tikkun Olam*," in *Judaism: A Quarterly of Jewish Life* 50:4 (2001), p. 482.
[32] Jonathan Sacks, *To Heal a Fractured World: The Ethics of Responsibility* (New York: Schocken Books, 2005), p. 265.
[33] Cooper, "The *Tikkun Olam* Catch-All," p. 49.
[34] Ibid., p. 50.
[35] See Cosgrove's sermon "Judaism—Universal or Particular?" (October 3, 2009), online at http://pasyn.org/resources/sermons/%5Bfield_dateline-date%5D-6.
[36] Yosef Green, "Universalism and/or Particularism," in *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 30:1 (2002), pp. 3–10.
[37] Sacks expresses himself in this regard particularly eloquently in his book *To Heal a Fractured World* (see note 32 above).
[38] For more about the American Jewish World Service, see www.ajws.org; for more about Project Ten, see www.tenprogram.org.
[39] Gerald J. Blidstein, "*Tikkun Olam*," in *Tikkun Olam : Social Responsibility in Jewish Thought and Law*, eds. David Schatz, Chaim I. Waxman, and Nathan J. Diament (The Orthodox Forum Series; Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1997), p. 18.
[40] Ibid., p. 20.