While Wingfield emphasizes the role of race in outsourcing and equity work, her analysis is intentionally intercategorical and intersectional. She examines differences in conditions of work rooted in multiple and interdependent dimensions of race, gender, and occupation. Her findings reveal that black doctors deny experiencing racism in interactions with white colleagues or patients. Likewise, black women doctors escape overt racism at work; however, they commonly report instances of sexism from supervisors, coworkers, and patients. At the lower end of the occupational ladder, black nurses and technicians report frequent racist incidents from coworkers and patients, the emotional toll of which is compounded by employers' expectations that they engage in racial outsourcing and equity work. What is revealed in these nuanced comparisons is similar to that described by Everett Hughes ("Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status," *American Journal of Sociology* 50 [1945]: 353–59), namely that being black functions as a "master status" that may "overpower, in most crucial situations, any other characteristic that may run counter to it" (Hughes, p. 357). However, a black man with a professional occupation such as a medical doctor may avoid racial discrimination in the workplace where his status is known. Other black workers with less prestigious occupations are not so lucky. Yet, and regardless of occupation, Wingfield convincingly demonstrates that all black health care workers participate in racial outsourcing and equity work in one form or another.

It would be remiss to close without mentioning a stylistic decision that is particularly puzzling: the frequent use of inexact terminology to describe incidents of antiblack racism. These include "racial encounters," "racial issues," "racial interactions," "racial challenges," and "racial experiences." Given the mainstreaming of critical race theory in the last two decades, and a growing public awareness of systemic racism and white supremacy in the United States, the use of "racial" over the more precise "racism" or "racist" was difficult to digest. That stylistic issue aside, in *Flatlining*, Wingfield offers an engaging, insightful, and compelling portrait of the health care industry as a racialized (and gendered) organization that institutionalizes racial inequality through racial outsourcing and racial equity work.

Degrees of Separation: Identity Formation While Leaving Ultra-Orthodox Judaism. By Schneur Zalman Newfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2020. Pp. xiii+210. $99.50 (cloth); $34.95 (paper).

Michal Kravel-Tovi
Tel Aviv University

In essence, Jewish ultra-Orthodoxy constitutes a conservative backlash to Jewish modernity and secularity. Bolstering separated, insular, and totalizing modes of living, Jewish ultra-Orthodox groups enact clear-cut schemes of "within" and "without" across a wide variety of communal settings and moralities. Schneur Zalman Newfield's new book *Degrees of Separation: Identity Formation While Leaving Ultra-Orthodox Judaism* offers a fresh perspective

on these schemes by looking at contemporary Jewish ultra-Orthodox life inside-out, quite literally: by following those who have chosen to exit Hasidic communities. The underlying rationale of the book is the premise that exiting a totalizing community is not analogous to exiting more moderate and less insular communities and thus deserves attention in its own right.

Newfield draws from 74 open interviews with exiters, delving into their ordinary habits of action and thoughts, mundane strategies of managing liminality, and continuing relations with their families. In so doing, he shies away from asking why exiters exit, instead focusing on the exit narrative as a discursive site in and through which exit is given shape. The book takes readers on a generally convincing journey into how exiters become something new while never fully separating from the people they used to be. Newfield's working definition of exiters proves itself once and again a suggestive framework for illuminating the ongoing, never-ending, and often taxing process through which those who leave their Hasidic communities remake themselves. This is precisely the key argument of the book.

The term "exiters" serves Newfield effectively as a means of capturing the enduring, fundamental liminality and in-betweenness that, as he argues, give shape to their leaving the ultra-Orthodox community. Newfield does not fall into the trap of romanticizing and heroicizing exiters for their bravery; nor does he succumb to the temptation of psychologizing their vulnerabilities. More interestingly, he makes a case for their being pushed and pulled between past and present, ultimately illustrating how these poles are largely inseparable in the lives of those who cannot really or fully assume an ex-Hasid identity. The past haunts exiters, exerting its grip over how they relate to God, the Rebbe, food, music, non-Jews, and their own body, but it also offers them a point of departure for exercising what they perceive as empowering chutzpah.

While Newfield embeds his argument on continuity in relevant studies on exiting and narrative and identity making, he might have benefited from building on the resonating discussion on the dynamics of continuity and change in the sociological and anthropological literature on religious conversion (see, e.g., Liana Chua, "Conversion, Continuity, and Moral Dilemma among Christian Bidayuhs in Malaysian Borneo," *American Ethnologist* 39 [2012]: 511–26; Matthew Engelke, "Discontinuity and the Discourse of Conversion," *Journal of Religion in Africa* 34 [2004]: 82–109; Joel Robbins, "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture: Belief, Time, and the Anthropology of Christianity," *Current Anthropology* 48 [2007]: 5–38). Likewise, the tenuous or questioned ability of converts to develop new bodily inclinations and undo previous habitus (e.g., Michal Kravel-Tovi, "As If It Was Ours All Along: Precarious Belonging, Jewish Habitus and the Materialisation of conversion in Israel," *Ethnos* 83 [2018]: 949–67) exemplifies the relevance of conversion studies to the study of exiting.

The protagonists of the book hail—and exit—from two Hasidic groups that are highly prominent in the American Jewish landscape: the Lubavitch and the Satmar. The juxtaposition of exiters from these two groups plays out well, never reduced to a simplified, schematic comparison and never

foregrounded as an exclusive narrative axis. Instead, it allows Newfield to enrich the story about exiting, and to flesh out—as well as, counterintuitively, to collapse—the ostensibly stark difference between the two Hasidic groups. Newfield accompanies these exiters as an emphatic native sociologist, one who knows firsthand what exiting entails. His introductory discussion of his research positioning is well placed, but readers don't get to learn much about, or from, Newfield's own position as an exiter. To be clear: what is lacking in this context is not a confessional exposure of Newfield's habits of thought and action or his own enduring liminality but rather a productive reflexivity that prompts further questions and brings nuance into how exit narratives are formative to exiting itself.

The title of the book is layered, richer than it seems at first glance. It not only calls attention to the limited separation of exiters from the community they once called home; it also underscores how the community itself distances itself from the exiter—separating and defending the collective sacred story it tells itself about itself against the grain of those who left the fold. Newfield illustrates the ways in which communal narratives of exiting reinforce shaming, gossip, pathologization, and the stigmatization of exiters and how these stories ascribe responsibility for the exiters' leave-taking on emotionalized instability and social dysfunctionality. These mechanisms work to preserve a utopic and stainless Jewish ultra-Orthodoxy. Exiters' families also exercise flexible degrees of separation, maneuvering between not wanting to know about the exiters' new lives and selves and allowing some family ties with them.

Degrees of Separation is a welcome addition to a nascent body of literature looking into Jewish ultra-Orthodox life from the vantage point of its restless, unruly, and permeable social margins (see also Lyn Davidman, *Becoming Unorthodox* [Rutgers University Press, 2014]; Ayala Fader, *Hidden Heretics: Jewish Doubt in the Digital Age* [Princeton University Press, 2020]). Similarly to how scholars of the state reconsider its workings by looking at it from its margins (Veena Das and Deborah Poole, *Anthropology in the Margins of the State* [School of American Research Press, 2004]), studying Jewish ultra-Orthodoxy by exploring the peoples and issues inhabiting its margins has much to teach us about these totalizing regimes of life and their discontents.