

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.



THESIS

A COMPARISON OF

THE "TANYA" by RABBI SHNEOR ZALMAN of LADI

and

THE " NEFESH HACHAYIM" by RABBI CHAYIM of VOLOZHIN

SUBMITTED

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Hebrew Literature and Rabbi

то

Dr. Henry Slonimsky, Dean Department of Philosophy Institute of Religion

By: Z.H.Gutstein

TABLE OF CONTRNTS

- I. For eword
- II. Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi
- III. Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin
- IV. The Contents of the "Tanya"
- V. The Contents of the "Nefesh Hachayim"
- VI. The "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim" in a Comparative Analysis
 - A. Introduction-General Comparison
 - B. Fundamental Principals
 - C. The Concept of God
 - D. The Concept of Creation
 - E. The Concept of Man and the place of Israel in the world
 - F. Additional Concepts
 - 1. Frayer and Worship
 - 2. Torah and its study
 - G. Remarks and Evaluations

VII. Bibliography

FOREWORD

The conflict between the instinctive yearning of the heart and the ritualistic formalism of divine worship, striving for a simple and direct communion with God, was a constant and continual source of strife in the matter of religious practice in Judaism. In this conflict, religious formalism achieved a temporary victory during the latter part of the seventeenth century and in the early part of the eighteenth century, not because it was a better approach to God, but because of the precarious situation of Jewry during those trying times. Expulsions, massacres, unsuccessful attempts at the restoration of Palestine during the previous centuries, the machinations of the pseudo-Messiahs, and various revolts and the partitions of countries helped legalistic ritualism gain an upper hand. Economic life of Jewry, in general, was at a low ebb, especially so in Poland; for the Chmelnikie and the Hadamiks uprisings brought about the gradual impoverishment of the Jews, which was not conducive to a healthy spiritual life, much less to fervent religious strivings. Legalism, ritual formalism and prescriptive sanctions, the special garb which Judaism assumed, were able to reach their peak at the end of

3

the seventeenth century because they helped curb the excessive aberration of the eccentricities of the followers of a Frank or Sabbattai Zevi. Besides this, it could lay claim to traditional sanction and was also able to assert its authority. At the same time, however, legalism and formalism congealed Judaism, bringing about a mental depression throughout East-European Jewry and a deadening effect on the spiritual life of the masses. There was a dearth of nourishment for the soul of the masses, who were ignorant and could not be aroused by, nor find comfort in, the subtle and intricate study of "pilpul" and casuistry. Many of the rabbinists took up Lurian mysticism and Kabbalah as a mental outlet for the spiritual yearning of the heart and soul.

In Podolia, and later in parts of Poland, Russia and the Ukraine, until it encompassed almost the entire east European Jewry, a great wave of reaction began in the form of a religious revivalist movement called Chassidism. This spiritual revolt was especially appealing to the poor and ignorant, where misery was at its worst. The reaction took such a turn that in its rise, it not only undermined the validity of ritualistic formalism and shook the frame and form of formal Judaism, but at times challenged the authority

of law and order and questioned the wisdom of the protector of law and order, the Rabbi. The movement, springing from the inner soul of the Jewish masses, never wholly assumed a sectarian bent nor held to a partisan bias but was universal and inclusive. Its opponents, however, treated it as a sect and persecuted it on that basis, thereby giving a tone and tempo to the movement which was not inherent in it nor, fundamentally, a part of it. The first proponents of Chassidism never had any intention of changing or even modifying any of the cardinal principals of Judaism nor did they wish to do away with any of the accepted forms of official Judaism. The reaction "Chassidism" glorified service rather than learning; method rather than doctrine. Its sympathy lay with every Jew and was aimed at every Jew in his relation, as an individual, to God. The grain and mettle of Chassidism was a humanization of the Jewish religion and its mood and vein was in the direction of finding a personal form of salvation.

Chassidism, as such a reaction and movement, had to supply a 'raison detre' for its existence. Although it was an old and basic feeling, yet as a philosophy of life it was a new phenomenon in Judaism and could not exist, unless it supplied its 'raison detre'. Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi in his great work, the "Tanya", supplied that definite need.

Official Judaism, at the time of the rise of Chassidism, had no accepted or universal doctrinaire. While its dogma was not necessarily uniform, it was universal and unquestioned. Official Judaism was the sum total of Talmudic Judaism plus all the tradition, as personified in the person of the Gaon of Vilna. With the coming of Chassidism and then the movement of the "Enlightenment" it was found necessary to reformulate and present anew the official doctrines of Rabbinic Judaism (as of itself) and its relationship to the new developments in Jewish life. This need was supplied by a disciple of the Gaon of Vilna, Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, in his remarkable work, the "Nefesh Hachayim". Chapter I: THE LIFE OF RABBI SHNEOR ZALMAN OF LADI

and

Chapter II: THE LIFE OF RABBI CHAYIM OF VOLOZHIN

In order to appreciate more fully a comparative study of the philosophies of the two men who excercised so profound an influence on the course of Jewish life, both past and present, as did Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi and Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, it would be well to consider briefly the story of their lives. By learning more of the background of the two leaders of opposing factions of Judaism, we will be enabled to judge more soundly the reasons for their divergence, in some cases, and their concurrence in numerous instances, in philosophical Jewish concepts, as revealed through their representative works, the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim".

RABBI SHNEOR ZALMAN OF LADI

Shneor Zelman, the son of Beruch, was born in 1748, in the small town of Lyozna. From early childhood, he studied much Talmud and commentaries until, at the age of thirteen, he was inscribed in the book of the (0.3) koah of the community as the: (10) koah (

Shortly after his Ber Mitzvah he married the daughter of a rich man of Vitabsk and moved to that city to continue his studies with great diligence. After he had considerable facility in all the rabbinic literature and seemed sufficiently prepared to go to the great city of Vilna, he suddenly became aware of a lack in his spiritual attainment and at the age of eighteen, he began to study Kabbalah. Eventually this path led him to the center of Chassidism, the city of Meseritch, especially since at this time Shneor Zelman made the acquaintance of Rabbi Mendel Vitebsker, one of the Great Maggid's finest disciples. It is also possible that Shneor Zalman was influenced by another contemporary, Rabbi Israel Polotzker. In any case, in 1768, Shneor Zelman left his wife and the house of his father-in-lew and went to Meseritch.

The Maggid, Rabbi Dov Ber, immediately perceived that his new pupil would achieve greatness. Shneor ZAlman combined keenness of perception and a profundity in the hidden precepts of the Torah, both in intellect and religious ecstacy.

In a comparatively short time, Shneor Zalman grasped the principle of the Besht and the ideology and outlook of the Maggid and soon reworked and reorganized Chassidism to his own satisfaction. To counteract the jealousies with which the Galician students annoyed this brilliant young Lithuanian, the great Maggid showed Shneor Zalman especial favor and friendliness and granted him the great honor of tutoring his son Abraham, who was later known as the AleN. 3

When the Maggid decided to edit a new "Shulchan Aruch" that would include all the laws, and the reasons and origins for each, he chose his brilliant student, Shneor Zalman for the important work. The young man entered upon this work with great enthusiasm and, in 1771 at the age of 25, he completed the first few chapters. After the death of the Maggid, Rabbi Mendel Vitebsk became the recognized head of Chassidism and Shneor Zalman was his good friend and most loyal supporter. After the death of Rabbi Mendel Vitebsk in Palestine in 1788, Shneor Zalman was recognized as the leading figure of Chassidism. From every land the Chassidim used to flock to Lyozna to seek advice from Rabbi Shneor Zalman and harry him with their individual problems and difficulties.

The tremendous influence of Shneor Zalman in Chassidic circles made him the target for the barbs of the mithnagdim. These opponents of Chassidism went to great lengths to discredit the new movement, by issuing new, and endorsing old excommunications and casting aspersions on the tenacity and faith of the Chassidic leaders. However, all the furor stirred up by the mithnagdim failed to have any detrimental effect upon the students of the Lithuanian "Rav", Shneor Zalman. No one was able to cast the slightest doubt upon the fundamental verscity and honesty of faith of the students of their teacher. Shneor Jalman, himself, interpreted the "Shulchan Aruch" strictly and was severe in respect to the precepts of the "Torsh" and the laws of morality. He strove for a merger between Chassidism and Rebbinism Mand in his conduct he was far removed from the manners of his precursing or contemporary extreme Chassidi m. Despite this, neither Shneor Zalman, nor his adherents were able to escape the vituperations of the mithnagdim; in fact they were included by those opposing Chassidism in all the laws and decrees of condemnations issued by the Rabbinists.

In later years, during the period between 1788 and 1795, the heat of the quarrel between the Chassidim and Mithnagdim was subdued and controlled to a great extent. In individual cases in various communities the strife was still quite apparent and likely to flare up under the slightest stimulus. Families were oftentimes divided and fathers were set against their own sons, because the younger generation had "fallen into the snare of Chassidism" and were wont to travel to Lyozna to hear the "Rav" expound the Torah. The novelty of the Chassidic movement and the effort to breathe a living spirit to the dried bones that was Rabbinism, attracted to Rabbi Shneor Zalman all the masses, who sought greater spiritual satisfaction.

Rabbi Shneor Zalman preached and taught the multitudes, who flocked to his side, and at the same time continued his work on his "Shulchan Aruch".

In 1797 his greatest work, the "Tanya" was finally printed in its completed form. The "Tanya" organized the principles of Chassidism and took them out of the realm of the simless and timid "groping in the dark" of the older Chassidic leaders. The "Tanya", in which the case for Chassidism is set forth strongly, served mainly as the handbook of spiritual faith for Shneor Zalman's

? Ah Chassidim. Throughout the first part of the "Tanya", the author repeats his fundamental thought, that every Jew must regulate all his actions by the three intellectual aspects of his divine soul: ANDH, ALA and A. This idea is so oft-repeated that the first letters ? Ah became the designation of that new system.

First the center of Chassidism was transferred from the

man of the masses to the super-man, from the "Chassid" to the "Zaddik", until the Zaddik remained the only active force in the upper worlds, while the Chassid remained the passive recipient, who lived only for his faith and his devotion to his representative in the heavenly realms. (This was considered the cardinal transgression of the Chassidim, and it was primarily for that, that the Mithnagdim censured them). In this manner, the yoke of Chassidism was removed from the masses, whose time was taken up by wordly worries, and was placed upon the Zaddik, who thus became the intermediary in the higher spheres.

There is no doubt that to a certain extent, Rabbi Shneor Zalman leaned towards Rabbinism (perhaps with a conciliatory motive), in order to forstall the arguments of the Mithnagdim, i.e. that the Chassidim were guilty of $\Im \Im \Im \Im$, that they were accustomed to make light of $\Im \Im \Im$, and that they corrupted the accepted laws and customs.

Among the works of Shneor Zalman were: the Shulchan Aruch, the "Tanya" and MLA with and many letters to his Chassidim

He died in January 1813 and was buried in the Jewish cemetery of the city of Hadiatch.

RABBI CHAYIM OF VOLOZHIN

Chayim of Volozhin, (1749-1821) a student of the Talmud and founder of the Yeshiva "Etz Chayim" in Volozhin, was born on June 10, 1749 to Rabbi Isaac, one of the leading citizens of Volozhin. On his maternal side, Rabbi Chayim was a descendant of Rabbi Meir ben Gedalya of Lublin and of Rabbi Yom-Tov Lippman Heller, author of the commentary on the Mischna, "Tossefot Yom-Tov".

Cheyim studied under Rabbi Raphael Cohen in Minsk from the age of 12 to 15. Thereafter, in the company of his older brother, Simcha, he studied under Rabbi Arye loeb in Volozhin, afterwards cheif Rabbi of Metz and author of the Response "Shaagat Arye" This publication, opposing the growth of pilpul, laid the groundwork of the logical educational methods of Chayim. Rabbi Israel, of Sokołow, proves in his introduction to his work "Taklin Chadetin", that Cheyim had thoroughly mastered the entire Talmudic literature.

The greatest influence upon Chayim was excercised by the Gaon, Rabbi Eliyahu of Vilna whom he visited yearly for twenty years in order to lay before the Gaon every dilemma or difficulty which he (Chayim) encountered in the course of his studies. Chayim undoubtedly considered the Gaon, Rabbi Eliyahu, the greatest authority in all questions of the Law and, therefore, far and away, the epitome of of religious and secular perfection, of holiness and purity.

In January 1773, upon the recommendation of his teacher Raphael Cohen, Chayim became Rabbi of Volozhin. In 1780 he was called Vilkomir. He remained there only one year and returned to Volozhin which he never left thereafter. His work penetrated into an ever widening circle and from everywhere all manners of queries on religious subjects came to him. He was especially esteemed as the leading authority in matters pertaining to the "Agunot" problem for whose benefit & he extended himself extraordinarily \mathcal{A} Rabbi Chayim was also, in general, very capable in social pursuits and organizational charity. He himself, according to the evidence of a trusted disciple, distributed one-fifth of his income among the needy. Rabbi Chayim was extraordinarily genteel and modest 5 He never signed his religious recommendations and letters as "Rabbi and Dean of Volozhin" but as "He, who was born in Volozhin" or as 'He who, with God's help, studies in Volozhin". In one case, where Rabbi Israel of Sokolow, in his book "Taklin Chadetin", had erroneously attributed some halachic conclusions of Rabbi Akiba Eger to Rabbi Chayim, the latter went to great length to clear up the misunderstanding. Rabbi Chayim's love of peace knew no bounds. He personally settled all quarrels in his community as well as the debetable halachic questions of his contemporaries 🖉 Rabbi Chayim also organized the collections of Palestine aid and

In 1816 he took part in a collection to improve the condition of the first Jewish colonists.

As a devoted disciple of the Gaon of Vilna and desirous of perpetuating the method of his master, Rabbi Chayim organized the Yeshiva "Etz Chayim" of Volcahin. Although the prime purpose was to establish a seat of learning, the Yeshiva was also expected to serve as a source of combatting the tendencies of the Beshtian Chassidim of his time who prayed and invoked toward God but engaged little, if at all, in the study of Torah. D Breaking away from the established order. Rabbi Chayim introduced three rather interesting innovations in the administration of his Yeshiva. Before Rabbi Chayim's days and even during his own student days. there had existed many evils in the system of Torah study in the Yeshivahs, many of which he was able to eliminate by his refors. Because the Yeshivahs were generally housed in the Beth Midrash, there had arisen a spirit of الراط adue to the continual interruption of study and the type of wastrels who tended to gether and fritter away their time in the the providing a special building, to be used solely and exclusively for the purpose of the Yeshivah, Rabbi Chayim made great strides towards the elimination of this fundamental evil.

The great teacher of Volozhin also eliminated the haphazard manner of subsistence of the Yeshivah student of that day. No longer did the students have to "eat days" at the tables of the townsfolk of the city. At great personal sacrifice, Rabbi Chayim instituted the stipend system and removed the evils arising from the necessity of seeking the good will of the "Baale Ba¢ttim" of the town.

To gain admission to the Yeshivah of Volozhin a mere declaration of intention to study was not enough as had been the case in previous times. A rigorous personal examination in all subjects preliminary to the advanced Torah study of the Yeshivah was given to all applicants for admission to the house of learning of Volozhin.

In the method of teaching, Rabbi Chayim goes back, primarily, to that of the Gaon, Rabbi Eliyahu. Like the latter, Rabbi Chayim laid the greatest stress upon the restoration of the original textual reading in the oftcorrupted text of the Talmud, Tosefta and the halachic midrashim. In this work he took no account of the authority of earlier expositors where improper sources had been followed. In general, also, he revealed, without timidity, incidental errors of earlier students and declared himself against the well meant efforts but similar small oversights which even many teachers of law of the Talmudic period could not combat through casuistic interpretations. His own errors he admitted freely; he thanked one correspondent who had called his attention to such an oversight. Rabbi Chayin was also a renowned scholar of the Kabbalah. In this study he was especially influenced by the Lurian philosophy which he interpreted quite differently than his teacher, Eliyahu. Whereas the Gaon, for example, accepted the lurian concept of "Zimzum" in its literal aspect, Rabbi Chayim considered it in a different manner.

Rabbi Chayim stepped forth spainst Chassidism. He admitted the fundamental concept of Chassidism about God and Creation and he himself said, in the "Nefesh Hachayim": ()

ביוני שיוק כל התקותות לתוכנטים אוט התציאות גיין התקותות מקומות יצמיה -ייי לתציות נחליב

"All things of space which we perceive through our senses are not absolutely existent but are only existent as they appear."

Yet he set himself against the excessive emphasis and popularization of the current trend of thought which, he felt, might lead to the shattering of the religious fundamentals among the unthinking masses.

The Yeshivah "Etz Chayim" was started by Rabbi Chayim with a few students whom Rabbi Chayim supported with h his own money. The institution rapidly grew until the limited funds of Rabbi Cheyim were insufficient to support all the students and Pabbi Chayim was forced to send out Meshulachim to collect funds for the Yeshivah. Although the Yeshivah had started with many innovations and departures from the accepted methods in administration and method of study, it was finally closed in 1892 because it had become ultra conservative and did not tolerate innovation or esoteric study. During its lifetime, the Yeshivah attracted to its doors many fine students and produced some leading thinkers, most prominent of whom were Yakob Karlin subsequently the authors of $\lambda \gamma \gamma \delta N$ and Joseph Zundel of Salant.

Before he died, on the 14th day of Siven in 1821, Rebbi Chayim included in his will the provision that the "Nefesh Hachayim", which he considered his most important work, be published. Besides the ρ "ha tajhe also wrote the response that the commentary on $\beta a c$.

NOTES

to

Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi

(7)	Madda - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -		•		
(1)	Teitlebaum; M	HARAV M'LADI	p. 3. note 1		
	aly in	Gulde and legin Ga	PIDDA 0"?		
	also may be		S DIC'IRI		
	גין צרם הרוק	ice a conters all cold	A MOS MESE		
(2)	Heilman; C.M.	HARAV M'LADI המונסג תנט ובזין הח ההרה האוכזג אוה הרוק BETH RABBI	p.2, chap. note 3		
			1		
(3)	Horodetsky; Dr.S	LEADERS OF CHASSIDISM	pp. 50-55		
			•		
(4)	Minkin; J.S.	THE ROMANCE OF	p. 201		
		CHASSIDISM			
	Rabbi Shneo	or Zalman embarked u	ipon a campaign		
	of peace and good will, counselling moderation				
	even forgiveness of their enemies, assuring them, at the same time, that the Gaon bore no				
	part in the treachery committed in his name.				
	-				
(5)		ent so far as to mak			
	to the Russian government about the Chassidim.				
	Twice Rabbi Shnec	r Zalman was incard	cerated because		
		f the mithnagdim.			
of			** • •		
-	TT- 2 3 0 35	Both Bobhi	n 51		

Heilman; C.M. Beth Rabbi p. 54 cf. Teitlebaum 71 vol. 1

- -

- (6) Introduction to the "Tanya"
- (7) Dubnow; S.M. TOLDOTH HACHASSIDUTH p.
- (8) Introduction fo the "Tanya"

(9) Fin; S.I. Knesseth Yisroel p.

NOTES

to

Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin

(1)	Shapiro; M.S.	TOLDOTH R. CHAYIM M'VOLOZHIN	chap, 1
(2)	Introduction to the	e Nefesh Hachayim	p. 5, note 1
(3)	Ibid		p.6
(4)	Finn; S.J. Chones; S.M.	KNESSETH YISROEL TOLDOTH HAPOSKIM	p. 157 p. 452
(5)	Katzenellenson;Sh Introduction to the	NE FESH HA CHA YIM	p. 3 p.8
(6)	Abbi; A.	Ibid (note 5a)	p. 3
(7)		of Nefesh Hacha yi m Finn; S.J.	chap. 4 p. 158
(8)	Shapiro; M.S.	TOLDOTH R. CHAYIM M'VOLOZHIN (IV No 6 N.Y. Oct 1929	p. 19
(9)	Nefesh Hachayim	Shaar (2) fool d	
(10)	Shapiro; M.S.	TOLDOTH R. CHAYIM M'VOLOZHIN	chap. 10
	Nefesh Hachayim	Shaar	chap, 1
(11)	Introduction to the	e Nefesh Hachayim	chap. 1

Chapter IV: THE CONTENTS OF THE "TANYA" Chapter V: THE CONTENTS OF THE "NEFESH HACHAYIM"

Both the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim", as apologetics for two divergent views in Judaism, are very interesting studies, even per se. Each becomes more interesting when they are compared and found to have much in common, despite the fact that the "Nefesh Hachayim" may have been written as an answer to the "Tanya".

Defore, therefore, proceeding from a nerration of the lives of the two authors, to a more detailed and involved comparison of the various concepts of the philosophies of the two men, as promulgated in these two representative writings, it would be well to obtain a picture of the general construction and philosophic trend of each work individually.

THE CONTENTS OF THE TANYA

The "Tanya" so called because of the first word of the book, is divided into two sections. The first part is called $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$ and the second is called $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$. Two sections are added to the above; the first $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$. Two sections are added to the above; the first $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$. and the second the $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$. These two supplementary parts, published later and added to the "Tanya" posthumously, are extensions of the philosophy contained in the first part. The $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$ is sometimes called $\sqrt{\eta}/\eta$.

The entire first section of the "Tanya" is dedicated to the study of ethics and human psychology and its purpose is to teach man the way of the Lord and to recognize the spark of the divine in man and in nature. It was written for the Chassidim in answer to many querfies concerning the individual's conduct in the religion and ethics of Judaism.

The first part of the Tayna is the longer and more elaborate of the two, comprising fifty-the chapters. The intent of the author, apparently, is instruction and edification. It gives us a simple explanation of Chassidism, comprehensible to an ordinary person. The author divides mankind into five categories; two types of righteous men, two types of wicked men and an intermediate type. Every man has two opposing inclinations, which are imbedded in his soul. The writer frequently repeats his thoughts and ideas for the sake of clarity and for better understanding. There are many chapters, where the thought is incomplete and not entirely clear. At times the author seeming forgets the previous chapter and without any transition begins an entirely new subject.

The Differ and Source that the Right of and also more lucid and in better style. It is much shorter, containing only twelve chapters and dealing with the same subject on a higher philosophic plane.

The psychology and ethics of the "Tanya" promulgate a mode of life and way of thought for the \Im \neg hChassidim. This work upholds that the root of all intention is present in the soul of man and is derived from two sources. The $\Im \neg \Im / \Im$ (evil intention) is related to and based upon the beastly soul \Im and the $\Im / \Im \neg \Im$ (the noble intention) is derived from the heavenly soul. (4)

The two spiritual aspects of man's soul have diametrically opposite origins. One comes from the "Klippo" or other (unholy) side, and clothes itself in the blood of man, enlivening the body and deriving all its evil attributes from four sources: negative precepts. Love is the source of all the 248 positive precepts and he, who performs them, loves God and desires to cleave to Him. And "Fear of the Lord" is the root of the negative principles, for he, who fears heaven, is afraid to rebel against God.

The evil side of the soul is derived from the Klippoth. It is worthwhile to note that the "Tanya" admits that good may be present even in the beastly soul which is the nest of the Klippoth; that is to say, the power that emanates from the corporeal or material side of life and not the divine. The author differentiates between pure and impure Klippoth. The pure Klippoth are those nourished by the source of bodily necessities in which there is no absolute evil and are capable of higher things if directed by the intellect and Torah study.

The overpowering of the emotion by the mind (the dominance of the brain over the heart) is the desired goal in the struggle between the divine and the beastly soul. The seat of the beastly soul is the heart, of the divine soul, the brain. These two souls are continually struggling in their yearning to rule over the body and its limbs. When man vitalizes the divine soul and fights the beastly soul until he banishes or wipes out the bad in it, he is called'righteous' for the bad in it, he is when his victory is not complete he is designated as 'intermediate' When the material isvictorious over the spiritual soul, he is called 'wicked' $\gamma\ell\gamma$.

The rule of the mind through the three enumerated attributes 37% is the aim of the righteous man, 713. This "mind" is not the rationalism of the Rambam type, whach tests the essentials of the faith, but is the rationalism of every mystic, whose faith necessitates the employment of the supreme intention als in the performance of every precept of the Torah. () The concept of Torah assumes, here, that high place which had previously been lost. Learning of the Torah becomes equal in value to all the precepts combined, for all mitzvoth are mere clothing....but the Torah is the true food and also the clothing of the soul's Even in the halachos of the Talmud the will of minds (4) God reveals itself. All laws are inner emanations from the divine will, for they are all part of the divine will In this respect it is said, "The Torah and the of God. Holy One are one" (b) The law unites man with his God. And in this way is it possible to interpret the Talmudic adage: "Since the destruction of the holy temple, God has nothing in this world except the four ells of the Halacha" The Author comes to a conclusion which is foreign to Chassidism, namely, that it is greater to indulge in the study of the Torah than to perform all the mitzvoth, even greater than prayer, which is the unifying force of all the upper worlds.

Through the study of Torah one may attain the high pedestal of λ_{1} and λ_{2} λ_{1} , awe and compassion, of the divine. Love for the Creator, λ_{2} λ_{3} , and fear of Gody which comes from the recognition of His will, as it appears in the Torah, is much better and far worthier than the love and fear, which flow from the natural emotions. The system thus established is a trend in Chassidic philosophy in which reasoning is the fundamental basis of faith.

Every created and existing object may be considered as non-existent in actuality in regard to the power of the God, who made it come into being. The reason for the appearance of reality of a created object is that we are incapable of conceiving and seeing with our human eyes the strength of God and the power of His words in creation. However, if the eye were able to see and to conceive the life and spirituality, which is in every created object as it emanated therefrom because of the words which came from the mouth of God, we would see, not merely the material corporeality in the object created but the essence which made it come into being as well.

Human creation differs from Divine creation in that, whereas mortal creation is merely a change of form (creating one object from another pre-existing thing), Divine creation is 'creatio ex nihilo'.

THE CONTENTS OF THE NEFESH HACHAYIM

The "Nefesh Hachayim" is a work of a rabbinic and Kabbalistic character with an apparent and definite tendency which is antagonistic toward Chassidism. Its purpose is to teach its reader the ways of God which are acceptable to traditional Judaism. It was probably aimed at and directed against Chassidism because they put too much emphasis upon prayer, ecstatic fervor and placed devotional yearning toward God on a higher plane or as a substitute for the study of the Torah and the performance of the daily precepts,

The "Nefesh Hachayim" is made up of four parts called pircl. The third part has an appendix and all four gates are intersporsed throughout with glosses explaining the mystical phrases or esoteric words used therein.

In the first chapter the author, using many of the terms of the Zohar and the writings of the Ari and other Kabbalistic writings, explaining them according to the accepted rabbinic view, tells us of man's value. Man, being the epitome and the crown of creation and its beauty, may be considered the $\int_{a} \int_{a} \int_{a}$ world above and below by the emanation of light and splendour of that divine power. Man, alone, is the architect and the builder of the worlds through his good deeds and may be likened to a builder and designer of a house. If, however, man walks in the path of evil or harbors evil thoughts - as when he speaks evilly against the Torah or thinks disparagingly about Jewish tradition - then and thereby, he destroys the world which, by his good deeds and thoughts, he had erected. By his acts man can darken those brilliant lights and by his deeds he can weaken the power of good, dimming the holy lights and the sanctity of the Torah to such an extant that he adds strength and valour to the forces of darkness.(2)

From there Rabbi Chayim passes on to attack the Chassid-In his humility and because of his love for people and im. truth, the author does not mention them by name. He speaks against those people who have "begun, in our days, to widen the evil path and to substitute devotional piety and mystic ecstacy for learning of Torah" ³He extends little sympathy to those people who claim that study of Torah, which is not accompanied by purity of thought and clarity of vision and intellect, is of no value. Any study of law, according to Rabbi Chayim, is better than mere devotion and prayer. After all, not many people can attain that stage of wisedom to know all the secrets of our Torah. The Torah is a tradition for the entire household of Israel. Happy is the man who comes into direct contact with the hidden secrets

and wisdom of our divine Torsh. (5) The author shows by definite proof that every precept has, incorporated in itself, the hidden secrets of the divine wisdom. Therefore, he argues, the mere fulfillment of a precept, even without complete understanding of the exact meaning or spiritual significance of the act, as mere study without depth of understanding, brins one nearer to the inner temple of Judzism. Man, by mere acts, acquires happiness and the innermost perfection of ecstacy. This does not mean that man should not try to enter into the inner depth of study and law and endeavor to learn the secrets of its purpose. Mere study, slthough not satisfactorily sufficient in itself, is not the performance of the choicest of precepts, Thaland In ald but man cannot be called a sinner for such an act.

Part of the second and the third gate deal with the performance of a \Im which involves material pleasure in addition to ecstacy and joy. It is inherently good even if it is done for mere enjoyment or the satisfaction of desire as eating or drinking. In some respects it is even better than too much \Im which accompanies other precepts (\varkappa) especially if, because of \Im , the mitzvoh is neglected. The basis of all mitzvoth is the performance not the ecstatic ferver involved in their consummation. The duty of performance devolves upon all and that duty is of paramount importance. Acts were commanded, not ecstacy, and not all men are capable of ecstacy whereas everyone is capable of action.

In parts of the third gate and in all of the fourth, Rabbi Chayim considers the value of the study of the Torah and its appreciation. With his thorough analyses and his vast knowledge of Torah, the author delves into the many phrases, words and expressions of the Talmud and explains their beauty and their inherent poesy. He demonstrates, by all methods of logic and philosophic means at his command, using his thorough familiarity with the subject matter to best advantage, that the study of Torah is the background and backbone of Judaism. In his "Nefesh Hacheyim", the author makes out a very good case for the fundamental precepts of Babbinism.

NOTES

to

The Contents of the "Tanya"

(1)	Ruderman; P. TEITELBAUN VOLI	HASHACHAR *	*	vol.6, p. 96
(2)	"Tanya" - Likuta	y Emohrim		Vd丁 pqD chap. 1, p.10
(3)	Ibid		J	chap. 2, p.11,12 Chapt 7
(4)	Ibid		Y	chap.2, p. 12
(5)	Ibiđ			of thopta 6 chap. 2, p. 12
(6)	"Tanya"-Chapters Chapters			p. 16
(7)	TANYA chapter 7			entre
(8)	TANYA chapter 12			lative
(9)	Tanya	Chapter 5		p. 19
(10)				
(11)	Talmud - Bab. G JANYA chyster	SANHEDRIN		
אברבה אבדיא	רא מואזין נכמד דבור נ האצייו שא דברד	ך גגלג הדרי	UN. Pg.90 = P1 ESI	175-1611.6 *

אי רו צערואן שיציא - יאוך אב בקדור טורד נפראטוג בספרו היאוני דקלה בגניטו אלר טאחו כקף טוארו נדאדם האניך רא אוווואצין בספל נפל באנק

Pir

NOTES

to

The Contents of the "Nefesh Hachayim"

(1)	Nefesh Hachayim	Shaar	chap. 12
(2)	Ibid	Shaar chap. 19	p. 42
(3)	Ibid	Shaar chap. 1	p. 93
(4)	Ibid	Appendix to Shaar chap.4	p. 88
(5)	Ibid	Shaar chap.	p. 98

INTRODUCTION

General Comparative Analysis

Rabbinic Judaism (1), the connotation of Jewish life, thought, practices and experiences in the 18th century, as distinguished from Chassidism, laid its primary emphasis on the study of the Torah, ritual legalism and formalism. Because of this, Rabbinic Judaism, prior to the advent of the Besht and his doctrine, did not offer complete salvation to the yearning Jewish soul nor was it a full and complete way of life to all. It served as a method of approach to God only to some select few. The obvious reason for this appalling phenomenon in Jewish life was legalism in its religion and formalism in its religious practice. Legalism and formalism in religious custom and ceremony are not the suitable means for ecstatic fervor which religious life and duty demands. Casuistric pilpulism or hairbreadth juristic quibbles are not soothing religious experiences to all men, but abe, rather, only for the select few who are agile in the realm of mental gymnastics. The masses are differently constituted; they do not favor formalism; they do not enjoy legalism; they neither understand nor do they delight in casuistry. Legalism, pilpulism, casuistry and their like constituted Rabbinic Judaism.

Rabbinic Judaism, therefore, did not appeal to the masses as it did to the select few with the result that: "Rabbinic Judaism offered no sort of religious

comfort...Religious ceremonies had degenerated, both among the Talmudists and the unlearned, into meaningless usages, and prayer into mere lip service." (2)

Rabbinic Judaism deadened the emotional response to the higher ideals of Jewish ceremony and left and empty void in the life of the Jews in the 17th and early 18th centurmes. To bridge this gap was a feat which many a man in Jewish history attempted but few succeeded. Where others failed the Besht was eminently successful. With the coming of Rabbi Israël Baal Shem Tov and the development of Chassidism a new era in Jewish history began.

Chassidism, when it appeared in 1740, was not a new phenomenon in Jewish history although it marked the opening of amera. Recognisable signs of Beshtian Chassidism were visible in various Jewish movements even prior to the advent of Rabbi Israel Baal Shem Tov. The beginnings of Jewish mysticism can be traced back to Biblical times(3) The desire to commune with God lay dormant in the Jewish soul from time immemorial. That desire was deadened by the legalistic formalism of the Rabbinist, on the one hand, and was certainly not enhanced by the dry and unemotional syllogism of the philosopher on the other hand. The Jew

gave vent to this emotional desire and divine yearning in the Messianic movements as in the case of Sabbattai Zevi. Sometimes it manifested itself in a coarser form - the baccanalian orgies and frenzied debaucheries of the Frankist movement.(4) That inherent desire of man to know God, to commune with the Unknown, was always present among the Even the Rabbinists thought they expressed God, Jews. the Unknown, by a complicated casuistric explanation of an unimportant jot or tittle in the Bible. The ordinary man, however, sought in vain to express his inner feelings. The Besht enabled the common man to share with the learned and initiated the fruits of the genuine Spirit, to understand and love God, to attempt to comprehend what may be above him. The Baal Shem Tov translated the crude depths of the common feeling into the sublime thoughts of the He was able to express the mood of the masses in Supreme. deeds and acts and give meaning and purpose to the man of Where his predecessors failed he succeeded every day. because where other philosophies led to apostasy, his led along the path of traditional Judaism. The Besht penetrated places where the Kabbalah was unable to enter and he opened strange and vast vistas of divine knowledge to his followers wherein even his predecessors themselves had That mystic desire and that longing to failed to delve. penetrate the unknown was a permanent part of the Jewish inquisitive soul from times gone by. The Besht brought

that desire to fruition. He permitted the soul to give vent to the mood and he let the world hear the Jewish soul's longing(5).

The work, begun so well by the Besht, was organized and translated into a movement with a definite trend and outlook by Rabbi Dov Ber of Miedzyrzecze (Meseritch). The "Great Maggid", as he is popularly known, put the principles the Chassidic movement into practice and it was he who was instrumental in spreading the idea of the Chassidic "brotherhood" into many lands. The work of Rabbi Dov Ber paved the way for the next step in the evolution of the philosophy of Chassidism.

That which Rabbi Israel Baal Shem Tov accomplished in the practical Jewish world, Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi accomplished in the philospphic Jewish world. If we consider the Besht the builder of Chassidism, we must acknowledge Shneor Zalman as the philosppher of the movement. If the "Great Maggid" is the political strategist of historic Chassidism, then Shneor Zalman was the formulator of the ideology of Chassidism. If the movement finally succeeded in making peace with, and winning over (to a certain extent), Rabbinic Judaism to its side as will be seen in later discussions, it was not so much to the credit of the mind of its founder, the Besht, nor even because of the wisemanipulations of the "Great Maggid", but because of the work of the "Tanya". "The basic reason", says Baron, "for the partial victory of Chassidism was its speedy compromise with Rabbinism. Shneor Zalman successfully synthesized the teachings of the Besht with the established rabbinic tradition."(7) His work was not merely a synthesis of the various forces and elements in Judaism but a regeneration of Jewish thought in general.

It must be credited to the author of the "Tanya", Rabbi Shneor Zalman, that he was the father of scientific Chassidism. He endeavored to place Chassidism on a philosophical basis and laid down and established "as much as it is possible to formulate mystical concepts in philosophical language," the basic philosophy of Chassidism.(8) Dubnow calls the "Tanya" the (0, 0) (3) (0, 0) of Chassidism (9); The first philosophic attempt in a field of thought and a way of life, where philosophy was a malum prohibitum.

The "Tanya" has been recognized by historians of the Chassidic movement as the basic philosophy of Chassidism. Although its author was, primarily, the founder of the Lithuanian branch of the Chassidic movement, the \Im A Chassidim, and the publication may have been for their enlightenment only. Similarly it may be that the "Nefesh Hachayim" was not intended as a reply to the "Tanya" but simply as a formulation of the basic philosophy of Rabbinic Judaism. For just as Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi was the leading representative of the Chassidim in his day and spoke with authofity for its doctrine, so his younger contemporary, Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, was the leading representative of Rabbinic Judaism and spoke with authority for its ideology.

The philosophy of Chassidism can hardly be called a new philosophy of religion although it contains new trends and has some sectarian ideas and novel religious concepts. Its idea of God, Creation, the physical composition of the world, the divine government of the Universe, are all ideas and concepts copied, in a modified form, from the Kabbalah, and much of it was the general credo of the Jew prior to the advent of Chassidism as well .. However, the Kabbalah and the earlier ethical philosophies as they have come down to us in the Zohar and other Kabbalistic works Wwere not easily accesible to all, nor did they lend themselves to general use or to be adopted popularly. Chassidism borrowed from everyone and everywhere. Any concept which served a utilitarian purpose was taken up by the Chassidism and incorporated into its philosophy. All this. however, would have been of no avail were there no formulation of a basic philosophy. Rabbi Shneor Zalman has to be credited with a great task well done, as well as a set of principles well formulated. Levi Yitzchok of Berdichev, upon reading the "Tanya", exclaimed, "It is really a stroke of genius to be able to describe a most mighty and great God in such a small book." Rabbi

Shneor Zalman has done justice to his subject from his point of view and has presented us with a genuine apology for Chassidism.

Rabbi Shneor Zalman gives us a philosophic basis of the Chassidic movement in the Tanya. He advocates an intelligent, rather than a blind faithe, for the followers of the movement. Accordingly, each adherent has to undergo a definite mental preparation in order to be able to enter into the service of God. The Zaddik in the system is not the miracle man of other Chassidic sects, but the moral teacher and scholar. The aim of the movement, as personified in Shneor Zalman and as set down in the "Tanya", is to restore rabbinic study to its authority as a way to God. It was no presumption on the part of Shnepr Zalman to speak as an authority for a form of Judaism and for a justification of that form. The "Tanya" was an exposition of the tenets and concepts of Chassidism, as he saw it, and as such was a fair exposition of a true and faithful account of an approach to God. It was, therefore, in a defense of Judaism that Shneor Zalman wrote his "Tanya", for Judaism gives every man the privilege of expounding the truth as he sees it.

Shneor Zalman succeeded in systematizing and establishing a very remarkable method of approach, as well as a system of thought, for Chassidism. By his writings he aided in the formulation and creation of a new religious philosophy of Judaism; a kind of rational emotionalism. He adopted the entire system of Bestian Chassidism, its thesis, dogma and doctrine, and simply formulated it in proper religious form and put it into a philosophic garb. By permitting investigation and speculation in matters of faith and religion and demanding faith plus study as prerequisites for a pure and wholesome Chassidic way of life, he bridged the chasm between petrified Talmudic legalism in Judaism and Chassidic emotionalism.

"In Dov Ber of Meserich and in Shneor Zalman of Ladi," a famous historian correctly states, "Hassidism found leaders who successfully synthesized the teachings of the Besht dnd the established rabbinic tradithon." Up to the year 1796, when the "Tanya" was published, Chassidism was characterized as a dangerous enemy to Judaism as a wholeand was such in actuality, to a certain extent, to Official Judaism, what we connote as "Rabbinic Judaism", From among the tales, fables and parables of the Besht no one bothered to gather a philosophy. On the other hand, the acts of Chassidim and their rebellion against authority called forth antagonism as well as actual decrees and injunctions from the rabbis which hindered the progress of the movement and almost caused a schism in Judaism. With the promulgation of the doctrines of the "Tanya" and, subsequently, its publication, Chassidism became not only a "rebellion" to contend with but a definite Jewish outlook and ideology which had to be taken into account.

The high quality of the intellectual work of Rabbinic Judaism indeed did not need a protector or defender until its authority was questioned. But when it was questioned by such a worthy opponent as the "Tanya" Rabbinic Judaism soon found a need for a Champion of its doctrine to defend its ideology. Such a representative Rabbinic Judaism found in the person of Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, the author of the "Nefesh Hachayim". What the "Tanya" was to Chassidism and Chassidic Judaism, the"Nefesh Hachayim" became to Rabbinic Judaism. Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, a disciple of the Gaon of Wilno, the prototype of Rabbinic Jewry, was the proper person to take up the cudgels of the hurt cause of Rabbinism. This he did in his public 201

The "Nefesh Hachayim is an ethical and Kabbalistic work with an apparent anti-Chassidic tendency. Though the "Tanya" is never quoted by name in the puble of many references and illusions in this work suggest to the mind of the careful reader that the "Tanya" is the subject of reference. The "Nefesh Hachayim" lays great stress on the necessity of minute conformity to all recognized religious duties and practices, (13) for in some respects the puble of the study of the

Torah can not in any way be changed or minimized. Neither prayer nor pietistic devotion of any kind can take its place, according to Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin.(14) In this respect the aim and purpose of the Nefesh Hachayim is not very different from the Tanya. Thus, regarding the study of the Torah the "Tanya" and the" Nefesh Hachayim" concur.(15) This apparent concurrence and meeting on common ground of the two proponents of the opposing ideas in Judaism may have been not merely an accident but may have been due to the meeting of a common enemy which we may call "Berlinism".(16) Even prior to the rise of western enlighterment ("Berlinism"). Chassidism curbed its enthusiasm and Rabbinism modified its antagonism toward the Chassidim when it became better acquainted with its apponent's doctrines. Their common hatred of the new enlightenment brought about a peace in the camps, for both Rabbinism and Chassidism actively opposed the new "wisdom" which was a strange plant in the Jewish vineyard. (17)

Rabbinism dulled the Jewish mind with excessive pilpulism and scholasticism. Chassidism sharpened the emotional imagination of the Jews and cultivated a feeling of the sublime. Bothz, however, were unable to guard against the encroachment of the 'enlightenment' which was due to come despite the various obstacles in its way. The struggle between Chassidism and Rabbinism thus ended peacefully leaving only slight and insignificant differences of no consequences which gradually blended themselves into the vast fabreic of Jewish thought, giving life and vitality to the Jewish people to continue on its road to its destiny.

NOTES

to

The Comparative Analysis of the

"Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim"

(1) The term "Rabbinic Judaism" and "Rabbinists", used here is borrowed from Graetz. The terms are not altogether adequate, for they leave the impression of being of sectarian connotation as we find them used in comparison with the terms "Karaitic Judaism" and "Karaism". This is not the case here. By Rabbinic Judaism, we simply mean "Judaism" as it was conceived in the period of our discussion prior and during the development of Chassidism. By a "Rabbinist" we mean a man, who emphasizes the strict performances of the ritual, as prescribed by the laws and tradition.

(2)	Graetz; H	HISTORY OF THE JEWS	p.385
		Vol. V	

- (3) Abeson; J JEWISH MYSTICISM Chapter I
- (4) cf. Dubnow: HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA AND POLAND Raisin: HASKALAH MOVEMINT Graetz: HISTORY OF THE JEWS
- (5) cf. Schechter: STUDIES IN JUDAISM Vol. I (6) רבי יקותיאל איל האר באר (6) כבי יקותיאל איל האר כביר בדר בדר בדר כביר לא איל איל איל איל איל איל איל איל איל
- (7) Baron; S.W. A SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS Vol.II p.161 HISTORY OF THE JEWS
- (8) Dubnow; S.M. TOLDOTH HACHASSIDUTH p.232
- (9) Ibid.
- (10) アパマカ is the name given to the system of Chassidism formulated by Rabbi Shneor Zalman, which uses as its basic principles マメンカ, マリママ, and カマス, as the bases of faith of every Jew. The strong emphasis of these principles and their frequent repetition, have brought about the use of the term アパマカ, made up of the first letters of these words, as the designation of the sect of Chassidim following Rabbi Shneor Zalman's school of philosophy.

- The Writings of the Ari (11)
- (12)Baron; S. W.

A SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE JEWS

p. 161

- Nefesh Hachayim by Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin (13)
- (14)Ibid
- (15)Ibid
- cf. Baron; S. W. (16) A SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS Chapter XI HISTORY OF THE JEWS p.231-Vol. II p 261 Dubnow:S.M. TOLDOTH HACHSSIDUTH p. 36 Raisin; J.S. HASKALAH MOVEMENT

The question whether the Haskalah Movement was a reaction to Rabbinism and Chassidism or developed naturally as a result of the general trend of progress and enlightenment of the period following the French Revolution is disputable. There can be no doubt, however, that traditional Judaism, whether it manifested itself, in what we call Rabbinism or Chassidism or the merger of both (as we contend), felt the danger and combatted the enlightenment. It was due to the combined forces of Chassidism and Rabbinism that the Berlin form of enlightenment (which we call "Berlinism"), did not have the same nor as rapid an influence upon East-European Jewry as it did upon the West. When it finally began to effect the East, it appeared in a vastly changed form.

(17) cf. p"h וליח היצוי ליים (17) ב.26

It was no mere accident that the Musar Movement in Rabbinism, which was emotional in character, should have had its origin in Joseph Zundal of Salanter and his disciple, Israel Salanter, the former a student of Chayim of Valozhin, who organized this movement to combat enlighterment.

17) (continued)

S. M. Dubnow

HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA AND POLAND

comjentu knalizeo

Bgs. 238.9

While warring with one another, Rabbinism and Hassidism found a point of contact in their common hatred of the new Enlightenment, which proceeded from the Mendelsson circle in Berlin. If Rabbihism opposed secular knowledge actively, looking upon it as a competitor who contested its own spiritual monopoly, Hasidism opposed it passively, with its whole being, prompted by an irresistible leaning towards mental drowsiness and "pious fraud." Hasidism and its inseperable companion Tzaddikism, the products of a mystical outlook on life, were powerless against cold logical reasoning. It stands to reason that the Tzaddiks were even more hostile twards secular learning that the rabbis. True, Rabbinism had immersed the Jewish mind in the stagnant waters of scholasticism, but Hasidism, in its further developement, endeavored altogether to lull rational thinking to sleep, and to cult-ivate, to an excessive degree, the religious imagination at its expense. The new cultural movement which had arisen among the Jews of Germany had no chance of penetrating into this dark realm, which was guarded on the one hand by scholasticism and on he other by mysticism. The few isolated individuals in Polish Jewry who manifested a leaning towards secular culture were forced to go abroad, primarily to Berlin.



Introduction - General Comparison

Rabbinism and Chassidism met on common ground in the persons of Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin and Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi. Our task, now, is to show how they met and wherein they agree or disagree. To do this we shall examine the magnum opus of Rabbi Shneor Zalman, the "Tanya" and compare its ideas and contents with those of Rabbi Chayim in his "Nefesh Hachayim". The difficulty in this comparison lies in the diverse nature of the contents of the books and in the purpose of our inquiry.

The "Nefesh Hachayim" is not a philosophical treatise like the "Tanya". It is a manual for the study of the Torah and its aim and purpose is to provide every man with a plan, as well as a method, for the correct study of, the Torah and worship of God. It is readily apparent from the author's general contention and specific remarks that the "Nefesh Hachayim" is a practical workbook and not a metaphysical thesis. Rabbi Chayim never shows an interst in philosophical questions per se, except in so far as they bear upon the question of Torah study and proper worship. We may readily gather this from his own words: O "Torah study and proper worship. We may readily state this from his own words: O "Torah study and proper worship. The philosophical (15) of the form his own words: O "Torah study and proper worship. The philosophical (16) and the philosophical (16) of the philosophical (16) and the philosophical (16) of the philosophical (16) and the philosophical (16) of the philosophical (16) of the philosophical study of the philosophical (16) of t

מקלק למאשיו באלק ביק מלדבר ללבק מלהרהר הזר מאון אות גנויאי בכל להק למחשבה ציגות חושה ומתר ליול אהרהר ושוב ליחוד מקלמן של צולק לצבובתו וליראול לא בבר לה נכחול ברית שלא לחשוב הילקלתו שוין כל מכמים וכולין לידע צבל ועש באורק

We are unable nor are we permitted to enter into a philosophic understanding of the wisdom of this awesome subject; to know and to perceive how the Lord, who is one, blessed be He, fills everything and all places with a simple unity and complete equality, is forbidden. As Rokeach, of blessed memory, wrote, regarding the source of the holiness of Unity, (and these are his words) 'God is obscured from you; do not investigate. Meaning, if you will think in your heart concerning the creator of the world, what He is and how His presence is in all places and in His works. Curb your mouth from talking and your heart from thinking. Remove that thought from your heart. If, however, your heart runs after this thought, banish if quickly and do not think. Return to he unity of His world to worship and fear Him; because on on account of this we made a covenant, not to philosophise about God, for none of the wise men are capable of knowing him.

As we can see from the above quotation Rabbi Chayim did not approve of philosophy or the tendency to philosophise as a genneral practice. However he was not averse to the employment of the very principles of which he disapproved if he felt that it could serve as an aid to Torah study. It was to instruct man in the proper manner of the study of the Torah that Rabbi Chayim wrote the "Nefesh Hachayim", for he says: (2) Kayim wrote the "Nefesh Hachayim", for he says: (2) Kayim Krote the "Nefesh Hachayim", for he says: (2) Kayim Krote the "Nefesh Hachayim", for he says: (2) Kayim Krote the Study of the Torah that Rabbi Soft and There is no proper worship of God possible among the Jews except through the wise men who indulge in the study of Torah day and night. For the eyes of Israel is upon bhem to learn what Israel should do; to teach Israel the path which it should thead and what it should do. Therefore, the man who causes that there be no wise man in Israel destroys altogether the worship of God since the Jewish community, heaven forbid, will remain without Torah or a teacher and tit will not know in what manner it has erred -

-Appendix to 3

Rabbi Chayim fortifies this contention with abundant examples. Accordingly, the only method of worship is through Torah and the only manner of action is study. Knowledge and Torah will bring one to real worship of God. All of man's action must be directed toward the Torah and the only way to reach God is thru the study of Torah.

Rabbi Shneor Zalman does not deny the efficacy of Torah and the effect of study. The permeating concept, of the "Tanya", however, is not Torah but God. Torah is merely another means of knowing or uniting with God. Rabbi Shneor Zalman concerns himself with the profound problems of philosophy; God and his relation to man; God and his relation to the Law; God and creation, etc. The "Tanya" of Rabbi Shneor Zalman, therefore, is an entirely different type of book than the "Nefesh Hachayim". It is not a manual for practice but a philosophic treatise. The author's interes lies in the domain of thought, not practice; his main problem is God. His approach to all problems in life is conditioned by his intense interes in finding a way to approach the Divine. He sees in every material object and phenomenon of life a philosophic concept and treats it as such. This may be illustrated best by his own words in regard to the question of love: (3)

אשר אוכי אצור אתר שאשות לאורה אות ה׳ וצריה לההין אייק שייך לאין צטייה אהי אותה שאלה אוק הצנין הלא ביש עני איין אנייה איי אותה שלה אוק הצנין אל גוראה ביושר אתאהר נבש שבלות של האותר....והשנית היא אוראה ביושר אתאהר נבש שבלות של האותר.....והשנית היא אובהב שכל אדר ונש שבלות של האותר....והשנית היא אובהב שכל אדר געשו וריין בן ואהב את הי כאשר יתנות וישים אל להו בי ה׳ האי נבשו האותית.

> The Bible tells us, (begins Rabbi Shneor Zalman) Thou shalt do that which I commanded thee, namely, to love God. We must understand (he argues) how it is possible to have command in regard to love which is of the heart. The truth is that bhere are two kinds of love of God. One is yearning of the soul in nature for God as the spiritual soul overpowers the body..... And the second is a love of which every man is capable if he should consider it Well.... As when he loves his soul and his own life so man may love God if he will philosophise and consider in his heart that God is his soul and life.

His entire phiEosophy is a fabric of concepts concerning God. Even the concept of human self love is bound up with God. Multiplication of examples cannot do anything but add to this prevailing idea, that God is latent in every one of his works. It is in such a light that we must study the "Tanya". If we look at the "Tanya" as a philosophic treatise and the "Nefesh Hachayim" as a handbook of practice about the same subject we can readily understand the reason for the respective positions of Chassidism and Rabbinism. The two ideologies met because there existed no definite rift in their philosophies; their ideas of God were the same even though their aproach to God was different.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The differences between the Mithnagdim and the Chassidim were not of a theoretical nature or a question of dogma but a concrete problem of practice. Dogmas, therefore, served merely as props upon which either group based and validated its philosophy and tendency of action. The thirteen fundamental principles of Judaism, the Jewish dogmas, as we understand them, which have been incorporated in the prayer "Yigdal" and in the I'NICN 1/1C are not clearly or definitely enumerated as a credo of their respective group by either Rabbi Chayim in the "Nefesh Hachayim" or by Rabbi Shneor Zalman in the "Tanya". They are, however, found hidden in these works and one has to gean them one by one, gathering the principles from the incidental remarks of the authors, in order to formulate them into a complete system of fundamentals.

We must, however, take into consideration that, since both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman mention Maimonides (1) more than once and accept him as an authority in matters of creed that both accepted the thirteen articles of faith as the Rambam promulgated them in 1168. The character of the two works testify that the thirteen articles of faith were understood by both men to be part and parcel of the Jewish heritage, although they are not specifically mentioned by either of them. Consequently we assume that both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman accepted the thirteen articles of faith as the basis of their respective philosophies, not because they postulated them as such, but because they did not negate them. We may, therefore, state that the creed of Maimonides forms the basis for the fundamentals of Judaism as formulated by each; except that they are stressed and emphasized in a manner peculiar and pertinent to each man's philosophy.

Rabbi Chayim took for granted that all the thirteen articles of faith were the accepted dogma and doctrine of Judaism but he stressed the dogma of the immutability of the Torah more than any other. Rabbi Chayim not only accepted the doctrine of the immutability of the Torah, but also claimed that only through Torah may one really worship God. To him learning of the Torah was a form of divine service or prayer.(2).

Rabbi Shneor Zalman, on the other hand, while accepting the thirteen articles as fundamentals of belief, stressed, in addition, the belief in the efficacy of prayer as a fundamental doctrine. (3) The author of the "Tanya" did not deny the importance of Torah but he put a greater emphasis on prayer, than Rabbi Chayim thought prayer warrents.

The question of worship and adoration is a problem of difference in fundamentals between the Mithnagdim and and the Chassidim. It would appear from the Nefesh Hachayim that the idea of adoration of God is similar to a large extent to that of Rabbi Shneor Zalman's as expressed in the "Tanya" (4)

After discussing the various aspects of divine worship, where man must always address God and pray only to Him and not picture God or personify Him or perform any act, which might infringe on the unity of God, Rabbi Chayim comes to a conclusion, which is characteristically opposed to the ideas of Rabbi Shneor Zalman. Rabbi Chayim denies completely the

belief in a Zaddik. (5) pinha 601 ווא זבר הכתוב לא יהיה בולהים שותירום של פני - כ"ל שלאו לכת לכון ח"ן השות בהר לאוין וכת פרטי שופיצו שוק ופיר אואן הכח האי פני היינו שופיצו שברט רובה שהאיזר And it may be said according to the previous inter-' pretation of the verse: "Thou shalt have no other Gods besides me"i.e. Not t ł to attribute, heaven forbid, to any object as re-1 gard any any aspect or parl ticular power even if that' very power be of aspect of

'Jo that is to say even to attribute divine power to any person or attribute the aspect of holiness in any of the most high powers. ביציי הקיקה האלמוני אכמיק קשורות נפש רוא ונשמה של צמי השרף ומיוחדת המתרן הרשטון ושרשם שהחכמה צילשוה שהלא ית וחכותל שי והלא המדע כוי

For by cleaving unto wise men the souls [2] of uncultured persons (fine with are bound and unite with the first essence and source of the highest wisdom, which is God, for He and His wisdom are one, and He is the Wisdom.

It has often been attributed to Rabbi Shneor Zalman that he modified or completely changed the position of the Zaddik from that of an intermediary between God and Rabbi Shneor Zalman goes so far as to say: () ועכל הדרה התיא מאתה לול הכאלה כאולו

LERG ASCILE WAS.

He who cleaves unto a 'Talmud Chochim', the Scriptures ascribes to him as if he were verily attached to God, the Holy Spirit.

Rabbi Shneor Zalman retains the original idea of the Saddik, as an intermediary between God and man. This is a belief in the Zaddik, which differs from the original conception only in that the Zaddik is a scholar. Zaddikism differs from the attachment of a 3/ / to a 27, (e.g. Rabbi Chayim to the Gaon), where the attachment was not to the person but to his Torah.

This difference of the importance of the scholar in relation to God, on onebhand, and to his disciple on the other hand, is the great difference between Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman in their approach The latter requires an interto the study of Torah. mediary, in addition to Torah and fervent devotion, in order to have real communications with God. That intermediary is not the original of the old Chassidic view, but a poh gindh, a scholar. Rabbi Chayim denies all that and claims that real communion with God is possible only through the Torah and its study.

There is another great divergence between the fundamental concepts of Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman and that is a difference in some aspects of the questions of prayer. The essential difference between them, in regard to prayer, lies in their interpretation of the efficacy of prayer and its position in the scheme of the Jewish ritual. We are able to obtain a graphic picture of their individual concept of prayer and the wide divergence in this particular aspect of the subject from a comparison between the ideas of the two men on that subject.

We can readily see that Rabbi Chayim has a more modern conception of prayer and to him prayer is merely communication with God. Rabbi Shneor Zalman, on the other hand, believes that through prayer one may have real communion with God, that is to say, union with the Upper Soul. We mak safely assume that both Rabbi Chayim, the leader of the Misnagdim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman who represented the foremost and the best that was in Chassidism, agreed in some of their views on prayer elthough even in these there are inconsequential and, sometimes, even barely perceptible differences. They agree that prayer should not be a petition for earthy wants and desires. Nor should

.

1000

it consist of mere praise offered to the Lord, for He is, admittedly, above praise.

The philosophic position of Rabbi Chayim of Voloshin and Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi in respect to the concept of God, and God in His relation to creation, are more extensively treated in individual chapters which follow. In practically all the fundamentals of Judaism not already discussed or treated in subsequent chapters (or preceding ones), the tendencies of Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman show striking similarity. This despite the fact that the two menk represented most widely opposed factions in Judaism .. It is, perhaps this definite tendency towards a similarity in vital fundamentals be in the representative works of these two leaders of Rabbinism and Chassidism which may have been a very strong factor in the final reconciliation between the Mithnagdim and It is sufficient to quote these the Chassidim. characteristic examples to illustrate the point just made and then to proceed to the dogmas which Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman considered most imprtant in the lafe and the religious conduct of the Jew.

In regard to the idea of the unity of God we canregard the following parmallel passages as indicative of the similarity in thought of the two Jewish leaders:

(8) - p"ha 621

ביינו לבוין שאנגון יחיד הייה האא אחד הכל השולאות וההריות כולק אחדות בשול במשמעו וכולק נחשבות לאין ואין עוד מלהרן ית לאתרי

That is, one may observe that the Lord, blessed be He, is unique in all the worlds and in all creations; a simple unity as it is meant; 'And all are considered as nought' and 'there is none else besides God'. שנין נתפות אחדותו של הקביר שנקרא י IAVE INITUE LES NOINITIA DUPIT JULI הלא קודם שנהרא הדולםלכן כל הצלא הודם שנהרא הדולםלכן כל הצלאות השליונום שנין הושים שק שוק שינוי האתרותי יתל הההראת אאין ליש שכית שהיה הלא להרו להרו כוא הלא להרו בוא יחיד ומיוחר שנחר הראש PRIDAD The idea of the essence and unity of the Holy One, blessed be He, who is called One and Unique - and all believe that He also is One as He actually was One before the creation of the world, for this world, and likewise all the upper worlds do not work any change in His Unity in creating them from nothing into something - and, as He alone was One and Unique before He created them, so He also is One and Unique after He

<u> 1- 1015</u>

created them.

We have further illustration of the concurrence of the two authors in their discussion of the thesis that God is not

1

corporeal but a spiritual essence:

(1) - le ys

الجروة كرار جراع مراجع مركز جراع مراجع م

Source of Himself and of all creation and all the powers and all the world and all **th**at is in it.

1

t

1

ŧ.

1

1

1.1

As to the remnants of the Shekinah, which is the evidence of God, and the light of the in any object, that is to say that that object is included in the light of God and its existence is nill altogether; then all that remains and is revealed in it of God is reunited. But what is not nil in existence, the light of God, does not rest nor reveal itself in it; and even the perfect who unites with it in love. There is no real perception of Him at all. For Godsim reality is the only true reality and bt is alone and unique, for He alone is and there is really nothing at all besides Him.

That a kind of pantheism is found in the "Nefesh Hachayim" cannot be denied. The only difference between the pantheism of Rabbi Chayim and that of Rabbi Shneor Zalman is that the former includes a gradation of rank in his high ideal whereas the latter, God, the Absolute, is the soul of the Universe and nature the body of the world. To Rabbi Chayim there are degrees in the attainment of the ultimate perfection, God, since there is nothing greater. Rabbi Shneor Zalman is a good pantheist and believes that God is in nature and that God is nature as will The universality of God and the unity of God, wf be shown. taken together in the extreme and most abstract manner, imply a sort of pantheism which is not material but ethereal and are a definite result of the doctrine of God in Israel. It is, therefore, little wonder that the doctrime of the Rabbinist and that of the Chassid met, for in the fundamental dogma there was little of no change. In essential doctrines of faith there was nox difference either. The only doctrine which did differentiate them was the idea of God.

NOTES

TO

Fundamental Principles

Tanya - Shaar Hayichood V'hawehmoonoh Likutay Ehmohrim (1) chap. 3-8 chap. 2 (2) Nefesh Hachayim Shaar chap. 14 Shaar chap. 3 chap. 23,24 Tanya - Likutay Ehmohrim (3) chap. 23,30,30 Tanya - Likutay Ehmohrim Nefesh Hachayim Shaar (4) chap. 4 Shaar

The Concept of God

From the repeated references of the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim" it is evident to us that both authors considered that the nature and character of God is not only unknown to us, but, in many ways, God's essence and existence are incomprehensible to the human mind. There is, however, a distinction between ability to know and the ability to comprehend.(1) In regard to the nature and character of God, unknowable may be applied to man only, because man is not initiated and not learned in the higher realms of Divine existence. By indulging in the mystic lore and fervent prayer - according to the "Tanya" - and by the study of the law (Torah) and pure and religious learning - according to the "Nefesh Hachayim" - one may be able to know God. That knowledge is limited and circumscribed as we shall see later. Incomprehensibility, on the other hand, has very little to do with learning, knowledge or initiation in to the mystic Incomprehensibility has to do with the very essence lore. of the subject matter. God is incomprehensible, not because man is uninitiated in the mystic lore, but because God is beyond the human mind. The mortal intellect cannot conceive of things beyond the human mind. God is beyond mortal conception and imagination. God, therefore, is a supernatural power that exists despite the fact that the human mind cannot picture Him. The fact of incomprehensibility

'proves', to an extent, that He exists.(2)

To follow up the argument, God's existence, according to both# authors, is not a matter which may be deduced through a logical process of reasoning; nor can we obtain the 'idea of God' as a result of a process of thought. God's existence is not a question of philosophic doctrine or postulation, nor would we have to assume the existence of God on philosophic grounds because of a logical necessity in our process of thinking and living. As a matter of principle and dogma, the Jewish philosopher will never admit that the idea and concept which we call "God" is a necessary assumption in order to explain any aspect of our life, natural of physical phenomenon which are inexplicable, or that the idea of God must be assumed as, for example, the They also negate the postulation that law of causality. God's existence is requisite because of the nature of human experience. A supernatural force, devoid of any comprehensibility, and which, for the convenience of human spetch and limitation of descriptive terminology, we connote by the word God, is accepted by both writers as the common Jewish conception of God, The Ein Sof

It follows from the above reasoning that the essence, existence and very being of God, which the Rambam proved (according to our authors) as one or Unity is not merely axiomatic but self evident. God is Infinite and is called the 'Ein Bof', therefore the necessity of human experience is merely a part of the world order and God is above world order. The omnipotence of God negates the postulation of Him as a necessity of logical sequence. We can neither reason God into existence nor can the human mind assume Him. God simply is because He is proved of order. His existence is not limited by space, nor time not motion.

INFO DE RENT INFO DE DATO

He rules the worlds and His presence is throughout the worlds. (3)

God is Infinite; God is omnipresent; God is omniscient; God is also incomprehensible and unfathomable. God, therefore, is the only and ultimate reality in the world. His manifestation is in the acts of creation at all times. A11 knowledge, all creation, everything in nature is a revelation He is the sum total of all that exists in the world, of God. but all that is in the world can not be identified as God. The physical manifestations of God do not make him finite for lo !.... Thus may we introduce the He is the Infinite, conception of God of the two authors, leaders of opposing trends in Judaism, and try to understand their views regarding the Infinite.

Before discussing the manifestation of God in nature, the emanation or effulgence of God and nature, something must be said in regard to the various names of God. In the

The "Tanya's" reason for the name, Ein Sof, in a similar channel. God, the first cause, the eternal is called **g**/o per for like all other names of God this one too merely shows that God has no name and - logically speaking - no limit, no beginning, no end, no purpose. The Tetragrammaton n'n, merely proves the point that God is above time and space. God eis the cause for time and space, and these are only means of limitation for the human perception. man may learn to know God through time and space (f) but they can have no effect on God. In other words, we may conclude that, according to both men, God has no name and even the most appropriate connotation of

 $\beta/o/...$ is merely a verbal means of expressing that which is truly incapable of representation. All names of God are only symbols of His relations to man; they can, in no manner, penetrate to the very essence of God.

That being the case, we find from a comparative analysis of the philosophies of the authors of the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim", that they commonly maintain the following views concerning God:

They call the true essence of God for the purpose of simplicity and better understanding, by the name of "Ein Sof", for under no circumstances can Man really know God. The true essence of the Ein Sof (God) is unknowable for Man, limited by time and space is not able to know nor perceive God. What Man is able to perceive and calls the "Ein Sof", is the power of God, as God Himself has revealed it in the created world. The Ein Sof, God, in His desire to become less unfathomable to Man, and more widely known, effulged the world through a power of emanation called $\rho I_{M} S_{A}$, which caused the world to come into being. That power of God is not the real essence of God but a power in potentia. It is a

the the sol

soft of spectre, which in relation to His real essence, is Nil. (Power in potentia, in itself, is never recognizable by Man, until it is in an actual state of existence in a concrete form). The change from the potentia into the actual, and the relation of the potentia is explainable through $\rho l \beta r \beta$.

Man, limited by time and space cannot possibly understand nor conceive the real essence, - the Ein Sof- because the Ein Sof, who is not limited by time and space, is beyond comprehension and understanding. What man can understand is a revelation of His essence. This revelation of God took place through a process pland, (concentration) a process-like transcalled plantation, which brought about the unveiling of the power of God, in time and space, because it resulted in creation. In creation, then we have an iota of God, which man, only through much labor, study and philosophy, may possibly perceive. Therefore the reveation of the power of God is possible only in creation; the revelation of the power of God, only, and not the real essence is in creation. Consequently, Man is able to understand God, only in the world as it has been created.

The concept of revelation of the power of God and the concept of creation, therefore, are one, merely expressed differently. The world, then, exists because of God and through the will of God and through His acts. The world is in God. All this is true only in regard to the human aspect of perception. Before creation there was a lack of perception of the power of God was impossible. Creation not only brought about perception but was for that express purpose.

הרישות הצולאות היש השביל התגלות אלכותו

The creation of the worlds was for the purpose of the revelation of his Kingdome (10)

In respect to the idea of the immanence of God in all of nature, and the existence of God, the "Tanya" follows the basic teaching of the Besht (11). The only difference between the two may be that the former attempts to rationalize God's existence and falls back upon the emotional aspect only as a last resort but the Besht never philosophizes in that field. We must glean the idea of God out of all the chaff and dross of Chassidic legend and lore. On the other hand, whenever we delve into the work of Shneor Zalman we find him a rationalist; but since he is a Chassid as well, he is, at the same time, an emotionalist, especially when he deals with the question of God. He contends that the world is substance only in appearance (12). He does not tell us what the world is as an actuality. He therefore seems to be interested in discovering divine emanation (God and his relationship to that which he created) in creation. His interest lies, not in the created object nor in its existence, but in the Creator of the object (13).

That no one has ever seen, nor is able to see, God is self evident. Nevertheless the existence of God is never questioned. Shneor Zalman goes about in search of the Creator without being interested in the object created per se. God exists and is, not only the creator of but is, actually, the sustaining force of the world; for the universe without God cannot exist even for an instant. If God were to remove his immanence from the world even for a moment the world would return to void and chaos. God is always present in the world. Creation came about by the word of God and that word, which is identical with God himself, is present in all things at all times. God's word, according to Shneor Zalman, is the cause for, and the mainstay, of all existence (14). That cause or mainstay is not merely the reason for its coming into existence but is also the explanation for its continued existence. Shneor את אאיה שא כא אל אקרא אלה אאיה איז כא איה שאיה אות Zalman reads into creation: כלק כי ה׳ נואן הויה אכל וצירה הכל שיה ועדה אולא אותה אהוה יא הפוא אהנכא היה נהפך לאין

Thou givest life unto all (playing on the Hebrew words $\Im / h N$ and $\Im / \Im N$, the "Tanya" reads life to all', but read, 'and thou givest unto all creatures at each and every hour' and if that power in potentia were removed from the created object, the object would be changed to nothing.

From the above verse we may derive that even creation and existence are really nil in comparison to the power in potentia in creation. The act of creation is really the equivalent of existance, for creation is continual. That power in potentia is so great that it causes 'creatio ex nihilo'. The potentiality in the thing created really caused it to come into existence. Our human senses, claims the "Tanya", cannot perceive the existence of an object except as an emanation of the Real Existence. Creation, as the human eye perceives it, is overshadowed by actual creation as the heat rays of the sun are overshadowed by the potential rays of heat that are contained in the sun proper.

בל ההרות לגבי שבע השלבי מכוח בין האבע אליהת ומהוה שותח והנא מקורת.... ולכן הת הטליק המציטות לגבי מקורת כמן שור השמש שהלו המציטות ונחשב לטיין ושובס מתש ואינן נקרא השת יש כלל כשרוא המקורו הה תמת השמין שאין שת מקורו בב בל הברשוות שוין נופל התקור שמוא רוח כ המכוב שוותק.

The perception of that potentiality or the act of creation is really impossible for the human eye. We perceive God's potentiality only in the world as it was created. One cannot conceive of the power in potentia before creation although its existence is certain and inherent. The creation of the world was therefore an essential act in order to indicate the existance of God in creation because potentiality is not recognizable until it becomes an actuality. Potentiality (although most certainly existing before creation, for God existed before the creation of the world) did not become an actuality until after creation and that may be considered the purpose of creation.

הריאת הצולמ היא השהול התגלות

[שצר היאור להווטונה - כ"]

This idea is followed by a statement which, in its philosophy, that of Kant and Berkely, with some differences:

"All existence is merely the creation of our conception and is really unknown to us".

The essential difference between Berkely and the "Tanya" in this respect is that Berkely claims that we give form to the object in our conception and according to the "Tanya" we may conclude that the human being never really can have a real conception of the actual form. Real existence is only in God.

Actually the "Tanya" does not prove existence. In

regard to that subject, Shneor Zalman bases his proof, not on reason but, on emotion:

"I truly see God, but naturally. not with my human senses of flesh and blood; just as a man feels his soul, that gives life to man's existence, even though man cannot see the soul; in the same manner I feel God."

It is not sufficient to deduce the existence of God with your reasoning power but one must be able to reach Him through one's feelings and emotions.

The "Nefesh Hachayim", on the other hand, comes to the same (or certainly to a very similar) conclusion but by a different method. His proof is more direct and more midrashic. He is not interested in demonstrating the existence of God by philosophic proof with varied references to potentia and creation. His proof is rather naive and sample. He relies upon no particular philosophical contention but proceeds as follows:

God is present in the entire universe. There is no place in the entire world where God is not present. The proof offered is that God is called $\rho[r[b]|N]$, meaning place of the world. The inference is readily made that God **bs** the place of the world and the world is not the place of God. Nak Kar Angle Star Angle Star Angle Star Angle Star Nak Angle Star Angle Star Angle Star Angle Star

[JYC 5- 6"CR]

Such a naive explanation from the leading representative of the Misnagdim may be considered rather insufficient and can hardly be considered a worthy rebuttal to the ("Tanya". However, the great disciple of the Gaon of Vilna redeemed himself in his reasoning along other lines:

The real essence of God is unknowable and man is forever denied the possibility of knowing the real essence of God except through His relationship to the world. To quote from the "Nefesh Hachayim" directly:

היה והוה ויהיה למהוה הכול ר"ל הלא יתהרק מתחבר הרצונו להצואמנ להווע ולקיימע כל

"He is, He was and He will be, and He gives existence to all things; that is to say, 'God through his will unites with all worlds and makes them come into existence and (continues) them in existence at all moments' (15) (thet's God is known or may be known).

That is the position of Rabbi Chayum, and his may be considered the position of official Judaism on that subject.

In regard to Prayer and Torah, the position of Rabbi Chayim was even more conservative, for his was the position of catholic Judaism at that time. How that position d&ffered from the Chassidic attitude will be shown in he respective chapters on the subject. The attributes of God are only touched upon by Rabbi Chayim. His attitude is negative in all respects towards this question since on that subject he feels that nothing may be known. As he says, very specifically:

ותב שמושג שלשנו קצת לשנו מכנים ומתשורוק כמה תשורת ושמות וכנויים ומדות ושוביצו השם הדצם המינתים הויב הייה שין דצמותו יתברק שבד שונו מיתדים שו שנשו מצד התתהרותו ידם הדולמות.

No one name, nor any specific attribute, properly qualifies God, according to Rabbi Chayim, not even $\frac{\beta}{0}$ //c.

According to Rabbi Chayim the manifestation of God is revealed through his work, namely, creation. Creation is, according to Rabbi Chayim as well as to Rabbi Shneor Zalman, for the sole purpose of revelation. However, the sources of the two men are different. The former arrives at his conclusion in the midrashic manner and the latter, the leader of the Chassidim, dereves it from Lurian sources:

ולכן אקדימין שנתנן לאתר שותה ה׳ מלק הדולא = ה׳ שותר שרצונק היה לדוות הדולומות ולהתחהר שליהק

And therefore we preface (at every benediction), thou art, oh Lord, the King of the Universe..... meaning, thereby, that after thy will was, that the world should come into existence and unite with th them, in order to reign over them. This is the identical reason that Rabbi Shmeor Zalman gives for creation. From the above quotation one may conclude that Rabbi Chayim includes some anthropomorphism on his conception of God. Although both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman would deny any anthropomorphism (as they do) the entire concept as a whole is permeated with it. There is no need to elaborate here and to reiterate the Chassidic concept of God, which was so successfully synthesised by Rabbi Shneor Zalman in the "Tanya". We are, rather, ready to proceed with the consideration of the other concepts of our respective authors.

$$\frac{N O T E S}{t_0}$$

$$Concept of God$$

$$C^{n} Q G Concept of God Concept Q Concept$$

The Concept of Creation

Although Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman are definitely Kabbalistic yet, contrary to the accepted Kabbalistic notion of creation, both agree that creation was 'ex nihilo'. No one questions the fact that the idea that the world is contained in God, and that the immanence of God in the world of nature, are accepted Kabbalistic doctrines. That 'creatio ex nihilo' is impossible and unthinkable in principle, if the previous premise is accepted is also unquesioned, for the immanence of God in the world and nature and 'creatio ex nihilo' are diametrically opposed concepts and are logically irreconcilable. If one is upheld the other may not be propounded. It is, therefore, very interesting to see how both authors reconcile these two views.

From parallel passages we may note that each believes that God is imminant in the world of nature. All existence in nature receives its source and is nourished by the power of God. God is in Nature and Nature is in god. Yet creation, both contend, was 'ex nihilo'. If we compare parallel passages we find: נכטהאיית -שצר א- פ"ב שכל כח פרטי הנתצא הכל המולאות הכל הלא ית"ש הגר הבא כח שלהת שתשפיצ ההת ג הכח וגבורת כל רגע ותלות ג הוף תמיד לטעת ולטורת כר צונו.

Every individual power that is found in all the worlds is of God, the main' source that bestows that power and strength at eve-' ry moment, and they are dependant upon His will and He may change them at all times.

אניא-(צ) שער היחור והשואונה EDNIA LENCE Del Stalla INGINA Male North DIGO CENNIG CE EREC a lold oil in 150 xeil rea C. galla laler and ANE ES LAR INGIE SILVA UND . CIS /ICN

The essence and the being of the heavens and earth have come into being from the absolute nothing merely by the word of God and the Spirit of the mouth of God. And even now the word of God is in them forever and emanates from them always and at every moment and causes them to come into being from nothing into something.

We may also conclude therefrom that without the power of God, creation, as well as existence, is impossible. Deprive nature of the pwer of God and creation as well as existence turns to void an and nonenity. Both existence and creation, therefore, appear to be identical states. Despite the apparent identity of the existence of the world of nature and creation through unity in and of the 'Ein Sof', both authors contend that the 'Ein Sof', both authors contend that the 'Ein Sof'is different than nature and has separate existance in nature as well as outside of it. Surely the 'Ein Sof' has also separate existence aside from creation, for creation is the act and will of the 'Ein Sof' and not its identity. The existence

1

٠

of 'Ein Sof' is undiminished after the act of creation, the same as before.

נפט החוות - שדר ג- פ"ה כי וצאוי האמת שמצבו ית גת דתה אתר שהחו וחידוש העולאות הרצונו הוא מעלא כל צולאת והמקומות והברות כושת השיוןי גמור ואתדות בשוט

> ובוא הוא אם זמה כקורת ההריאה שהיה שריה בכל מלא עצמות אים היה גת התקוק טעותרות העולמות עתה

Because it is indubitably true that on the part of God, even now after He created and caused to come into being the worlds by His will, He fills all the worlds and places and creations entirely with complete equality and simple unity. Because, before the world was created, God alone was the unique unity and filled all this space in which, he created the world and even now He is in it in the same way.

And He even now as He was before creations, (namely) Everything was filled with the essence of the 'Ein Sof' Blessed be He, even the space Which the worlds occupy now.

אניא - ציקוטי אותריק - פיצו בי קונים שנברטו הטולין היה הוא למגין ייצי יאיני ומותו ומתלטו בל המקוק הנה שברט בו הצולים 120 RVC of CIN Jeril 51

In this matter regarding the concept of creation both Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin and Rabbi Shneor Zalman of Ladi Their examples are only slightly different. God is התקוק, the place, and animates the world. If God were to remove himself from the world even for one moment only, the world would become a chaos and void. parallel runs in this vein, as Rabbi Chayim compares God to the soul of man albeit God is greater than the soul. 2"2 - 2 JYC - D"MA 62] 1

בגול ושלא מצואות הבני שלמו ואיון אלו היו האתות מהאקות כרש חו י מתבטל מהציאות גם באת הנשמה ממני ואוצרות שמקירן ביו כל השמים אין אבל ה׳ הצולמות כולם כל ציקר וזוכס ממש והין כלא היו כלל וכתוי התהוות מצואותם כל רזי הוא רק אות אליש ואולו היה מסלק רצוע ית"ה אלהיא SILA CO LAS EI BOILD ISIGO NAUS

The body has existence by itself alone and does not become a nonenity in its existence even when the soul 'leaves; but so God. The entire world structure, its basic being and existence,all of it comes from Him, praised be His name. Were it His desire to remove existence from them even for a moment, they would become an actual nonenity and nullity.

100 - ALIST האוגוני - 621 .

קודם מאומר והי רקיע

If these letters were taken 1 away for a moment, Heaven for-1 bid, and returned to their source, then all the Heavens would become an actual nonenity and nullity, and they would 1 ' be as if they never had been ' at all, just like before the ' word of God saying: "Let there be a firmament.

Thus both conceive God as a separate being, who is in the world and is still separable from the world. That being the case can "creation" and the Ein Sof be accounted for?

1

To these problems both give adequate answers, as has been demonstrated in a previous discussion upon God.

The concept of creation has various angles and aspects. It is bound up in the fabric of the mystical perception of (concentration) and woven in a warp and woof of a new philosophy of Judaism. Before we reach that inner sanctuary of the hidden concept, we must explain some elementary ideas which are involved in an elucidation of that concept as it took shape in the minds of these two men.

In the concept of "creation" we understand, the bringinginto being an object which never existed before the act of creation. The act of creation in such a case has very little or nothing to do with the essence of the object created but merely with the form. The foregoing idea of creation, however, is different from the concept of creation which claims that creation is the cause of the coming into existence of that which never had existence at all. If we look into the concept of creation from this point of view, then our entire outlook changes. Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin and Rabbi Shneor Zalman beingat this point, and noting subtle distinctions, reason to a common conclusion, though their use divergent methods and systems of thought. In no aspect of their divergent philosophies do they approach more closely than upon this topic, as can be readily observed from the following quotations:

2"3-K >8-P"halea

כי שא כאצא הן ארא הקגה כו הארא בשגונה גנין היא איצא אין הגונה גורא ואיציא אז אכוחו הצר רק שלוקא צליק שבהר נגראו ואידרא הגנין ואיר שבהר סדרת צבי רצוני דת שכחו בלסר ונסתלק אהת צביצ הגנין קיוק.

For the ways of Man are not the ways of God! When a man builds a building from wood, for example. the builder does not create nor draw from his own power, the wood. He merely takes wood that has already been created, and organizes them into a building. If after they (wood) has already been arranged accordding to his will, his power should be removed and diverged from them, inspite of that the building would re- ' main standing.

<u>מניאר שער היאר האות האות</u> ב- ה ההברל הגבא שבין מצשה אניט ותחבולא שהאי יש מיט רק שמשנה הצורה והתמנה מתמונת אתיכת

כים לתאנת כלי למצופה שמים וארצ שהלא יש מאין והלא פלא גבול

Creation

3

The great difference that exists between the work of man and his purpose, which is a thing made out of another thing, wherein only the form and image are changed, as from a form of silver to a form of a vessel; as compared to the work of heaven and earth, which is a thing made from a nonenity and is a great wonder. indeed.

Concomitant with this concept of the difference in creation between man and God comes the idea of purpose of creation, which to some extent is brought to light in the

illustration, below,
<u>Leg Rhing - 380 5 - 6'</u>
Leg Rhing - 380 5 - 6'
Leg Rhing - 380 5 - 6'
Relating the service of the serv

אניא-שער היאור והאוצרה- נצ) כי הנה טובב וטגם הציילם וההית הצב שהיארו לדשים הקה"ה אא החיות של העולם כדי שיהיה הדולם נראה דהר נכרד הפני עצמן הנה הוא ידוע שכל כי תכלית הריאת העולם הוא השהיל התשות ולכותו We therefore gather that, according to both authors, creation is not the same as that postulated by Spinoza. The act of creation is not incidental to the existence of God and cannot continue to exist without God and is always dependant upon God. According to Rabbi Chayim:

התרבש הטובן הכז ווק תמיד....

"Creation continues ever day

In other words both agree that creation is an eternal act and God is first the Lord and then the creator of the Universe. His manifestation is the evidence of the creator. God as the creator of the world become s known tox the inhabitants thereof as God because He is the Greator. This distinction in the conception of God **in**d creation is different from the modern concept of God, wherein the Almighty is the creator and Duly assumes His divinity through His creations. To avoid a misconception of their ideas, both authors applied the Lurian principle of $\rho|_{J_N}^{J_N}$.

The Concept of Man

The concept of man, on the scene of the many things which God created, is comparable to the place which Jerusalem holds in mediaeval philosophy. Man is the center of all things which God created. Man is the crown of all creation; therefore man was created on the last day of creation. He is the epitome of creation; therefore ht was the last thing mande by the hand of God. Indirectly, he was the cause of creation, therefore he stands in the senter of all created matter.

ECISIA RELIAL COS EDER

In man there is that latent power which enables him to blend the worlds together and move the world into existence and to destroy the world. He rules and has dominion over all the upper worlds $\gamma' \beta c$. The idea of the interaction of the lower and the upper world, which was a powerful doctrine in the establishment of Chassidism by the Besht, is also found in the "Nefesh Hachayim". The only difference between them is that Rabbi Chayim denies the influence of the **J**uman act or behaviour upon God. Rabbi Chayim offers, as proof of his contention, verses from the holy writ and makes the point: $\beta'' \partial - b \gamma c$

את שתנין של ההלקך אין הכולתת לקשר האלאת צד רדתת לתשה הגון הטודת בנל כי לתק צולת הצשיה הוצרכו ההברתל שהתנהש הגוף הצולת המשיה

In respect to $\int - \int (\mathbf{N} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{N})^*$ of man, which is important to bind the world together until they enter into the body of man, it seems to me that, in order to perfect the world of $\int \partial \mathcal{P}$, it is perfore necessary to clothe them (N R N) in the body of man, in the world of $\partial \mathcal{P} \mathcal{N}$.

The Chassidim, however, hold fast to that doctrine that man may changed the course of nature by concentrating the thoughts upon God. It is a sort of communion with God th through prayer and ecstacy. That is a well known Chassidic doctrine. There is, however, a tinge of the Chassidic doctrine in Rabbi Chayim, in regard to the influence of the upper worlds.

זובל היזואת להציהה הלא הלא אצוםה יצי גידים צצא שהרחיק והוסיץ והתקין חלק לצצא האיציון.

The truth is that the world to come is in itself the work of man himself as he widens and adds and establishes his part for knimself by his deeds.

Man is the creator of his own destiny by his work and acts, according to Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman, no doubt, would claim the same thing for man. The principle which the rabbis have set down follows: the rabbis have set down follows: $kic \rho = \int hhh con \int kic \rho = \int hich (200) kon \rho = \int hic$

Fer = N= 697 D=R= his I-N= ANOS

This is an acceptable doctrine with all Kabbalists and is accepted equally by Rabbi Shneor Zalman and Rabbi Chayim. This no more than might be expected because of the principles laid down in the previous chapters; that God created man and endowed him with powers and gave him dominion over all things in creation; in the hand of every man lies his fate as a human being. This doctrine, from its content, can readily be interpreted as the real Chassidic doctrine of the inter-relation of the world and the power of man:

שכמו שהוא יאל שמן הוא הזאורים השלוקים הש הכוחות הנימטיים הכל הצולמות כולם ומסדרם ומנהאם כל הא ברצוני כן השליט רצוני יאברק את האדם שוהא הוא הכותם והסוגר של כמה אלהי הכואות כותות וצולמות:

Just as God, blessed be His name, (who is Elokim) is the master of all the elements found inthe worlds and orders them and leads them at all moments according to his will, so He made man have dominion and be capable of opening and closing many thousands of worlds and powers.

Prayer

Prayer, in general, may be defined as the act of making a request with earnestness or zeal for something desired. The concept of prayer is an abstract concept which has troubled many. It has changed with the changes of time and environement. Prayer never had the same position in every culture and civilization, nor even the same position in one religion over a long period of time. Prayer, at times, was a propitiation of the Deity and sometimes appeasement of God, sometimes thanking the Lond and sometimes even bargaining with the Divine ruler.

Among the Jews prayer is of ancient origin and peculiar significance. Its origin is attributed to the Patriarchs; Shachris to Abraham, Mincha to Isaac and Maariv to Jacob (1). The significance of prayer as a seperate entity in the framework of divine servace and its value as a means of direct communication with God is of mystical origin. Prayer, in mysticism, holds a. special position and is of utmost importance. Prayer, to the mystic, is a helpful and reasonable way in which man may express his hope and desire for union with the Divine. It is an abstraction made into a means for the communication with the Divine Spirit. This concept of prayer is what with the Divine Spirit. This concept of prayer is what both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman calladad arge and verbal utterance. the Heavenly Body may be awakened if all the concomittant parts of prayer are present (3). Rabbi Chayim says almost the same thing about prayer and its relation to the soul: 100 kch 600 color office office of close of close of the soul: 200 color color color of the color of the close of the

The real difference between the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim" is not in the concept of prayer but in its purpose, time and intention and in its position in the Divine worship. Prayer, according to both, is an abstract concept. Prayer is a mystical concept of the mind according Rabbi Chayim as well as to Rabbi Shneor Zalman. Both consider the composition of prayer, its content and its relation to the faith, not as a form or a part of the fabric of Judaism, but as a sort of mystical communion with God.

The best way to understand prayer in its proper perspective, both in regard to the Chassidim and in regard to the Rabbinists, is to look at prayer from the mystical point of view. Prayer, according to the mystics, is the main function of life (Lurié). The soul of man, at its most exalted state (when it is called JNUJ), can only enjoy the divine love i.e.

4 - -

its real union with the Shechinah (the main source of adoration), is only through prayer. The soul, even when not in its pure state, can unite with the Shechinah after certain mystical changes have taken place in it through proper prayer. Prayer, therefore, is a sincere desirefor, or love of union with, the Divine. Nowhere in Jewish literature is the idea of prayer raised to such a high pitch of sublimity as in the writings of the mystics.

Since prayer, in mysticism, is the direct means of union with God, the only proper type of prayer is the mystic mood of prayer. The truly suppliant and prayerful person is the mystic. Both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman, as mystics, speak of prayer in that wein and it is only in the minor aspects of the subject that they disagree. The problem which is really a matter of conflict between these two sects is the subject of • JJ during prayer and the primacy of prayer in regard to Torah. Even here the differences are slight and negligible, Rabbi Chayim contending that the study of Torah has precedence over all things and he must therefore relegate prayer to a secondary position. לשתם אין בירושו בבקות כי זנין לשתה בירושו לטם תורה As he says: Pirva (57)

Rabbi Chayim even extends that point in its fullest

extent in regard to all mitzvothe on his part, does not seem to negate this position but Rabbi Shneor Zalman, as a Chassid his tendency towards attributing primacy to prayer is no more than would be expected. His apparent obiter dicta about Torah seems to be unintentional but He sets the study of the Torah upon a much higher plane than any of the Chassidim of previous generations. The position of prayer is subordimated to the equally important Torah study. In Bestian Chassidism, prayer was the primary essential of the Chassidic movement although study had a definite, albeit a subordinate, place. It should be understood that whereas prayer, in 32h is not subordinate to Torah it is not superior either. In the system of Rabbi Chayim Torah is the supreme function and prayer is only a part of the complex system of divine In this respect only do we find a very worship. distinct difference between Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor In general, taking all things into consideration, and assigning to each the proper weights we find little Zalman. that is fundamentally different in the philosophy of the Their differences lie mainly in their emphasis and in their manner of approach to the various aspects of the different subjects in the breader realm of Judaism.

The purpose of prayer and worship is, Saccording to Rabbi Shneor Zalman, to unite the soul of man with the Rabbi Chayim, however, thinks that prayer is the duty of man, not as an individual, but as a part diezen 12. As on can see elsewhere, Rabbi Chayim of held that union with God is made possible through the study of Torah (4), However, both agree that prayer must have of and must be from the heart. 163 (d'19- 6" 15 - 980 A A ניא - ליקטי אמריק - כ" ול erice excled adela KOIC 1 ותנה מצת שההה זו הארה היואורה ההינונית השעת התבלה ד"ו הארארות הנכש השנהית בו' הנה לאהי מצרגת שהצת שהשונים אוצים אבור כלי תיקה אפתפלה וציור לן אב האתלהתו אותה התעהה האותותיה כצורתה וזכוו להום הצביקית צוקני כ׳ האית שואיתו אין א וצב כא בקצושב שיצלה כרי לאיאה להרמו whill sight of the service when יקרושק ואורק. כמשיל הפיו שלכן נקחת אות כלל מאחר שאולפת וצוברת אחר בתבופ בברית הצותרים ברוא של צולם وموعد ادمدم عوم ماس مدار المدور ישבו אנה הלורת מאש היא האי וצר שוראוצה אשון שקר ושודה"ב אגבו ו אצראת ההינונים נקרשות צב וצה תמהי אתק משלה כל אותו אתקור ושרטר לבידו באצות ותקועי נבזווים . והיםן ANNY BUILD BUIL BUILD DIA CONK D סצולה נבלאה הצוק ומנוסה שמרגילות מפראת המבראת הבינונים ובריני קורא באמהים אהתפותא ג׳יב שפת אותת תבן שיצאת הצה י אהת ואה ואה היו הצר אצר תואות והכת נבשת השטהית אתובי כל מתשהות התקנות הטורצות ומניצות ואתרכ התוי שותהב צו אצוות ההתנהתי טהרת המתשהות והכוונכי וכל שולר שצמע הלה י שהא ושהיר מאין הלב כל מתשבות בהבלוק הטורצות ותניצנת השית בתבלה מדי ולק היוק ציו הכנה 15 Boly . 232 18222 gioli הראויה זכז נפט בבי ארכה ואבראל כי תנב מקת סומת ביז מדת של ידרה י טהרת היא שבתו התבוה וביא הנקרא הריון התכון המברים או ארבי כוונה השליא 1 אל הקצה ארות המצות ומנרגות צר סוף כל בראין.

Rabbi Shneor Zalman takes the position that prayer helps man to reach God - to unite with God. Prayer helps one to fight and banish the evil inclination. The "Tanya" points out in fight and banish the evil inclination. for pli Soa pinto ede 11 NS poor la voira 600 300 pilo pinto ede 11 NS poor pinto pilo And this is the reason that our Rabbis decreed that the prayer Windo be said thrice daily because of the sin of not learning, since no man is immune to that daily sin.

Prayer is an aid to the study of Torah. The position of Torah is not questioned and holds the highest position. In this manner Rabbi Shneor Zalman created a "modus vivendi" for a new type of Chassid, with prayer still the greatest of the forces of the upper worlds, but without minimizing the value of Torah study. He emhasizes that it is within the power of man to banish evil at all times. Evil is the result of the absence of the good and not the outcome of some material damage in act, thought or object of worship. Neglect, rather then any other thing, causes all evil. Prayer may bring about the worship of God and that form of worship 3112. should be with great

In prayer, Rabbi Chayim claims that the repitition of words is of more significance than المراح. Rabbi Chayim makes prayer a duty which must be performed by the movement of the lips:-المراح المراح مراحي مراحي المراح المراح مراحي مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح المراح مراح مراح مراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراحي مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراح مراحي المراحي مراحي مراحي

Praise of the Deity and imploring for something material

is not real prayer. Praise is a human perception and is not applicable to God. God is above praise and what man must strive for is union with God. Prayer, therefore, is a reasonable thing and not merely hopeful yearning. The result of prayer, therefore, is permanent and comes to those who believe in the genuiness of prayer and apply it as a rational lever in their daily life.

It follows, therefore, that both Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman agree that prayer is a reasonable part of life and gains its full significance when it is habitual. To Rabbi Chayim the habit of praying is beneficial in itself while to Rabbi Shneor Zalman the act of prayer is significant because it is a means toward a Intention (\Im_{j}) , therefore, is of better end. supreme importance to Rabbi Shneor Zalman, whereas it is of lesser significance (though if has a degree of importance) to Rabbi Chayim. It is a sign of hopefulness to Rabbi Shnepr Zalman, a means of faith. It a appears that Rabbi Chayim would contend that praying is an act which benefits the person praying even though he does not understand the entire ades of prayer and the profound philosophy underlying it. He actually benefits by the mere eperience of prayer. Prayer comes essily to those whb pray constantly. However, union with the

Divine is only possible in real communion which is devoid of personal and material aspects of human desire.

Prayer, therefore, is a reasonable thing and not merely a hopeful yearning. The result of prayer is permanent and comes to those who believe in the genuineness of prayer and apply prayer as a rational lever in their daily life. BEROCHOS, 26
 אברפת תקן אפאת שחרית שעאת (הישית כה) וישכק אברפת הבקר שול השור שווין געיצה שולה וישכת אבשיה באביה שולה ביול השווין געיצה שולה אבשיה אבשיה שלה אישור השווין געיצה שווין געיצה שונים אבשיה אבשיה השווין אישיה בשווין אישיה באביה אבשית ביולי אישיה בשווין גער באביה שווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין בי יצאר לפויק בי שנה אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין בי יצאר לפוי בי ישבור שווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה בשווין אישיה ביצור בי גבוין אבוין בי יצאר לפוי בי ישבור ביאיה בשווין בי גבוין אישיה בשווין בי יצאר לפוי בי ישבור ביאיה ביאר בי גערים ביאיה ביאר בי גבויק בי גבוין בי יצאר לפוי בי ישבור ביאיה ביאר ביאיה איבוי בי גבוין אישיה ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביארי ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביארי ביאיה ביארי ביאיה ביאריק בי יצאר לווין שווין בי יצאר ביאיה ביאר ביאיה ביארי ביאיה ביארי בי גבוין בי יצאר ביאיה ביאויה ביארי ביאיה ביצו ביאיה באביה ביאיה ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביאיה ביצו ביאיה ביאיייייייין ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאיה ביאי

3) TANYA, chapter XIII

 The Concept of Torah and Its Study

The position which the study of Torah holds in judaism is unique. This position is peculiar only because of the concept of Torah, which is identical in all factions of Judaism. This concept encompasses the entire ethical and most sacred religious duties. A11 the factions promulgate the principle that through the study of Torah one can accomplish the greatest good. Mastery of the Torah enables the scholar to worship God by imparting th him knowledge of the Lord and his commandments. Rabbi Chayim emphasised this phase of Torah by fressing the fact that study is a prelude to action. On the other hand, Rabbi Shnepr Zalman emphasised the study of the Torah because that action is, in itself, a means of divine worship. The author of the "Tanya" made this position of learning a permanent characteristic of his Kabbalastic lore as well as one of the principles of his entire Chassidic tendency. He tried to make his teaching a thing accessible to all people through the change in emphasis from piety and devotion to study of the Torah.

From the life and work of Rabbi Chayim it is apparent that he was, first and foremost, a teacher and not a philosopher. His life and works, although they bear testimony of a definite Rabbinic trend in Judaism, do not in any way negate the aforementioned conclusion. As a teacher he naturally soled as a doctrinaire of principles in which he sincerely believed. His doctrine was the Torsh, the penaces to all evil. In our modern for lance we would substitute Education for their use of the word Torsh. The idea of Torsh permeates all the thoughts, acts and belief of the suthor of the "Nefesh Hacheyim". Through Torsh man can achieve the greatest good and through its neglect, bring about the greatest evel. His sincere belief in Torsh, as the prime and perfect model for life, made Eabbi Cheyim the perennial student. It caused him to give up all worldly life; sell his wife's jewelry; give up his business and devote his time to study and the indoctrination of the principles with which he was imbued.

From the life and works of Rabbi Shneor Zalman we may learn, in a like manner, that he was, primarily, the philosopher and mester not the genuine teacher that Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin was. Rabbi Shneor Zalman was a great Talmudist, imbued with the spirit and love for God. Although he was influenced by that emotion and was always known for his personal himility and demogratic tendencies, he could not Quite understand the plain man, nor did he have much patience with the ordinary uncultured person. Despite the fact that he was the leader of a sect which was preaching the doctrine of brotherhood and importance of the common man, yet he was too much of the scholar and the philosopher to be thorough-

ly understood by the averagem man.

work we find that profound line of reasoning and living. paradoxically, but true nevertheless, the great exponent of the masses understood the common man much less than the leader of the elite and select. It is therefore, because of this peculiar phenomenon in the personality of the two men and their high and influential position in Jewish life that their life works were abde to serve as a harmonizing influence in Jewish life and help bring about an eventual merger between Rabbinic Judaism and Chassidism.

According to the ideas of Rabbi Shneor Zalman we could dub him a rationalist. He does not deal with the practical problems of the masses. In Rabbi Chayim's work, however, we find a wrestling with practical matters, a use of philosophy as a means for a practical solution. This can best be appreciated from a examination of parallel quotations of both:

תלאלך תורה שקולה כנאד כל האצוות להי שנאלו הן לגושית הלהה התורה היא אצון ואת לגוש לנו האשכלת שתלהשת הה הצוונה וליאודה

The learning of the Torah, a more weighty than all the precepts, (For the mitzvoth are mere clothing but the Torah is food and clothing for the thinking soul that clothes itself in thinking and learning. (Spinancia) הרי דטן תורתי יקר אאג הצוני ותי יותר גבל המצוות לשמה הקרושת ואהרת המחשהה ברא

Behold, the who studies His Torah is most cherished in the eyes of God; more than the performance of the precepts in holiness and purity of thought as is fitting.

The teacher speaks about actual learning and in its evaluation is pragmatic and practical as a teacher would be. It is true that he takes into consideration all philosophical and pedagogical principles involved therin. His main purpose, however, as a teacher is the activity, the process of learning. It is different with the philosopher, Shneor Zalman. To him the question of learning is a manter of abstraction. He finds interest in the questions; What value can we put to learning and how does that compare with the sum total of Torah? Surely the teacher would not deny such evaluations if he were concerned with them because they were material to the object lesson, but that is not his scope home. The same philosopher, even when he touches upon the practical side of the same question, looks at it from the ivory tower of the scholar. In speaking of actual learning:

1

1

t.

1

ŧ

אכל באלג ביוסך בגורב יוגר אכל במצוות שיביטו מתביצה שביא יחוד גלאות איונים.

The act of the study of bhe Torah is greater than all the precepts - Alan even prayer, which is the union with the upper worlds. נפש פאיים העיקר הכל מצוות הוא חלק העישב ולברת המחשבה אינה סולטו מצלרפת למדשב ולמצוה

The basis of all precepts is that part which deals with its performance, whereas purification of the thought is merely joined to the act or the precept.

Although the "Tanya" considered the study of Torah very highly (for he said that "sincé the destruction of the temple, God has no other resting place tham the four ells of the Halacha)(1) still his conception of the efficacy of Torah is not the same as that of Rabbi Chayim. According to the "Tanya" study is merely another form of worship. Its entire philosophy is permeated with the idea of the immanence of God. The constant immanence of the living presence of God in all creation requires enthusiasm and adhesion to the devine spirit.

Rabbi Chayim on the other hand, did not agree to Study need not necessarily start with enthusiasm. that. As a teacher, he knew that the study of the Torah itself, even without enthusiasm, could become a means of attaining that category designated as the highest type of learning SURE namely: studying the Torah . In the early stages of the study of the Torah the student cannot acquire that depth of understanding or extent of knowledge, that one studying the Torah and is commonly understood to possess. On the whole, however, assiduous study of the Torah, will perfect one so that he will finally reach the highest rung of spiritual and intellectual attainment called " JAUS min". It is therefore, wrong to look askance upon the one who studies without enthusiasm, rather one should duly respect and honor him, despite the fact that he is not a scholar. The real test of the student is not in what manner he learns but rather what he learns.

Remarks and Evaluation

In his Toldoth Haposkim, Chones establishes the fact that the "Nefesh Hachayim" was merely a manual for practice for the Misnagdim:

practice for and provide the state of the s

The truth of the matter is that Rabbi Chayim did not really oppose the Chassidim in principle and even would have wished to make peace with them. His biographer (1) shows us that Rabbi Chayim's attitude towards the new Chassidism was quite different from that of the Gaon. The biographer claims (and his contention is partly confirmed by the arguments offered above in the chapter, 'The Comparative Analysis of the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim" ' (2) that the "Beshtian Chassidism did not come to uproot any principles in Judaism nor to change any of the

legal customs from established form. Chassidism merely wanted to enliven the people of Israel through its new teaching which was, according to its attitude, the best." Rabbi Shapiro is corroborated by the contents of the "Nefesh Hachayim" (3): אַק באה איואן אור הרבת אוקים וחכנו האב החרו אינאם יואר באה ויועים: אקבוד כא זיקר איודם הסברי יראופי ואוסר כל הואים. באאו הביצות זיקר ביסק האוהק האקראות ובלכות ארובות.... כי יסוח לכב כי כוונתם לטאום אבו או צו הדרק ישכון הם אור האורה And also of those people who desire the nearness of God, they have chosen for themselves to indulge in study every day mainly as a basis for learning; from the books of $20/N \neq 30$; without setting aside time for basic learning of our holy Torah and its variour departments May God forgive them! Their intention is worthy but this is not the manner through which the light of the Torah may rest with them.

From the above quotation it may be logically deduced (as Rabbi Shapiro concludes) that Rabbi Chayim claims:

- Chasidism is not contrary to Rabbinic Judaism. 1)
- Chassidism is a new path in Judaism, not pure 2) faith,
- It was not the intention of Chassidism to form a 3) new sect in Judaism.
- The Besht and his disciples interpreted Judaism 4) in this manner.

Rabbi Chayim did not agree with, nor see any possibility of adhering to, the philosophy of Chassidism because, he claimed, it did not foster pure faith, Jold alle. biographer makes the addittional point that while Rabbi Chayim admits that Chassidism is fundamentally and intrinsically worthwhile, it is quite mistaken in its

The Chassidic version of Rabbi Chayim's atticude method.

towards Chassidism is that it constituted a complete conciliation between Rabbi Chayim, who can be considered the official representative of Rabbinic Judaism, and Rabbi Shneor Zalman, who was the acknowledged leader of the Chassidim. According to one version, Rabbi Chayim and Rabbi Shneor Zalman met in Minsk although the year is not exactly indicated (4). At this meeting, Rabbi Shneor Zalman vindicated the entire attitude of the Gaon. He forgave him for his rudeness in not meeting him and for his participation in the Poh and all the Gaon's unfriendly actions in the persecution of the Chassidim. According to this biographer (P. Ruderman), Rabbi Shneor Zalman blamed everything upon the mother of the Gaon who had a great influence on him and being unaware of the true nature of Chassidism, she spoke out strongly against The Gaon was not a man who took an interest in it. worldly affairs, and in secular matters he was notoriously ill informed.

Although Isaac Suwalsky, in the Hapeles Corroborates Ruderman in regard to Rabbi Chayim's attitude towards Chassidism, and Finn and Chones Gagree with him in regard to Rabbi Shneor Zalman's attitude towards Rabbi Chayim, yet I find it difficult to recwards Rabbi Chayim, yet I find it difficult to reconcile Rderman's contentions with conflicting texts of the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim".

وعرود درارد ک In his (), Ruderman says (?):

מטבען בינ שיוש שוובה שלום ורודף שלום וחפף חיוק רשושות מטרא ביתה שש לימוף בקבלה כי שוק לבמדיט שת לומור מטרא ביתה שש מימון כל דמנאנון הכלט ולבטף מכל וכל המעמיד שושר דשק ממנן כל דמנאנון הכלט ולבטף מכל וכל הוא בפלפול בפרט שות ישרת בימום ביתה טויק אק הקבלה שובה גק שות הפשוט במובן נרשה ביטר ביור הקבלה באניש שושר שוארין כקוף שארי בטודק האנוך הקבלה בשבה מובנת וקלה והדרק קברה.

Despite definite expressions of that opinion by competent students of both the "Tanya" and the "Nefesh Hachayim", I do not think that Rabbi Chayim imitated the "Tanya", though that may have been his original intention. Rabbi Chayim makes out a strong case for the Misnagdim but I donot believe that his work was intended as a counter argument against Chassidism and certainly not in imitation of the leading apology for that group. This is especially evident when we view, critically, his thorough explanation of ارر. It is therefore logical to infer from all that has been said that the intention of the "Nefesh Hachayim" was not to negate the teachings of Chassidism but to give the world a proper manuel for In this respect, M.M. Horowitz (8) Rabbinic Judaism. serves to corroborate the contention that has already

been made. געון רך אאר כי הדהר לב יאר שאת אק אהוסידאת אל בתוכלה החדשה היושכנצית תורת משה הק אהוסידאת אלי נתנה לדמון אבי תומנין המתצוק נהיאו ההאל אורי השקר וכו גווק נשות שבנו גול כל הימות הטארונית מימו לקופות הן מנאת וצר היות הזה ונראה כי צוון ששבת שחסורות וזכל דגלה כי אוטי היה שביתה צנו מי יודד גוק אתרו צור רגטינו צל דרכי גומונת ישראל. There is no doubt that Rabbi Shneor Zalman's entire tendency in Chassidism, as it is incorporated in the "Tanya", was to placate the Misnagdim. In many respects the "Tanya" must be considered as an apologetic for Chassidism, especially where the author endeavors to apologize for the transgressions of the Chassidim, their lack of Torah study, their levity in the performance of the serious mitzvoth and for their general attitude toward Judaism. He also tried to return the average Jew to his duty of which the Beshtian Chassidism had relieved him to a large extent. Rabbi Shneor Zalman established the foundations of faith upon the rationalistic basis and thereby made the yoke of Chassidism a heavy one for its adherents. In this respect Shneor Zalman was not entirely successful, for two reasons. First of all, not all the Chassidim accepted the teachings which Shneor Zalman had so clearly stated in his "Tanya" and then again, a great many of the Misnagdim were not quite ready for this change in the Chassidic attitude.

It was not until after the death of the Gaon and the publication of the "Nefesh Hachayim" that a beal conciliation between Rabbinism and Chassidism took place. The formen had already lost its sway over the multitudes of Jewry and

Chasside tendencies were beginning to be visible in the most ultra rabbinistic circles. The Yeshitra of Volozhin was full of students of Chassidic stock. movement was making inroads into the innermost and most The Haskalah unexpected places of the orthodox homes. circumstances a modus vivendi had to be found for the Rabbinists. This 'way of life' was set down in an elaborate fashion in the "Nefesh Hachayim". Rabbi Chayim never mentions the Chassidim by name, only referring to them in a very indirect manner. His references were also not quite so peercing in their venom as those which were made by his predecessors. All the references that may be construed as antagonistic should be interpreted as Rabbi Shapiro regards them (9).

It is difficult to agree with P. Ruderman in his contention that the "Nefesh Hachayim" mimicked the "Tanya": ()

הסברי היאיציו הקבלב האניא אשר אארין כקוץ אארי האצץ האציק רי איים מואאלין הסברי נכש האיים הא האר אר הקבלה השבה מובנא וקטר והדרק קצרה.

We must weigh Ruderman's remark carefully and even admit that there may be some truth in his contention. However, it would be better to say that Rabbi Chayim attempted to conciliate Rabbinism and Chassidism. This conclusion is based on the concurrence of the opinion of the leading

scholars on this subject. Hurwitz and Shapiro claim that Rabbi Chayim was not antagonistic towards Chassidism. Shechter feels that Shneor Zalman's philosophy is, not only worthwhile but, even constitutes a real contribution to Jewish ideology. (1)

The works of S. Ladier or of Mendel Witipsker read with attention and without western preconception, certainly give the impression of both originality and depth of thought. But most characteristic of all is the passionate yearnings of authors such as these towards the Divine. The reader is astonished and moved by the intense sincerity and ordour of their longing after God.

Chones claims that Rabbi Chayim directed his criticisms, contained in his "Nefesh Hachayim", against the Haskalah movement. We may therefore conclude that the two, formerly antagonistic movements, met and were reconciled. This is collaborated by Dybnow in his 'History of the Jews in Russia and Poland', where he states that,

"Chassidism and Rabbinism had reason to fear the Haskalah movement and may have made peace for the sake of combatting a common enemy".

The only official biographer of Rabbi Chayim of Volozhin, who was one of the disciples of the former, and a student of the Yeshiva of Volozhin, claims that Rabbi Chayim was not opposed to Chassidism in principle. In his biography, Rabbi Shapiro states that Rabbi Chayim believe that Chassidism was a new path in Judaism, tending to depath

from the pure and true path, adlad apply is. The founders of the movement (Chassidism), however, never thought of it, or intentionally interpreted it, in that way. About the views of Rabbi Chayim on Chassidism his biographer has this to say: אבל לא כן היתה השקבת הזרת לאויה אבי דעתי לא הא החו החטידות השטונית לעור אות היהדות או אפונת מנהאי דת מצורתם הקבוצה היא רוצה רן אהמיות את יש ישרול א ובי טמי מרכה אבשים אשר אבי שרול א ובי טמי מרכה אבשים אשר אבי דעת היא טובים ועזולות אוק כי לבו דעת היא טוצה .232

It is readily apparent that the veew of Rabbi Chayim was quite different from that of his venerated teacher, the Gaon of Vilna. According to the former, the Beshtian Chassidism did not come to uproot Judaism, nor to change any of the customs and mores of the religion from their set form. Chassidism merely wished to stimulate and invigorate the decadent and lip-service form of the existing Rabbinic Chassidism offered a remarkable cure for the Judaism. admitted evils of Rabbinism. Just as its precepts were revolutionary in regard to the times, so also were the spiritual therapeutics which it offered for the diseased However, according to Rabbi Chayim's soul of Judaism. point of view, the methods used by the Chassidim fell far sk short of their lofty and commendable aim.

If we take this estimation of Rabbi Chayim at its face value and add to it Chones' opinion as expressed in the 'Toldoth Haposkim (1):

נדיש האוות מהאר את ואדות הדגורה שדר הנבצית אבל אדם אישהאל בדגורה שאת העצות אבל אדם אישהאל בנגד שאת האורים האדשות מקרוב באן.

it becomes evident that it was definitely not the intention of Rabbi Chayim that his "Nefesh Hachayim" be considered as a rebuttal against the powerful influence excercised by the "Tanya", nor even that it was an attempted attack against Chassidism. The most that can be said in any description of its ultimate goal (if it must be considered as having been written against something) is that it was undoubtedly intended as a polemic against the new movement which threatened Judaism externally, namely the Enlightenment, which emanated chiefly from Berlin, or as we have previously dubbed the newest of the movements, Berlinism.

In summation we may say that the preponderance of evidence is on the side of those who contend that the "Nefesh Hachayim" was not actually, or even pointedly, against Chassidism. Since its tone is friendly, its attitude apologetic, and its entire framework definitely not hostile to Chassidic lore, it is safe toassume that the book was not written against Chassidism, but, bather that, aside from its ostensible purpose to serve as a guide for Rabbinic Judaism, it is more than likely that the main purpose of the "Nefesh Hachayim" was an attempt to arm jewry against the enemy common to both the Chassidim and to the Misnegdim, i.e. Berlinism, the new Enlighterment.

NOTES

to

Remarks and Ex

-10	Evaluation

1)	Shapiro; M.S.	TOLDOTH RABBI CHAYIM M'VOLOZHIN	p. 16
2)	See above - Chap.	VI - The "Tanya" and the "No Hachayim" in a Comparative A	efesh Analy si s
3)	Nefesh Hachayim	SHAAR , chap. 1	
4)	Ruderman; P.	HASHACHAR	p. 97,98 note 17
5)	Suwalsky; I.	HAPELES	
6)	Finn, S. J.	KNESSETH YISROEL	p. 347
	c/f Chones; S.M.	TOLDOTH HAPOSKIM	
7)	Ruderman;P.	HASHACHER	þ. 96
8)	Harwitz; M.M.	DERECH AYTZ CHAYIM	p. 88
9)	Shapiro; M.S.	TOLDOTH RABBI CHAYIM M'VOLOZHIN	
10)	Ruderman; P.	HA SHAC HER	
11)	Shechter; S	STUDIES IN JUDAISM vol. L	p. 43
12)	Chones; S.M.	TOLDOTH HAPOSKIM	p. 451

Bibliography

אכנא ורהנא שניאר לאון

חיים היל יצחק בקיך וואאינין

רבי יקואיאל שורי קשואאלהאר

תנוא - דם אורת התשובה

נפש האיים

ספר בלר בעת זורבי תקופות האוני התראי

3"ah Den

Albeha adoreda

ספר הית רהי

Revery leyonal phanola

פרה מלאני ומפואת חבייה הולקה) תולהות רהי חיים מוואלאניון

Vol IV - No.6 Cer Ang Alicola Pub colo

ספר תולדאת הפוסקום

ווילנא , תרצ ווילנא , תקל"י היצטרקוב, תרצ"ה

ורשה הרצין

הלישותה הרצה

2°orh, aleGara

הרשין ארפיץ

1096 , 1.08%

KJS111

ניו יארק, אוקט. איאו

ווארשא, תרפיה

חיים, יצחק בלטן שמזן בלבעה חיים מאיר בייטמאן בי שא בורבצקי מרכי טיטצבוים מ. שבירב

שבילי האנוק

oxjich .N.e

[השחר] ווישן , תרלה גרוקי וויטנשי, תריק קרשק א, תריק השרשין , תריה השרשין , תריה

11210 , 100 7/0/1

1856 [c]].[] [ed. ptettin]

68621-111-1658

1909 ICAICA

1928 - Densych MI I no. 6 (which ero. 21) האקפה בללית א החסיצים SICOR IDES קריה נאמנה ברק צר חייק קורות ההיצוטוביה תולבות הפוסקים אית אלית האסיצות וההשכוה חטידות ותחוקים רהי איים אווסולאונין האר בדאו

lich usala hoo 10 fol Siche 1'3 foli Siche אנאמ מנצל הצוו הורוויף יצאק סלבלסקי orgh Den Itre יה לאוון A.11212 S.i.e fillola Sie שהילי האינלק

ΒΙΒΙΙΟ G R Α Ρ Η Υ

Abelson; J.

Baron; Salo, W.

Bension; Ariel

Dubnow: S.M.

Graetz; H.

Margolies; Max,L & Marx; Alexander

Minkin; Jacob, S

Pringle-Pattison; A, S. THE IDEA OF GOD

Raisin; Jacob, S.

Rogers; Arthur, K.

Schechter; S.

Spiegel; Shalom Waite;A.E.

JEWISH MYSTICISM

A SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE JEWS Vol.II

THE ZOHAR

- HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA AND POLAND Vol.I
- HISTORY OF THE JEWS Vol.V
- A HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE
- THE ROMANCE OF HASSIDISM

THE HASKALAH MOVEMENT

- A STUDENT'S HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY
- STUDIES IN JUDAISM Vol.I

HEBREW REBORN

THE HOLY KABBALAH

London, 1913 New York, 1937

London, 1932 Philadelphia, 1916

Philadelphia, 1898

Philadelphia, 1927

New York. 1935

New York, 1920

Philadelphia, 1913

New York, 1905

Philadelphia, 1896

Magnania

New York, 1930 London, 1929