

54 (1979): 'Ha-Mahloket al Moreshet Habad', *Tarbiz*, vol. 49 (1980). R. Dov Ber succeeded to leadership of Habad in 1813 after the death of his father, and settled in the town of Lubavitch. He was opposed by R. Aaron Halevi Horowitz (d. 1829), who became a rival Hasidic leader in Saroselye. R. Dov Ber is unusual among early Hasidic leaders in his concern for publishing. Immediately after the Napoleonic war, despite the devastation of the area, he ensured the publication of his father's *Shulhan Arukh* (Kopyszt and Shklov, 1814), and a collection of R. Shneur Zalman's letters, *Iggeret ha-Kodesh* (Shklov, 1814). He then edited and published his own transcripts of his father's teachings: *Seder Tefilot mi-Kol ha-Shanah... im Perush ha-Mittler and Burei ha-Zohar* (both Kopyszt, 1816). Subsequently about eight volumes of R. Dov Ber's teachings were printed during his lifetime, most of them by a printer in Kopyszt who was one of his followers. Other tracts and discourses were published posthumously. His best-known works are: *Kimrey ha-Hitpadlut* (Königsberg, 1831?), a discussion of ecstasy in prayer which circulated in manuscript long before its posthumous publication; *Pokeah Iyrim*, a tract in Yiddish (? 1817); *Shaar ha-Teshuvah ve-Ha-Tefilah I-II* (Shklov, 1817-18); *Derech Hayyim* (Kopyszt, 1819); *Ner Mizvot ve-Torat Or*, which includes a manual on contemplation (Kopyszt, 1820); *Aretz Rosh* (Kopyszt, 1821); *Imrei Binah* (Kopyszt, 1821); *Shaarei Orat* (Kopyszt, 1822); *Al Totar et Meav* (Kfar Habad, 1976), a long discourse delivered in the presence of R. Akiva Eger in 1825; *Torat Hayyim* (Kopyszt, 1826); *Bad Kodesh*, a long epistle addressed to the Governor of Vitebsk (Warsaw, 1871). Publication of R. Dov Ber's writings still continues in a series entitled *Maamarot Admur ha-Emitsa* (Brooklyn, 1985-6). Two volumes of his halakic teachings have also been published: *Piskei Dinim... Yoreh Deah* (Brooklyn 1958), *Piskei Dinim... Even ha-Ezer* (Brooklyn, 1977).

6 Much scholarly attention has been devoted to this theme; see note 45 above.
7 For the bibliography of Habad see A. M. Haberman, 'Shaarei Habad', in *Alai Ayin* (Jerusalem, 1948-52); Y. Mondshem, *Torat Habad*, vols. 1-2 (Kfar Habad, 1982-4). The history and thought of Habad are discussed in M. Teitelbaum, *Ha-Rav mi-Lyadit u-Miflegat Habad* (Warsaw, 1910-13); R. Schatz, 'Antt-spiritualizm ba-Hasidut, Molad, nos. 171-2 (1962); L. Jacobs, *Tract on Ecstasy* (London, 1963); id., *Seeker of Unity* (London, 1966); N. Mindel, *Rabbi Shneur Zalman* (New York, 1969); id., *The Philosophy of Chabad* (New York, 1974); *Sefar hakani—Kovrei Maamarim al... R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit* (Jerusalem, 1969); M. Hallamish, 'Mishnato ha-Iyunit shel R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit', doctoral thesis (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1976); id., 'Al Mahadurot ha-Sefer "Torah Or", *Alai Sefar*, vol. 5 (1978); id., 'Torat ha-Tedakah be-Mishnato shel R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit', *Daat*, no. 1 (1978); id., 'Yahasei Zaddik ve-Edah be-Mishnat R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit', *Hevra ve-Historiya* (Jerusalem, 1980); id., 'Alim Rishonim mi-Perush ha-Tanya', *Daat*, no. 13 (1984); id., *Netiv la-Tanya* (Tel Aviv, 1987); Y. Jacobson, 'Torat ha-Beriah shel R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit', *Eshel Be'er Sheva* (1976); R. Eilior (note 5 above) and 'Viknah Minsk', *Mehkeret Yemshalayim be-Mahshevet Yisrael* no. 4 (1982). 'La-Dialektika shel Shelemu ve-Gilyu' *Daat*, no. 9 (1982), 'Mekomo shel ha-Adam ba-Avodat ha-Shem ha-Habadit', *Daat*, no. 12 (1984), 'Iyyunim be-Mahshevet Habad', *Daat*, no. 16 (1986); T. Ross, 'Shnei Perushim le-Torat ha-Tsimsum: R. Hayyim mi-Volozhyn ve-R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit', *Mehkeret Yemshalayim be-Mahshevet Yisrael*, no. 2 (1982); Foxbruner (note 2 above); I. Ekkes, 'Aliyato shel R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit le-Edmat Manhigut', *Tarbiz*, vol. 54 (1983); id., 'Darko shel R. Shneur Zalman mi-Lyadit ke-Manhig shel Hasidim', *Jubilee Vol. of Zion*, vol. 50 (1986); Loewenthal, 'Early Hasidic Teachings—Esoteric Mysticism, or a medium of Communal Leadership?' *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 37 (1986); id., 'The Apotheosis of Action in Early Habad', *Daat*, no. 18 (1986-7). Letters concerning early Habad are collected in D. Z. Hillmann, *Iggeret Baal ha-Tanya u-Biurey*

Doro (Jerusalem, 1953) and S. B. Levin, *Iggeret Kodesh me-eti Admur ha-Zaken, Admur ha-Emitsa, Admur ha-Temach Tsadek* (Brooklyn, 1984). See also E. Kripter in *Tarbiz*, vol. 47 (1978). An account of the first three generations of Habad written by a follower of the Kopyszt line is H. H. Hielman's *Beit Rebbe* (Berdichev, 1992). See also the exposition of Habad thought by Tishby and Dan in 'Torat ha-Hasidim ve-Siftunah', *Hebrew Encyclopedia*, vol. 17, collected in A. Rubinstein, *Perakim be-Torat ha-Hasidim u-ve-Toledotיה* (Jerusalem, 1978).

8 *Toldot Yankov Yosef* (Koretz, 1780), fols. 20a, 29b. Cf. G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* (London, 1971), p. 214.

9 *Maggid Devarav le-Yankov*, ed. R. Schatz (Jerusalem, 1976), p. 74, sec. 51. *Ibid.*, p. 186, sec. 110. Scholem considers the concepts of *bitul* and *unio mystica* through *devekut* to be primarily of Hasidic origin, relating particularly to the Maggid and his immediate disciples (note 8 above, pp. 214, 222-7). Tishby, by contrast, discerns parallel ideas in earlier kabbalistic texts, such as Azriel of Gerona's commentary on the *aggadot* (13th cent.) and R. Eliyahu di Vidas' *Reshit Hokhmah*, a work known to have been studied in eighteenth-century Eastern Europe. See I. Tishby, *Mishnat ha-Zohar*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1961), p. 289, n. 69.

10 See Dresner, Schatz and Nigal (note 4 above).
11 The question of to whom the early Hasidic teachings on *bitul* and *devekut* were addressed has received contrasting answers. Scholem suggested that they were addressed to everyone (note 8 above, pp. 203-27). The contrary view—that they were directly relevant only to a small elite of incipient leaders—has been expressed by Rapoport-Albert (note 4 above), pp. 296-317, and Loewenthal, 'Early Hasidic Teachings' (note 7 above), p. 64. See also G. Nigal, 'Al Mekorot ha-Devekut be-Siftut Reshit ha-Hasidut', in *Kiryat Sefar*, vol. 46 (1970-1), p. 343.

12 See Loewenthal, 'The Apotheosis of Action' (note 7 above) on R. Shneur Zalman's teachings on the role of the practical mitzvot in the quest for *bitul*.
13 Concerning R. Avraham of Kalisk, see J. G. Weiss, 'R. Avraham Kalisker's concept of communion', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 6 (1955); Z. Gries, 'mi-Mitos la-Etos, Kavim, li-Demuto shel R. Avraham mi-Kalisk', *Umah ve-Toledotיה* (Jerusalem, 1984). The controversy began with R. Shneur Zalman's publication of *Tanya*, which makes a strong demand on the individual to strive for an elevated level of spiritual attainment. R. Avraham feared this would be too much for the ordinary person: 'too much oil in the lamp will extinguish the flame' (Hillmann, note 7 above, p. 105). Various aspects of the controversy have been discussed by A. J. Braver, in *Kiryat Sefar*, vol. 1 (1924); Eilior, 'Viknah Minsk' (note 7 above), p. 193 ff. I. Ekkes, in *Tarbiz*, vol. 54 (1983).

14 In Habad thought, the basic concept of the Zaddik was pushed to a corner, 'Tishby and Dan, note 7 above, col. 783). Schatz maintains a more extreme view (note 7 above), p. 521-2. Many of the points raised in that article have been answered by Moshe Hallamish in his doctoral thesis (note 2 above), p. 233 ff. He discusses R. Shneur Zalman's concept of the Zaddik on pp. 352-63, and in his 'Yahasei Zaddik' (note 7 above). See also Eilior, 'Viknah Minsk' (note 7 above), p. 193, and Gries (note 14 above), p. 119, n. 10. In addition see the works by Ekkes in note 7 above, and Foxbruner (note 2 above), pp. 149, 195, 217, 267-8.
15 See note 7 above, Hillmann, pp. 58-69; Levin, pp. 75-9, 103-5; Mindel, *Rabbi Shneur Zalman*, pp. 109-18.

16 Levin, op. cit., p. 47.

17 M. Wilensky, *Hasidim u-Mingegedim*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1970), p. 276

18 *Tanya* I, ch. 2, fol. 7a, explaining T. B. Ketubot 111b: 'He who cleaves to a scholar is considered as if he cleaved to the Shekhinah.'

19 *Tanya* IV, sec. 27, fol. 145b-147b. R. Menahem Mendel, who travelled to the Holy

- Land in 1777, was an older colleague and teacher of Rabbi Shneur Zalman. On the relationship between them see Etkes, 'Aliyato shel R. Shneur Zalman' (note 7 above).
- 21 *Mamarei Admur ha-Zaken* (MAHZ) 5568 (Brooklyn, 1972), p. 26. For this and the following points I am indebted to Foxbruner's collection of sources on Zaddikism in Habad (note 2 above), pp. 195, 217, 267–8. 'Unifications' are a mystical joining of soul to soul, the importance of which is emphasized in the Lurianic Kabbalah. See *Sharei Kedushah*, III: 6; *Shaar Ruah ha-Kodesh* (Tel Aviv, 1963), pp. 74–6, 108–9, 111; *Shaar ha-Yihudim* (Koretz, 1783), fol. 1a, 4c–5b.
- 22 MAHZ *Eihalekh Liozna* (Brooklyn 1957), p. 36.
- 23 MAHZ 5569 (Brooklyn 1981), p. 102.
- 24 *Mamarei Admur ha-Zaken ha-Ketanim* (Brooklyn, 1981), ed. S. B. Levin with notes, an informative article on the development of R. Shneur Zalman's teachings and a chronological list of known discourses from the earliest years to 1801.
- 25 *ibid.*, p. 58.
- 26 *ibid.*, p. 130. See R. Schatz, 'Perusho shel ha-Besht le-Mizmor 107', *Tarbiz*, vol. 42 (1972–3); (Scholem disputes the attribution of the text discussed in this article to the Baal Shem Tov and considers it was written by R. Mendel of Bar. See note 8 above, p. 189. See also Foxbruner, note 2 above, p. 98.)
- 27 MAHZ *ha-Ketanim*, p. 314.
- 28 *ibid.*, p. 535. Concerning these aspects of Zaddikism in Habad, see Foxbruner (note 2 above), p. 295, no. 108.
- 29 Y. Mondshem (ed.), *Likutei Reshinot u-Maasivot* (Kfar Habad, 1966), p. 43.
- 30 Levin (note 7 above), p. 235.
- 31 *ibid.*, pp. 53–9. Part of this letter is printed in *Tanya* IV, sec. 22, fol. 134a. Similar ideas are expressed by R. Menahem Mendel of Vitebsk and R. Avraham of Kalisk in Y. Barnai, *Iggerot Hasidim me-Erets Israel* (Jerusalem, 1980), pp. 153–5, 234–8. Cf. Gries (note 14 above), p. 119, n. 10, and Etkes, 'Darko shel R. Shneur Zalman' (note 7 above), p. 331.
- 32 Elsewhere R. Shneur Zalman openly declares that he employs the Lurianic teachings in order to explain the ideas of the founders of Hasidism. See *Tanya* IV, sec. 25, fol. 141b.
- 33 *Eis Hayyim*, Portal 48, ch. 2, states that 'the Jew has a soul . . . of holiness.' Portal 50, ch. 2, describes the Animal Soul, which is from *kefirat nogah*, a spiritual concealment of the Divine. On this dualism in the make-up of the individual in the Lurianic writings, see I. Tishby, *Torat ha-Ra ve-ha-Kelipot be-Kabbalat ha-Ari* (Jerusalem, 1966), pp. 105–8. The theme of the Divine Soul is found in the writings of Judah Halevi, cf. *Kuzari* I: 27, 95, 103. It is also expounded in the thought of R. Judah Loeb, the Maharal. See his *Tiferet Yisrael*, end of ch. 1 and ch. 7, and A. P. Kleinberger, *The Educational Theory of the Maharal of Prague* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1962), p. 40, n. 58. See also L. Jacobs 'The Doctrine of the "Divine Spark" in Man in Jewish Sources', in *Studies in Rationalism, Judaism and Universalism in Memory of Leon Roth* (London, 1966). R. Shneur Zalman makes clear that in normal consciousness the Divine Soul is concealed by the Animal or Vital Soul. The Vital Soul is the everyday 'self' of anyone who is not a Zaddik. See *Tanya* I, ch. 29, fol. 36a.
- 34 See the description of the pneumatic inner change within the *benoni* during prayer, in *Tanya* I, ch. 12, fol. 16b.
- 35 See *Tanya* I, ch. 10, fol. 15a. Schatz regards the rarity of the 'perfect Zaddik' in R. Shneur Zalman's system as concealed anti-Zaddikism, 'for it is impossible to claim that all those called Zaddikim in his generation had reached the level described here' (note 7 above, p. 521). Our view is that R. Shneur Zalman was indeed critical of the self-deception possible among those seeking the higher rungs of the spiritual ladder. Part of the effect of his *Likutei Amariyim* was to disenchant the person who thought he
- was a Zaddik (cf. *Tanya* I, fols. 34a, 35a). Nonetheless, the contemporary existence of the Zaddik, his exalted spiritual stature and his ability to lift the world (and, in particular, the Hasid) towards the Divine is an integral aspect of R. Shneur Zalman's thought.
- 36 Schatz presents the Maggid and a number of his disciples as the source of a quietistic episode in the history of Hasidism. Later, she states, in the third and fourth generations, the tension of quietism decreased. *Ha-Hasidut ke-Mistikah* (Jerusalem, 1980, p. 22). By contrast, Scholem emphasizes the active nature of Maggidic self-annihilation, and states that through the total union with the Divine described in the Maggidic texts, 'man . . . has, in truth, only then started to be man, and it is only logical that only then will he be called upon to fulfil his destiny in the society of men' (note 8 above, p. 227).
- 37 *Tanya* I, ch. 10, fol. 15b.
- 38 See Etkes (note 4 above).
- 39 'The soul of a man, even if he is a perfect Zaddik . . . is none the less not completely and utterly . . . annulled and absorbed in the Divine radiance . . . Rather he is a separate entity, fearing the Divine and loving Him. This is not the case with the commandments . . . which are the inwardness of the Divine Will and there is no concealment of the Countenance at all' (*Tanya* I, ch. 35, fol. 44b). In relation to the Essence, to which contact is granted through the commandments of the Torah, the Divine Soul itself has a concealing quality and must be transcended. Cf. Loewenthal, 'The Apotheosis of Action' (note 7 above). It should be noted that there is also a quietistic aspect of R. Shneur Zalman's depiction of the Zaddik, although his allusions to this are very rare. See Hallamish, 'Mishnato ha-Yumi' (note 7 above), pp. 245–5; the reference in *Tanya* I, ch. 40, fol. 55b–56a to 'love without service which has the quality of the World to Come'; and *Tanya* V, fol. 154a, which quotes the *Zohar* II, 244b to the effect that through 'gazing' alone, i.e. an internal contemplative movement, the same effect can be achieved as through the practical commandments. This, states R. Shneur Zalman, is an example of the *mesirat nefesh* of *Nefilat Apayim* (see below). However a few pages later, referring to this theme, he insists that nonetheless the practical commandments are also essential (*Tanya* V, fol. 157a–b).
- Another instance of a quietistic depiction of the Zaddik is an intriguing but obscure discourse which speaks of two types of Zaddik: one is involved with the practical world, the other is predominantly concerned with *Yihudim* and spiritual ascents. See *Likutei Torah, Shenini*, fol. 18a. There is an oral tradition in Habad that *Likutei Amariyim*, termed the 'Book of the Intermediate Man', only describes the Zaddik in terms that are suitable for the 'Intermediate Man', i.e. the non-Zaddik. According to this tradition, R. Shneur Zalman wrote another book, 'Book of Zaddikim', which was lost in the fire of 1810 that destroyed many of his writings (including a considerable portion of his *Shullhan Arukh*). Concerning this fire see the introduction to the *Shullhan Arukh* and *Iggerot Kodesh*, p. 235. See also Mondshem (note 7 above), vol. 2, p. 28, and his article in *Bitein Habad*, vol. 32 (1971), p. 18. Mondshem quotes a tradition that in the fire of 1810 there was burned 'a volume of Hasidic teachings in manuscript bound on both edges' which bore a warning forbidding anyone to study it.
- 40 He states that this commandment is so important in the eyes of the sages that it is simply termed *mitzva* in the Palestinian Talmud; it is the most important of the practical commandments, for a person puts all the energy of his Vital Soul into earning a living, and when he gives of this money to charity 'his whole Vital Soul rises to the Divine' (*Tanya* I, ch. 37, fol. 48b). Further, most of R. Shneur Zalman's letters collected (presumably by his son R. Dov Bet) in the fourth part of *Tanya* concern charity. R. Shneur Zalman also recommends charity as the manner of

- repentance most suitable for the generation (rather than undertaking self-imposed fasts) and states that the talmudic limitation of donating no more than one-fifth of one's wealth to charity (T. B. *Kethubot* 50a) does not apply to charity given for this reason (*Tanya* III, ch. 3, fol. 93a).
- 41 Other aspects of R. Shneur Zalman's reaction to this stature are discussed in Loewenthal, 'Early Hasidic Teachings' (note 7 above), pp. 67-74.
- 42 A kabbalistic phrase meaning 'transform evil to good'.
- 43 T. B. *Hullin* 7a. R. Pinhas is presented in the *aggadah* as a man with mystic power (cf. T. J. *Demai* 1:3).
- 44 Levin (note 7 above), p. 141-2. Part of the letter is printed in *Beit Rabbe*, p. 86. Concerning R. Shneur Zalman's meeting with R. Barukh and other aspects of the dispute between them, see Y. Mondshen's article in *Bireon Habad*, vol. 32 (1971), pp. 14-16. This suggests that R. Barukh was critical of R. Shneur Zalman's path of broad communication of Hasidic teachings.
- 45 The concept of self-sacrifice for Judaism is found in Daniel, chs. 1, 3 and 6 and II Maccabees 6. The term *Kiddush ha-Shem* is first found in *Sifra* to Lev. 22:32. The Talmud and later Codes provide halakhic guidance as to when the person should give up his life rather than transgress. In normal times martyrdom is declared to be obligatory when the alternative is the transgression of laws prohibiting idolatry, immorality or murder. However, in a time of religious persecution, or in public, it is obligatory when the transgression of other laws or even mere customs is involved. Cf. T. B. *Sotah*, 74a-b, Maimonides, *Yad, Hil. Yesodei Ha-Torah*, ch. 5, *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 157. It is noteworthy that a full halakhic treatise on *Kiddush ha-Shem* was compiled by R. Eliyahu Yosef Rivlin (d. 1865), a follower of the *Mitteler Rebbe: Oholei Yosef* (Jerusalem, 1868), pt. I. The theme of *mesirat nefesh* for *Kiddush ha-Shem* is emphasized in Talmud and Midrash (for the actual term *mesirat nefesh* see T. B. *Ber. 20a* and *Tanhuma, Lekh Lekha 2*) and the tenth-century work *Yosipon*, which enumerates instances of Jewish martyrdom in the Hellenistic period, and the later communal self-sacrifice at Massada. This phenomenon recurred in the communities of the Rhineland during the People's Crusade of 1096, and the theme of *Kiddush ha-Shem* was given an exalted position in *Sefer Hasidim*. A long catalogue of incidents of *Kiddush ha-Shem* is found in Solomon ibn Verga's *Shevet Yehudah*. There is a considerable literature on this topic. A brief list is as follows: H. G. Friedman, 'Kiddush Hashem and Hillul Hashem', *HUCA* (1904), I. Baer's introduction to Haberman's edition of *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsofot* (Jerusalem, 1946); id., 'Sefer Yosipon ha-Ivrit', in *Sefer Dinahuburg* (Jerusalem, 1949); id., 'Gezerot TaTNU', *Sefer Asaf* (1953); id., 'Am Yisrael, ha-Kenesia ha-Notzrit ve-ha-Kesarut ha-Romit', *Zion*, vol. 21 (1956); the last three reprinted in his collected essays, *Studies in the History of the Jewish People* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1985), vol. 2, pp. 101-27, 147-61, vol. 1, pp. 254-302; S. Spiegel, 'Mipitegemel ha-Akedah, etc.', in *Kaplan Jubilee Vol.* (1953); id., *The Last Trial* (New York, 1979); J. Katz, 'Beyn TaTNU le-TaH-TaT', *I. F. Baer Jubilee Vol.* (Jerusalem, 1966), and *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1962), pp. 82-92; A. Shohet, 'Kiddush ha-Shem ba-Hagutan shel Meqoreshei Sefarad u-Mekubbelet T'fat', in *Holy War and Martyrology* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1968); Y. Dan, 'Baayot Kiddush ha-Shem be-Torah ha-Iyunit shel Tenuat Hasidut Ashkenaz', op. cit.; H. H. Ben-Sasson, *Perakim be-Toledot ha-Yehudim* (Tel Aviv, 1969), pp. 172-84; G. J. Weiss, 'Kiddush ha-Shem u-Miatar Kortan', *Mehkarim be-Hasidut Braslav* (Jerusalem, 1974).
- 46 The concept of the 'spiritualization' of the theme of *Kiddush ha-Shem* was defined by Katz; see 'Beyn TaTNU le-TaH-TaT' (note 45 above).
- 47 When one recites the *SHEMA* one should have the intention to accept on oneself the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, to be killed for *Kiddush ha-Shem*... This is what is meant by "with all your soul" (Deut. 6:5)—even if He takes your soul (*Sifre* and *Rashi* loc. cit.; T. B. *Ber.* 54a, 61b)... With this *kevanah* one will recite it with fear and trembling (*Bayit Hadash* to *Tur Orah Haryim*, sec. 61). This is emphatically expressed in Azkari's *Sefer Harelim* (Zolkew, 1804), fol. 20b ('Positive commands concerning the heart', 1:14ff).
- 48 Concerning the *hanhagot* (rules of conduct) literature and its significance in the history of Hasidism, see Z. Gries Sifrut ha-Hanhagot ha-Hasidit', *Zion*, vol. 46 (1981) and 'Hagdarat ha-Hanhagah ke-Sug Sifrut be-Sifrut ha-Musar ha-Ivrit', *Kiryat Sefer*, vol. 36 (1981).
- 49 *Noam Elimelech*, 'Tselet katani', sec. 1.
- 50 *Ibid.*, secs. 2-3.
- 51 *Pri ha-Arets* (Jerusalem, 1974), p. 76 (sect. Kedoshim). See Schatz (note 36 above), p. 30.
- 52 See Schatz, 'Contemplative Prayer in Hasidism', in *Studies in Mysticism and Religion presented to Grishom G. Scholem* (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 226, and note 36 above, p. 110. *Maggid Devarav le-Yankov* (Jerusalem, 1976) refers to prayer with self-sacrifice, sect. 152, 209.
- 53 In eighteenth-century Poland the blood libel was the cause of a considerable number of cases of Jewish martyrdom. A book on this theme by an apostate Jew named Serafinovich was published in 1716, 1758 and 1760. There were trials and executions of Jews in Sandomir (1698-1710); Posen (1736); Zaslav (1747). In the latter case a group of Jews celebrating a circumcision were arrested and tortured. One or two of them agreed to convert to Christianity; none the less all were killed in a barbaric way. This trial was followed by a series of ritual murder accusations, occurring almost annually for the next fifteen years. Particularly notable are the cases of Dunaigrod (1748); Zhyromir (1753), in which eleven Jews were fayed alive while another thirteen saved themselves from death by accepting baptism; Yampol (1756); Stupnizza (1759); and Volsavitzka, near Lublin (1760). In this last incident the rabbi of the community killed himself, and four others accused in the blood libel were sentenced to be quartered. They were induced to let themselves be baptized, and their sentence was therefore made more lenient: they were beheaded. As a result of Jewish endeavours, in 1763 the new Pope Clement XIII made an official denial of the blood libel, but martyrdoms continued, particularly as a result of Haidamak persecution. The worst massacre was in Uman in 1768, where three thousand Jews were killed in the synagogue after the Polish governor of the city of Malanovich betrayed them, following a pattern familiar from the massacres associated with the People's Crusade in 1096. See Dubnow, *History of the Jews of Russia and Poland*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1916), pp. 172-86. According to R. Nathan of Nemirov, his *Rebbe*, R. Nahman of Braslav, wished to be buried in Uman because of the martyrs who had died there for *Kiddush ha-Shem* (*Haryei MoHaRaN*), fol. 39a.
- 54 The letter mentions the vision of Jews who were killed and some who became apostates and were still put to death. The Baal Shem Tov, in his visionary experience, asks Samael about the Divine justice of the incident. (See the text of that letter at the end of R. Jacob Joseph of Polonnoye's *Ben Porat Yosef* [Koverz, 1781], and the variant text printed by D. Frankel in *Mikhlavin me-ha-Besht* [Lvov, 1923], pp. 1-5. Another version was published by Y. Mondshen in *Maggid Oz* [Kfar Habad, 1980], pp. 119-26. A series of discussions on the text of the letter, by A. Rubinstein and S. Bauminger, is published in *Sinai*, vols. 67-8, 71-3. Each of the three versions of the letter gives a different answer from Samael.) The letter continues (in the version printed in 1781 and also in that of Frankel; only briefly in that of Mondshen) with an account of the actual events in the Zaslav blood libel of 1747 and mentions two other contemporary instances of Jews dying for *Kiddush ha-Shem*. In these the Jews did not

convert (since in Zaslav also those who had converted were killed). Instead 'All gave up their lives for *Kiddush ha-Shem* and sanctified the Name of Heaven and withstood the test. By this merit will come our Messiah . . . ' (see Dubnow, *Toledot ha-Hasidim*, p. 61, note 2). A further reference to *mesirat nefesh*, pointed out to me by Chimen Abramsky, in the first printed text of this letter is that the Baal Shem Tov employs the phrase 'masrit mamash natsih' (I really surrendered my soul), to describe his spiritual activity during the ascent of his soul, in which, he says, there was great danger. This important text by the founder of Hasidism thus refers both to the classical *Kiddush ha-Shem* martyrology and also to the 'spiritualized' form of the theme of *mesirat nefesh*.

55 *Tanya* I, ch. 18, fol. 24a: 'And therefore even the lowest of the low and sinners give up their lives for *Kiddush ha-Shem*, generally, and suffer severe torture rather than deny the One G-d, even if they are coarse and ignorant, without knowledge of the greatness of the Divine. And even that little they do know they do not think about at all; for they do not give up their lives because of knowledge and contemplation of the Divine. Rather, without any knowledge, nor contemplation, just as if it were absolutely impossible to deny the One G-d, without any reason or explanation at all. This is because the One G-d illuminates and gives life to the entire soul . . . ' The significance of this idea in Habad Hasidism was noticed by Tishby and Dan (note 7), col. 814.

The idea of the propensity of even the lowest Jew to give up his life for *Kiddush ha-Shem* occurs in the writings of R. Jacob Joseph of Polonnoye, but without amplification: 'I heard a saying that a woman from the holy community of Medziboz said in Russian: "We made a good choice in G-d, but also G-d made a good choice in the Jews. For Fatvish is a low person, yet he Sanctifies the Blessed Name"'. (*Toledot Yadev Yosef*, Koretz, fol. 43a). Tradition records that R. Shneur Zalman's grandson, the *Tsemah Tzedek*, was asked about the fact that Gentiles too sacrifice their lives for their faith. If this is so, how can the propensity for *Kiddush ha-Shem* be proof of the presence of the 'hidden love' of the Divine Spark within the Jew? He answered that among the Gentiles only the pious give up their lives, whereas among the Jews even the lowest of the low are ready to do so (J. Korff, *Likutei Buirim be-Sefer ha-Tanya*, vol. 1 [New York, 1974], p. 139).

56 See *Tanya* I, ch. 25, fol. 31a-32b.
57 This work, probably the earliest tract by R. Dov Ber, was read by his followers in manuscript during his lifetime. It was first published in Königsberg, perhaps in 1831 (see Elior in *Kiryat Sefer*, note 5 above). We will refer to the Warsaw, 1868, edition entitled *Likutei Buirim*. This includes a commentary by R. Hillel of Poritch (d. 1864). The text of *Kuntres ha-Higdalut* has been translated and annotated by L. Jacobs, with the title *Tract on Ecstasy* (London, 1963).

58 Cf. *Likutei Buirim*, 49a, 51a-b, 56a.
59 *ibid.*, 55b.
60 *ibid.*, 56a. 'Since this [level] is hardly found at all among most people, it would be superfluous to expound on it further.'

61 *ibid.* . . . and also at the moment of *Kiddush ha-Shem* this power radiates. However, in this case it radiates 'bi-vehinat hisdalekut', i.e. as a form of removal from the world. The same is so also of the true baal *teshuvah*, like R. Eliezer b. Dordaya, whose soul expired in his repentant weeping (*ibid.*, cf. T. B. *Av. Zar.*, 17a). The *mesirat nefesh* of the Zaddik, by contrast, is a force expressed positively within the world.

62 This was published in two parts in Shklov, 1817 and 1818. They were later reprinted together, with the title *Shaarei Teshuvah* (Zhitomir, 1864). A third section of this work is entitled *Derekh Hayyim* (Kopyst, 1819).

63 *Shaarei Teshuvah* (Brooklyn 1983, reprint of Zhitomir, 1864), sec. 1, p. 9 (originally misprinted p. 5).

64 *Derekh Hayyim* (Brooklyn 1955), p. 23.

65 R. Dov Ber states that the epoch of intensive *Kiddush ha-Shem* was brought to a close because of the stature of R. Isaac Luria 'who had the quality of Tikkun' (*loc. cit.*, note 63 above). Elsewhere he mentions the phenomenon of *Kiddush ha-Shem* during the later Chmielnicki massacres (note 64 above).

66 This rather positive attitude to mediaeval Jewish philosophy is noteworthy; it contrasts with the negative attitude which G. Nigal (note 12 above), p. 344, states pertained to the early generations of Hasidism through the commentary of R. Yosef Yabez to *Pirkei Avot*. (An outstanding example is R. Nahman of Bratslav, although in his case this is not a simple question at all: see Weiss, note 45 above, pp. 109-49). According to R. Dov Ber's explanation, *mesirat nefesh* achieves *Tikkun* for idolatry because, like idolatry (*Keter* of the *Kelipah*), it is beyond Reason.

67 See *Emek ha-Meleikh* (Amsterdam, 1648, reprinted Bene Berak, 1973), *Shaar Olam ha-Tohu*, ch. 66, fol. 37a-b, which speaks of the deaths of the Ten Martyrs of Mishnaic times as having been necessary because, as a result of the idolatry of the epoch of the First Temple, 'the world began to rotter'. At the same time, they were atoning for the act of the brothers who sold Joseph. (This idea is found in the Martyrology in the Yom Kippur liturgy.) Further, later souls deriving from them 'sacrifice their lives for *Kiddush ha-Shem* in every generation.'

68 Cf. *Shullhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim*, sec. 131, paras. 1-2.

69 See Tishby (note 10 above), vol. 2, pp. 275-6. Thus: 'There are six commandments expressed in prayer . . . the sixth: to sacrifice one's soul to Him . . . A fitting time to sacrifice one's soul to Him . . . is when carrying out *Nefilat Apayyim*, saying "To you, G-d, I lift up my soul" (Ps. 25:1). One should have the intention to sacrifice one's soul to Him with full determination' (*Zohar* II, 202b). Cf. also *ibid.*, 200b. Similar ideas are expressed by R. Abraham ben Eliezer Halevi, living at the time of the Expulsion, in his *Megilat Amrtalet*; see G. Schולם, 'Perakim mi-Toledot Sifrut ha-Kabbalah', *Kiryat Sefer*, vol. 7 (1930-1), p. 154. See also A. Shohet (note 45 above), p. 143 and Elior *Theory of Divinity* (note 5 above), pp. 276-8.

70 Quoted by Shohet, *op. cit.*, p. 143, from *Tefilah le-Moshe* (Premislan, 1892), 107a. Shohet makes the point that in this, as in a number of passages from R. Hayyim Vital, *Nefilat Apayyim* is described as an act directly manifesting (spiritualized) *Kiddush ha-Shem*, rather than a mere affirmation of one's readiness for self-sacrifice.

71 *Shaar ha-Kavanot*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1962), pp. 310-11.

72 *ibid.*, p. 303.
73 *ibid.* Cf. Tishby, *Torat ha-Ra ve-ha-Kelipah be-Kabalah ha-Ari* (Jerusalem, 1960), pp. 128-30.

74 Note 71 above, p. 304.
75 *ibid.*, p. 303.

76 *ibid.*, p. 305. The 'perfect Zaddik', through *Nefilat Apayyim*, can raise the souls of others. One who has a lesser level of attainment cannot raise others but is able himself to leave *Gehinom*. Some on a lower level are unable to leave. This last eventuality explains sudden transformations for the bad, such as that of Yohanan the High Priest who, after eighty years of priesthood, suddenly became a Sadducee. On account of such danger R. Haim Vital writes: 'Therefore I am warning you stringently that the person who undertakes *Nefilat Apayyim* in this way should be a perfect Zaddik, or at least should have *kavanah* in that prayer from beginning to end' (*ibid.*, pp. 304-5).

77 *ibid.*, p. 304.
78 Cf. T. B. *Yoma* 86a.

79 *Shaar ha-Kavanot*, vol. 1, p. 100.
80 See Weiss (note 2 above), pp. 69, 74-5. See also Scharz (note 26 above), pp. 154-84, which explores the concept of the descent of the Zaddik to *Gehinom* as found in

Hasidism: on p. 174 she discusses the relationship of these ideas to the Lurianic teachings concerning *Nefilat Apyayim*. Cf. the Maggidic passage in *Maggid Devorav le-Yakov*, ed. R. Scharz-Uffenheimer (Jerusalem, 1976), sec. 147, which speaks of the dangers of *Nefilat Apyayim*. The theme of *Nefilat Apyayim* as a descent into the *keiphot* is briefly referred to by R. Shneur Zalman in the name of R. Avraham, the son of the Maggid. See *Torah Or*, 6a.

81 *Seder Tefilot mi-Kol ha-Shana . . . in Perush ha-Mittot* (Brooklyn, 1971), fol. 92d.

82 *Shaarei Teshuvah* I, p. 87. This passage expresses R. Dov Ber's position in contrast to that of his contemporary rival R. Aaron Halevi of Staroselye. R. Dov Ber maintained that detailed intellectual contemplation was the path to the highest level of *hivul*. His *Kinuros ha-Hitpadut* emphasizes this point. This cerebral ecstasy was rejected by R. Aaron, who instead advised his followers to seek heartfelt emotional enthusiasm. Concerning R. Aaron, see L. Jacobs, *Seeker of Unity—the Life and Works of Aaron of Staroselye* (London, 1966) and Elior, *Theory of Divinity* (note 5 above).

83 Gershon Scholem, in his article on *devekut* in Hasidism took it for granted that this was an intermittent state. He explained the Hasidic concepts 'descent' (*yeridat*) and 'smallness' (*kamut*) as forms of temporary cessation from *devekut*, citing teachings of the Baal Shem Tov and R. Jacob Joseph of Polonnoy (note 8 above, pp. 218–22). Rivka Scharz has shown that in the teachings of R. Elimelech of Lyzhansk, while *devekut* is seen as generally intermittent, there is also an ideal of permanent *devekut*, which is the achievement of a higher level of Zaddik, or which will be realized in the messianic age (note 4 above, pp. 368–9). To R. Elimelech, contact with the physical world is itself a disturbance of *devekut* which the teaching of the Lurianic 'sparks' present in food and other necessities of physical life does not completely mitigate. See *Noam Elimelech* (New York, 1956), *Vayigash* 25c: . . . it is permitted to have benefit from this world, that is, from physical things such as eating and drinking . . . in order that the Zaddikim should . . . extract the holy sparks from them. But for this, the Zaddik would not be permitted to interrupt and be separated, even for a moment, from holiness and *devekut*, to turn to physical things. Only in order to bring [the sparks] into holiness is he permitted to descend a little bit and slightly to interrupt his *devekut* . . . In Braslav teaching there is strong emphasis on the concept of *kamut*. However, as is made clear in A. Rapoport-Albert's "Kamut," "peshitut" ve-"Eyni Yode'a" shel R. Nahman mi-Braslav, *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History presented to Alexander Altmann* (Alhambra, 1979), p. 21: 'the descent to the bottom of the ladder is not just the path which prepares the Zaddik for his rise . . . but is itself the ascent to the most exalted level.' In other words, in Braslav thought the Zaddik is in a state of permanent spiritual exaltation whatever he is doing and whatever the area of his struggle. In the teachings of the Maggid we also find the term *kamut* employed not as an implication of any lowering of the level of the Zaddik but rather as an expression of his transforming existence around him to express its Divine quality (cf. Tishby and Dan, note 7 above, p. 292). We also find a clear statement from the Maggid to the effect that *devekut*, if it is real at all, is permanent: "One who makes his *tefilah* (lit. phylactery) circular—it is dangerous and it is not a *mitzvah*" (T. B. Meg., 24b). "His *tefilah*"—this means, his cleaving to the Holy One; "circular"—this means sometimes he is cleaving to the Holy One and sometimes he is not, like a wheel which revolves; "it is not a *mitzvah*"—"mitzvah" meaning connection, as the Aramaic word *tsavta*—presumably he is not connected to the Holy One" (*Maggid Devorav le-Yakov* [Jerusalem, 1976], sec. 3). Indeed it is likely that, despite Scholem, in the teachings of the Baal Shem Tov too the concept of *kamut* is nothing but an opportunity to 'sweeten the harsh forces at their root'. (Cf. *Toledot Yakov Yosef* [Koretz, 1780], 146c). J. G. Weiss, in his account of the way the approach to *devekut* in the thought of the Baal Shem Tov went further than in that of R. Nahman of

Kossov, similarly indicates that this is a state which is not diminished by social or material involvements with the world and shows that there are several ways in which this teaching of 'unification' and 'raising' of the world is expressed, one of them being in terms of the Lurianic sparks (note 2 above, pp. 60–9). Thus Weiss quotes from *Zofnat Pane'ah*, 60a: 'For I heard from my teacher that there are "unifications" in speech; whether in speech of Torah and prayer, or in speech with one's fellow in the market. One can "connect" him and raise him up, each one according to his level; some through sacred speech and some through profane speech; for it has in it the twenty-two letters [of the sacred Alef Bet] . . .' (*ibid.*, p. 64). It is noteworthy that Weiss considered the concept of the 'descent' of the Zaddik only peripheral to the teachings of the Baal Shem Tov (*ibid.*, p. 88). Perhaps the concept of the intermittence of *devekut* is to be traced specifically to R. Yaakov Yosef—because his works are addressed not primarily to pneumatists of the highest rank, but to the generality of the scholarly class, Hasidim rather than Zaddikim.

84 *Tanya* I, ch. 12, fol. 16b

85 *ibid.*, ch. 13, fol. 19a

86 *ibid.*

87 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. I, pp. 88–9

88 *ibid.*, p. 90

89 *ibid.* The quotation is from *Zohar* II, 114a.

90 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit. It is interesting to note that while *Nefilat Apyayim* is hardly mentioned in the teachings of R. Shneur Zalman, it is discussed extensively by both his son R. Dov Ber and his leading disciple R. Aaron Halevi Horowitz of Staroselye. This indicates the presence of an 'oral teaching' imparted by R. Shneur Zalman which only took written form in the next generation. Concerning R. Aaron's treatment of the theme of *Nefilat Apyayim*, see Elior, *Theory of Divinity* (note 5 above), pp. 273–81. As in the teachings of R. Dov Ber, in those of R. Aaron the *mesirat nefesh* of *Nefilat Apyayim* concerns entry into the daily world (cf. his *Shaarei Avodah, Petah ha-Teshuvah*, ch. 12, fol. 18b). However the emphasis in R. Aaron's treatment of this subject is on giving counsel to the reader on achieving a true negation of the world and its desires even while having to come in contact with it. He stresses the mental movement of 'giving oneself over to death', in a manner comparable to R. Elimelech of Lyzhansk's employment of the theme of *mesirat nefesh*, mentioned above. Thus R. Aaron speaks of 'the extinction and total burning away of "being" (*yesh*) which has the quality of *Nefilat Apyayim*, that he delivers himself to death. This means, that he really does not want to continue existing . . . ' Through this, promises R. Aaron, the person attains an inspired sense of closeness to the Divine 'the whole day long' and is able to join the otherwise contrary qualities of being and non-being (*Avodat Halevi*, *Tetzavah*, fol. 47c). In another passage he states that the fact that after prayer one has to be involved with earning a living could be disastrous spiritually ('one could fall completely, Heaven forbid'), and therefore one says *Nefilat Apyayim*. The effect of this is to impart a 'coldness' to one's worldly activities, as if one's possessions were not really one's own (*Avodat Halevi*, *Vayehi*, fol. 71b). Through the concept of *Nefilat Apyayim*, R. Aaron found a suitable medium to transmit in meaningful terms the ascetic, kabbalistic world-view to his followers, imparting also the asceticistic yearning which is the cornerstone of his system. By contrast R. Dov Ber, through employment of this theme, sought to communicate a concept of unity with the Divine which lay far beyond even the most exceptional of his followers, and is clearly the province of the rare Zaddik alone.

91 Cf. *Tanya* I, ch. 34, fol. 43a: 'It is known that "the Patriarchs were the Chariot" (*Ber. Rab.*, ch. 47 on Gen. 17:22) that all their lives, perpetually, they never ceased even for a moment from binding their minds and souls to the Master of the Worlds in the

- above mentioned state of *bihiul*. See also *Tanya* I, ch. 23, fol. 28b.
- 92 *Hiner bet*, also *hiner plet* or *himmel plet*. See Horodocky (ed.), *Shivhei ha-Beshit* (4th edn, Tel Aviv, 1975), p. 185, n. 1.
- 93 He is noted as a follower of R. Dov Ber by Heiman in *Bei Rabbe*, p. 149. Concerning *Shivhei ha-Beshit* see Dubnow (note 2 above), pp. 382; 411–16; J. G. Weiss, 'A circle of Pneumatics in Pre-Hasidism', *JJS*, vol. 8 (1957), p. 207, n. 21; Y. Mondshain, *Shivhei ha-Beshit* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 5–75, and the bibliography pp. 69–70. A second edition of *Shivhei ha-Beshit* was printed in Bertichev in 1815. In the same year a Yiddish version was printed in Ostrah. English translation by Dan Ben-Amos and Jerome R. Mintz, *In Praise of the Baal Shem Tov* (Bloomington, 1970).
- 94 At the same time it relates to the conflict with R. Aaron (see below).
- 95 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. I, p. 91.
- 96 *ibid.*
- 97 *ibid.*
- 98 See Katz, 'Beyn TaTNU le-TaH-TaT' (note 45 above), p. 324ff. See also A. Shohet (note 45 above), pp. 143–4.
- 99 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit. Compare *Sefer Hasidim* (Jerusalem, 1970), sec. 222: 'Many Jews were killed during the persecution and many decided to be killed but were saved. A Jew whose name was R. Shabrai saw in a dream a person who had been killed . . . he said "all those who decided in their hearts to be killed for *Kiddush ha-Shem*, their portion is with us in the Garden of Eden"; Cf. I. Baer, 'Ha-Megamah ha-Datit-Hevratit shel Seter Hasidim', *Zion*, vol. 3 (1937), p. 14ff. (*Studies in the History* . . . vol. 2, p. 188ff.)
- 100 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit.
- 101 This image occurs in the talmudic account of 'the woman and her seven sons' (*T. B. Gittin*, 57b), and in the Fourth Book of Hasmonaens, ch. 8. (Cf. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 2 [Berlin, 1928], pp. 5–6.) For discussion of *Akedah* imagery in the medieval chronicles and *piyyutim* see L. Zunz, 'Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters' (Berlin, 1855), pp. 136–40; Spiegel (note 45 above); Baer, 'Gezerot TaTNU' (note 45 above), p. 136ff. and n. 46.
- 102 T. B. *Berakhot*, 61b.
- 103 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit.
- 104 *ibid.*
- 105 T. B. *Moed Katan*, 28a.
- 106 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. I, pp. 92–3.
- 107 Concerning this controversy see Jacobs, *Tract on Ecstasy* (note 7 above), pp. 11–12, 41–49 and *Seeker of Unity*, pp. 12–14; Eilior, 'Ha-mahloket al Moreshet Habad' (note 5 above) and *Theory of Divinity*, pp. 5–15 and *passim*. Eilior characterizes the approach of R. Aaron as 'theocentric', contrasting with that of R. Dov Ber which was 'anthropocentric'. One could add, translating this into the terminology of Habad thought, that R. Aaron sought above all the acosmic contemplative perspective termed 'the Upper Unity', in which no world, only the Divine, is perceived; R. Dov Ber, by contrast, emphasized the perspective termed 'the Lower Unity', in which the world, as world, is seen (at least potentially) as a full expression of the Divine.
- 108 Rivka Schatz makes the point that Hasidism exhibits both quietist and activist aspects, and that this paradox is the key to its unique nature (note 36 above, pp. 14–19). On the one hand there is the demand to be involved in the world, whether the world of the practical *mitzvot*, or the wider realms of physical and social life and involvement which are their outer framework; on the other there is the emphasis on contemplation, *bihiul*, self-abnegation in the Infinite Divine. She emphasizes the significance of the concept of 'service with materiality', which is based on the teaching of the Lurianic 'sparks', in providing a bridge between these two aspects (*ibid.*, p. 16). Weiss, too, deals with this question, but makes it clear that the teaching of *dereket* in the midst of practical action is not expressed solely in terms of the Divine Sparks (note 2 above, p. 65). It seems that the *mesirat nefesh* of *Nefilat Apyayim* also has the quality of such a bridge, connecting *bihiul* with involvement in the practical world. In fact, the basis of both this kind of *mesirat nefesh* and the 'service with materiality' is the same concept of raising of the Divine Sparks, for in the kabbalistic sources this is the underlying significance of *Nefilat Apyayim*. R. Dov Ber too speaks of *Nefilat Apyayim* in terms of the raising of the 'sparks'. Thus in the discourse under discussion in *Shaar ha-Teshuvah ve-Ha-Teftah* he asks why the word *hiddukim* in the phrase 'To him shall ye cleave' (Deut. 13:5) ends in a long (final) *nun*; his answer is that 'the long *nun* indicates spreading downwards . . . to the lowest level. . . This is through *Nefilat Apyayim*, when the Divine Radiance descends far below, even into the coarseness of *nogah*, to sift out the sparks and raise them, that they should cleave above, to the highest level' (*Shaarei Teshuvah* Pt. I, p. 94). R. Dov Ber goes on to explain that the body of the person who has achieved this state of *mesirat nefesh* of *Nefilat Apyayim* is no longer a concealment of the Divine. This is a state of being with messianic connotations: ' . . . for the materiality of his body does not conceal, in *Nefilat Apyayim*, for it too rises; of this it says "and to Him you shall cleave" (*hiddukim*) with a *nun* extending below, so that everything can rise, as it will be in the Time to Come, when evil will be completely eradicated'. For one in such a state, action is possible together with the highest *dereket*, the physical world no longer conceals or contradicts the Divine. This is the special connotation of *Nefilat Apyayim*, and it is by virtue of this that it is distinguished from other varieties of *teftah*. Thus through the esoteric concept of the *mesirat nefesh* of *Nefilat Apyayim*, R. Dov Ber arrives at an activist delineation of the Zaddik which complements that found in the teachings of R. Shneur Zalman. Discussion of the relationship of *mesirat nefesh* and activism cannot end without reference to the historical background of this concept and the fact that there too we find an emphasis on practical action. Jacob Katz has commented that in 1096 and subsequently the Jewish martyrs did not passively allow themselves to be killed, their minds in distant contemplation of radiant unity. On the contrary, they first 'employed every worldly means of saving themselves' including political machinations and physical battle. (*Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, note 45 above, pp. 86–7.) Only when these means failed did they give themselves over to death for *Kiddush ha-Shem*. There has even been an attempt to distinguish Jewish martyrdom from its Christian counterpart by the presence of this form of activism (*ibid.*, p. 87, n. 6). An echo of the activist aspect of historical *mesirat nefesh* is preserved in its mystical 'spiritualized' delineation in the teachings of R. Dov Ber.
- 109 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. I, p. 92. See *Zohar* III, 120b–121a.
- 110 This idea is found in the Midrash: 'When the sword reached his neck, the soul of Isaac left him. When the voice came forth . . . "do not stretch out your hand against the lad", his soul returned to his body. [Abraham] released him and Isaac stood up; he knew that thus would the dead be revived and he said "Blessed are You . . . Who revives the dead" (*Yalkut Shimoni, Parveta* ch. 22, sec. 101).
- 111 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit.
- 112 One of the points of conflict between R. Aaron and R. Dov Ber concerned whether anyone in their own generation could achieve the most exalted heights of spiritual attainment. Near the beginning of his polemical attack on R. Dov Ber in small print in the introduction to *Shaarei Avodah* (Shklov, 1821), R. Aaron states that true abnegation of self was only achieved by Moses and the giants of the past. This is a shaft aimed at the claim implicit in R. Dov Ber's teachings that contemporary figures might reach the highest level.
- 113 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit.

- 114 See note 131, below.
- 115 *Shivhei ha-Beshit*, Mintz edn. (Tel Aviv, 1961), p. 63; Horodecky edn. (Tel Aviv, 1975), p. 106.
- 116 He is identified as Dov Ber of Linz, the son-in-law of Alexander Shohet who for eight years had been the scribe of the Baal Shem Tov (cf. Dubnow, note 2 above p. 413).
- 117 *Shivhei ha-Beshit*, Horodecky edn., p. 35. (This is the text for the most part as published in the Kopyst, 1815, edition, albeit arranged by Horodecky in a different order. Compare with Mintz, p. 23.)
- 118 R. Shneur Zalman himself had a role in editing at least part of this work—a fact which itself is informative about his concept of the Baal Shem Tov. R. Menahem Mendel of Vitebsk, the colleague and teacher of R. Shneur Zalman, also had an exalted view of the power of the Baal Shem Tov. See Israel Jaffe's preface to *Shivhei ha-Beshit*, Horodecky edn., p. 33, and R. Menahem Mendel's *Pri ha-Areiv* (Jerusalem, 1974), p. 8.
- 119 After R. Shneur Zalman died, Yakov Cadaner apparently initially followed R. Aaron of Staroselye but later became a prominent follower of R. Dov Ber. He outlived the latter and followed his successor R. Menahem Mendel, the *Tsemah Tsedel*. He is the author of *Sipurim Noraim* (Lemberg, 1875) and had a hand in the editing or writing of *Matsef ha-Avodah* (Königsberg, 1851) and *Vikhuha Rabah* (Tchernovitz, 1864). Cf. Y. Mondshem, 'Vikhuha Rabah u-Matsef ha-Avodah', *Altei Sefar*, vol. 5 (1978), p. 169. A commentary on *Tanya* is also attributed to him. Cf. Hielman (note 7 above), p. 213.
- 120 Y. Cadaner, *Sipurim Noraim* (Jerusalem, 1957), pp. 34–5.
- 121 *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- 122 Reports of visitations from departed souls, who transmit Torah teachings from a higher world, remain a feature of the Habad leadership, extending to the present day. See Rabbi M. M. Schneerson, *Ha-Yom Yom* (Brooklyn, 1981), pp. 43, 122–3, 186; *Sefar ha-Mammarim 5709* (Kfar Habad, 1976), pp. 92–7; *Likheutei Shivot*, vol. 2, p. 496; Mondshem, *Migdal Oz* (note 54 above), pp. 471–82. In the case of the present Lubavitcher Rebbe, in 1955 a remarkable incident took place in the presence of about 400 followers. An eyewitness account by the Lubavitch emissary to England, R. Nahman Sudak, describes a Hasidic gathering at the close of the Shavuot festival. The gathering began before sunset. The Rebbe would normally recite Grace after Meals, signifying the end of the gathering, before midnight. On this occasion he made the assembled gathering sing Hasidic melodies for more than two hours. During this time he sank deep into himself, his eyes becoming glazed. At certain moments, however, he would suddenly lift himself from his seat, as if greeting someone. Around 2.45 a.m. the Rebbe delivered a brief speech about the way R. Shneur Zalman would say 'Greeting' (*banukh ha-ba*) to the soul of the Baal Shem Tov at the Hasidic gathering on Shavuot (the *yahrzeit* of the Baal Shem Tov). The Rebbe then in effect greeted each of the Habad leaders in turn, from the Previous Rebbe back to R. Shneur Zalman, and then the Maggid and the Baal Shem Tov. He also mentioned Elijah and Ahyyah the Shilonic (the heavenly teacher of the Baal Shem Tov). He stated openly that all were present and said 'anyone who can see them should say *banukh ha-ba!*' The Rebbe then began the *Shir ha-Madal* Psalm which introduces Grace. Then, in an extraordinary way, the Rebbe invited everyone present to say 'le-Hayyim' to the Previous Rebbe, Rabbi Joseph Isaac, who had passed away five years earlier. Everyone said 'le-Hayyim'. The event is remembered as a mystical experience in which all who were present took part. A brief record of the incident is found in *Sefar ha-Sivot* (unedited transcript) 5755 (1955), p. 142.
- 123 See above, no. 108.
- 124 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. 1, pp. 97–112.
- 125 Levin (note 7 above), pp. 98–9.
- 126 See G. Scholem, *Kabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1974), pp. 157–8. For R. Shneur Zalman's use of this term in his discourses see Hallamish, 'Mishnato ha-Lyumi' (note 7 above), pp. 181–4.
- 127 'During the Ten Days of Penitence, even the lowest of the low who has transgressed the whole Torah is moved in full repentance to weep. . . . This is because of the aspect *Yehidah* within him, which has not been defiled with the impurity of his sins. . . .' (*Shaarei Teshuvah*, Pt. 1, p. 108).
- 128 'When a man serves the Divine with the aspect *Yehidah*, which is the Essence, then there is no battle; this means, even after the prayer, when he walks all day in the market, in the valley of the shadow of death, [he] does not fear evil at all. . . . This is the meaning of the level of "stripping off materiality" of the perfect Zaddikim, and this is also the basis of the concept of *hishavuni* (equanimity). . . . A man such as this is really in the image of G-d, for he has a Divine quality. . . .' (*Ibid.*, pp. 108–9).
- 129 *Ibid.*, p. 109.
- 130 *Ibid.*, pp. 109–10.
- 131 *Ibid.*, p. 111. Possibly this relates to the tradition found in martyrological literature that the martyr feels no pain. Cf. I. Baer, 'Gezerot TATNU' (note 45 above), p. 139, n. 57, for the appearance of this idea in the Spanish kabbalistic tradition, see G. Scholem, 'Perkim mi-Toledot Sifrut ha-Kabbalah', *Kiryat Sefar*, vol. 7 (1930–1), p. 153; Shohet (note 45 above), p. 134. See also D. Tamar, 'Perkim le-Toledot Hakhmei Eretz Yisrael ve-Ithala u-le-Toledot Sifrutam', *Kiryat Sefar*, vol. 33 (1958), pp. 376–7.
- 132 *Shaarei Teshuvah*, loc. cit.
- 133 *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- 134 *Ibid.* The concepts 'Wisdom' and 'sight' (*reyyah dekhmah*) are linked in kabbalistic thought.
- 135 There is a Habad tradition that this work, printed in Kopyst, is distinguished among R. Dov Ber's writings by virtue of the breadth of its intended audience. We thus find, in the name of R. Shmuel (1834–82), the fourth-generation leader and grandson of R. Dov Ber: 'The books *Shaar ha-Yihud* and *Shaarei Or* are general, and written for all the Hasidim; for *Shaar ha-Yihud* is the table of contents to the teachings of Hasidism, and *Shaarei Or* is the Alef-Bet of the teachings of Hasidism.' (Rabbi Joseph I. Schneerson, *Kuntres Linnud ha-Hasidut* [New York, 1956], p. 30). This is in distinction to R. Dov Ber's other works, which according to this tradition were compiled for particular 'types' of Hasid, for some the emphasis was intellect, for others it was ethical striving.
- 136 See S. Dubnow, *History of the Jews*, vol. 5 (New Jersey, 1973), pp. 142–51. In 1817 the 'Society of Israelite-Christians' was set up, to persuade Jews to convert. In 1820 a vast tract of land was set aside in Ekaterinoslav for the hoped-for converts. These did not materialize. Further, the government was alarmed to learn in 1817 of the existence of a large group of Judaizers, called 'Subbotniks', who claimed they wished to return to the teachings of the Old Testament. Legislation against the Jews began in 1819, with the banning of *Krestenzie* lease contracts; this was followed in 1820 by a piece of mediaeval-style legislation in which Jews were forbidden to employ Christian domestics—lest they convert them to their faith (this was clearly a reaction to the 'Subbotnik' phenomenon). The government now resumed the realization of its old intention to expel the Jews from the villages, which had been expressed in the Statute concerning the Jews of 1804: the operation of this had been halted shortly before the Napoleonic war. A crop failure in 1821 led to renewed urges from the noblemen that the Jews be deported from the villages. In April 1823 a decree was passed banning Jews from holding leases and from dwelling in villages in the regions of Moghilev and

Vitebsk—the Habad area. Long before 1823 news of this impending decree was no doubt conveyed to Jewish leaders by the Jewish deputies, headed by Zundel Zonnenberg, who functioned as Delegation of the Jewish People, residing in St Petersburg and maintained by the Jewish communities between 1818 and 1825. Indeed, the deputies were accused of divulging information on impending government plans to the Jewish leaders (*ibid.*, pp. 144–5). When the 1823 edict was passed, there was impassioned reaction by the Jewish community at large. The Hasidic leader R. Yehoshua Heshel of Apr called for three days of public fasting, the saying of the whole book of Psalms in all the synagogues, the saying of Psalms with children, and the giving of charity. See I. Halpern, 'R. Yehoshua Heshel me-Apro u-Gezerot ha-Malkhut be-Sof Yamav shel Aleksander ha-Rishon', *Tarbiz*, vol. 27 (1957–8), pp. 372–9, reprinted in his *Eastern European Jewry* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1968), pp. 348–54.

137 In the introduction the distinction is made between 'spiritualized' *mesirat nefesh*, expressed in prayer, and the more concrete *mesirat nefesh* 'which everyone has for *Kiddush ha-Shem* in actual fact, which is only for Torah and *nitzivot*, that when they are forcing him to change his religion . . . he gives himself up actually to be killed. And this is like nature in every one, to give up his life for *Kiddush ha-Shem*, even in the worthless ones . . . as is known that the Jews have withstood trials for three thousand years . . .' (*Shiarei Orah*, Brooklyn, 1956, p. 3).

138 One form of *mesirat nefesh* stems from the essence of the Divine which reveals the Torah; the other from the essence of the Jewish soul which receives it. These are expressed in Purim and Hanukkah respectively and relate to the kabbalistic concepts of 'white radiance' and 'dark radiance' (cf. *Zohar* I, 51b). The author states that it is because of these two kinds of radiance that he is calling the book 'Gates of Radiance' (*Shiarei Orah*, p. 5).

It is in terms of the distinction between the two kinds of *mesirat nefesh* that R. Dov Ber expresses the nature of the Ten Martyrs. Their level of *mesirat nefesh* was higher than that expressed either by Purim or by Hanukkah, for they included in themselves both aspects. Their nature is that of 'Princes of Torah', who disseminate Torah to the Jewish people. Because of this they have both the *mesirat nefesh* of the revelation of Torah, as well as that of receiving it. 'And far more than this was the *mesirat nefesh* of the Ten Martyrs who gave up their lives for the Torah itself . . . which is because of the bond of the essence of the souls of the Jews with the Upper Torah. And they were the "Princes of Torah", disseminating Torah to the Jewish people. In this there is involved some of the power of the essence of the Divine. They include both kinds of *mesirat nefesh*' (*ibid.*).

139 An outstanding example is the figure of Rabbi Joseph I. Schneersohn (1880–1950), who in 1927 himself suffered harsh imprisonment by the Communists for his dissemination of Judaism. His writings are filled with exhortations to his followers and other Jews to act with *mesirat nefesh* for the same cause.

On Women in Hasidism, S. A. Horodecky and The Maid of Ludmir Tradition

Ara Rapoport-Albert

'The Jewish woman was given complete equality in the emotional, mystical, religious life of Beshtian Hasidism.' This statement was made in 1923 by S. A. Horodecky in his book *Ha-Hasidut ve-ha-Hasidim*, where he devoted a short chapter to 'The Jewish Woman in Hasidism'.¹ It was Horodecky who first singled out the position of women in Hasidism as an area of sufficient novelty and interest to merit particular discussion, and his view of the matter, now more than sixty years old, has been remarkably durable. In one form or another, acknowledged or unacknowledged, Horodecky's findings as well as his analysis lie behind virtually every subsequent treatment of the subject in the popular, belletristic and semi-scholarly literature about Hasidism, as well as in the now growing library of works, of limited scholarly merit but considerable apologetic thrust, about the position of women in Judaism generally.² Notably, the scholarly literature on the history of Hasidism has generally ignored the subject, implicitly dismissing it as marginal or at any rate insufficiently documented to permit serious consideration.

Horodecky highlighted the equality he perceived between men and women in Hasidism by contrasting it with the exclusion of women from active participation in the intellectual and devotional life of what he called 'official Judaism' or 'rabbinism'.³ Deploying here the categories from which he was later to construct a framework for the interpretation of Jewish civilization as a whole, the categories of 'intellectual' versus 'emotional' Judaism,⁴ he identified 'rabbinism' as 'intellectual' while portraying the distinct mystical-messianic elements of the tradition, from which he believed Hasidism to have evolved, as primarily 'emotional'. Since he shared as a matter of course the common assumption that intellectuality was by nature a male quality while the female temperament was innately emotional,⁵ he was able to portray 'rabbinism' as inherently, and so also effectually, the exclusive domain of men, while conceiving of mystical-messianism, and ultimately Hasidism, as inherently, and so historically, more accessible to women.