

Hillel Goldberg is the Senior Editor of the Intermountain Jewish News, Denver, Col., and a member of the Editorial Board of TRADITION.

BETWEEN BERLIN AND SLOBODKA: THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF YOSEF ZEV LIPOVITZ

The life of Rabbi Yosef Zev Lipovitz is a story of hidden righteousness, suppressed biographical information, and genuine pathos. The writing of Rabbi Lipovitz is a treasure that almost never came to be, a tale of unique balance and integration. Not well known, his life and writing demonstrate the tricks which fate plays with reputations and the truism that great artists and thinkers—Vincent Van Gogh, Giambattista Vico, Dam Julian—are often prophets without honor, their originality and power undiscovered or unappreciated until after their time on earth has come to its end. Rabbi Lipovitz (1889–1966), like other once-forgotten figures, has much to give. He was a pietist who was not intellectually closed, an intellectual who was not emotionally dry, a Zionist who did not disdain the old world, a searcher who did not fear the new. Rabbi Lipovitz bridged many worlds—Berlin and Slobodka, Europe and Palestine, business and scholarship—but the total configuration was a whole greater than the sum of its parts. The story begins not with Rabbi Lipovitz himself but with the two divergent seedbeds of 20th-century Orthodox Judaism which he sought to harmonize and blend into an approach that contained yet transcended them both.

I

Appropriately enough, on the day that I began to prepare this article, there arrived in the mail a book by Donald L. Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*.¹ “Weimar,” of course, refers to Germany’s abortive 14-year experiment with democracy, from the Treaty of Versailles in

1919 to the election of Hitler in 1933. A glance through this book on the Jews of Weimar reveals virtually nothing about Orthodoxy.² This is more than an insignificant omission since it was primarily in this period that Orthodoxy underwent its transformation from an intellectually self-enclosed, self-sufficient configuration to a modern ideology fraught with the tensions and the creativities of cross-cultural encounter. A search of the index of *The Jews in Weimar Germany* reveals no entries under: Soloveitchik, Heller, Birnbaum, Kaplan, Hutner, Schneerson—or Lipovitz. The omission by Niewyk is not uniquely egregious; a number of volumes by Peter Gay, Walter Laqueur, Frederick Grunfeld, and others on the same or similar subjects reveal the same deficiency.³ And the fault, perhaps, is not theirs at all, for if Orthodox Jews do not show an interest in writing their own history, why should they expect others to do it for them?

To the historian wishing to identify the origins of Orthodoxy as a twentieth-century ideology, two names tower above all others: Rabbi Nathan Zvi Finkel, “the Saba (Elder) of Slobodka,” and Rabbi Hayyim Heller, founder of an unusual rabbinical academy, Bet Midrash Elyon, in Weimar Berlin. The Saba of Slobodka founded what became the most high-level and influential talmudic academy after the closure of the Volozhin yeshiva in 1892.⁴ On a subterranean level Slobodka carried on the ideal of cross-cultural encounter of Rabbi Israel Salanter, father of the Musar movement and mentor of the teacher of the Saba.⁵ Ostensibly a traditional academy with neither curriculum nor sympathy for secular studies, Slobodka both nurtured a strain of cross-cultural confrontation and undertook the recruitment of the most intellectually exuberant Lithuanian Jewish youth, be they Communist or traditional. Slobodka generated the most diverse intellectual offshoots, frequently of the highest quality. For example, out of Slobodka came, respectively, talmudic, pietistic, halakhic-judicial, and scholarly giants such as Rabbi Aharon Kotler, Rabbi Yaakov M. Lessin,⁶ Rabbi Dr. Yehiel Y. Weinberg, and Professor Harry A. Wolfson.

Unlike the Saba of Slobodka, Rabbi Hayyim Heller nurtured not implicit or subterranean encounter with Western culture but an open and explicit one. Under Rabbi Heller’s aegis, a group of young and extraordinary Orthodox East European talmudic scholars gathered in Weimar Berlin to struggle directly—explicitly—with the intellectual challenges which Western culture posed for Orthodox Judaism. Rabbi Heller both fostered and cushioned the struggle.

The historian can never reach a fully adequate explanation of why genuinely creative epochs emerge when they do. Why did Rabbis Joseph B. Soloveitchik, Yitzhak Hutner, Menachem Schneerson, Yosef Zev Lipovits, Shmuel Bialoblocki and other East European Jews

come together from different cities under one roof in Western Europe in a certain brief period just at the turn of the first quarter of the century? There were, of course, the necessities and drives of their own lives, but there had to be more, for biography can explain the quandary and the search only of the individual. The convergence of many destinies, the coming together of a whole pool of questing young men—so alike, so different—must find its explanation in realms reaching beyond the biographical even as it includes it. And then, what if they had all come to Berlin, for whatever reasons, but Rabbi Hayyim Heller—the mentor, the pathbreaker, the model—had not been there? Clearly, more was at work than traceable causal connections in the coalescing of modern Orthodox ideology in Germany in the 1920s. Grace as well as the personally impelled search, Providence as well as the dynamic of social and economic necessity, nurtured and sustained “Berlin” as a term rich with connotations for modern Orthodox Jews no less than for the disciples and fellow travelers of Rosenzweig and Buber, of Scholem and Altmann,⁸ of Musham and Lasker-Schuler, of Einstein and Planck, or of Hugenberg and Hitler. It is the aim of this article to reclaim one element in that connotation of “Berlin” which has meant so much to a certain segment of the eternal people—a segment which conceives itself to be the bearer of the message of the Divine in language which the troubled and tortured modern Jew can understand.

Rabbi Hayyim Heller, born in Bialystok in 1878, rabbi in Lomz, Poland, in 1910, and publisher of a critical edition (based on manuscript translations of the Arabic and on the original Arabic itself) of Maimonides’s *Sefer ha-Mitsvot* (*Book of Commandments*) in 1914⁹—this scholarly, quiet, inarticulate, unlikely leader of future intellectual giants moved to Berlin in 1917 and opened Bet Midrash Elyon in 1922. In less than a decade he was gone, off to New York, then Palestine, then Chicago and again New York. In the short span of his residence in Berlin, young but already ripened talmudic scholars of Eastern Europe found that his combination of Lithuanian talmudic learning and modern critical scholarship commanded their respect, impelled their search, and softened its effects. Rabbi Soloveitchik (age 22) arrived in 1925; a few years later the present Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, came. Both studied for a brief period under Rabbi Heller simultaneously, whence their enduring friendship. Others came—the brilliant young prodigy from Warsaw and Hebron, Yitzhak Hutner,¹⁰ the future critical rabbinic scholar, Shmuel Bialoblocki, and the unique bearer of the Salanterian musar tradition, Yosef Zev Lipovitz.

Yosef Zev Lipovitz is the least known of the illustrious group which gathered around Rabbi Heller, and this for two reasons. First, as we shall see, Rabbi Lipovitz was in certain respects a retiring

figure, and the circumstances in Palestine were less hospitable to modern Orthodoxy than they were in the West. Second, Rabbi Lipovits was in a sense least affected by his stay in Berlin. He reacted differently than, say, Rabbi Soloveitchik; he reached his own *modus vivendi* half-way between the Berlin tradition which he entered and the Slobodka yeshiva whence he came.

It was not that Rabbi Lipovitz was less learned or intellectually curious than his comrades. Rather, he was less self-reflective. The degree of self-consciousness in his use of philosophic and scholarly terminology was low. The development of his "position" was hardly explicit. He struggled successfully with the greatest challenge facing any Jewish intellectual coming out of a world of intensive piety and talmudic learning. This challenge is to absorb new knowledge without letting that knowledge destroy one's sense of naive affirmation, of wholehearted and natural faith, of organic commitment. The supreme challenge in synthesizing talmudic and Western knowledge is not the development of an intellectually honest *Weltanschauung* which remains faithful to Jewish Orthodox tradition. That, to be certain, is most difficult, but an even greater challenge is to reach an integrated intellectual position without letting the long months and years of intellectual struggle transform one's living relationship with God—one's naive response to the Divine command—into a self-conscious, self-reflective commitment which puts decision before the promptings of the heart and embodies a compartmentalization of intellect and emotion. What made Rabbi Lipovitz unique is not sheer intellectual power but the ability to integrate not only philosophic and Jewish *ideas*, but philosophic ideas and Jewish *being*.¹¹

In reading Rabbi Lipovitz's writings, the introduction of philosophic or secular notions is always unobtrusive and natural. The explicit philosophic-talmudic confrontation which characterizes Rabbi Soloveitchik's corpus, the great effort at camouflaging philosophic notions which characterizes Rabbi Hutner's corpus, the overt scholarly methodology of Professor Bialobocki's works—all this is missing in the writings of Rabbi Lipovitz. Ideas from the outside have been scrutinized and then selectively absorbed into his whole being so harmoniously that his thought remains fundamentally undisturbed in its naive affirmation of God and the commandments; and if his readers are not sensitive to Western ideas to begin with, his readers can pass them right by.

To say that philosophic or secular notions are not prominent in Rabbi Lipovitz's writings is not the same as to say that he absorbed them by virtue of living in a certain "climate of opinion" or *zeitgeist*. Concerning Rabbi Abraham Issac Kuk, another twentieth-century Orthodox thinker whose writings reveal and yet conceal the influence

of various ideas of Western origin, scholars search for his Western sources on the assumption that Rabbi Kuk himself might never have identified them because they impinged upon him through channels almost intangible and unidentifiable—through the “spirit” or the “climate” of his age.¹² Unlike Rabbi Kuk, Rabbi Lipovitz spent about one-and-a-half years in Berlin (though this fact is omitted from the only published biographical material on him);¹³ he read and heard directly the ideas with which he grappled. More important, he was introduced to bibliography and a scholarly agenda which served as a source of topical and methodological challenge in the years to come. Hence, his selective absorption of Western ideas into his whole being, his ability to keep philosophic ideas from rendering the style and content of his thought self-consciously critical and analytical, is all the more remarkable.

Rabbi Lipovitz's life and thought embodied one side of the fundamental two-fold typology of the Orthodox ideal which emerged from the thinking of East European talmudic scholars who studied in Berlin. One side of the typology asserts the supreme value of harmony and wholeness; the other side, of disharmony and existential anguish. Tracing the typology to its origins, the proponent of harmony was Rabbi Israel Salanter, generally known as the founder of the Musar movement, but also the first of the first-rank East European talmudic scholars who went to Berlin;¹⁴ while the proponent of disharmony is Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik. For Rabbi Israel, the ideal, in his terms, is the whole man, the person in whom religious struggle neither contradicts nor effaces spiritual tranquility; while for Rabbi Soloveitchik, the ideal, in his terms, is the oscillating man, the person for whom struggle is supreme, and tranquility but a sign of either superficiality or the inability to face the essentially disjunct but equally valid secular and covenantal challenges which God sets before man.¹⁵

It is crucial that this typology—the dispute between harmony and disharmony—not be mistakenly cast as a dispute between the ideal of pietistic self-enclosure conducive to inner harmony, and between the ideal of openness to the secular world—a stance conducive to irresolvable conflict. The inner harmony which Rabbi Israel Salanter advocated, and which Rabbi Lipovitz embodied, was to be achieved in a context of intellectual and programmatic openness. What Rabbi Israel opposed was not confrontation with new ideas but the absorption of those ideas in such a way that Jewish being became split, one's mind separating from other levels of being, one's ultimate intellectual synthesis flowing from a self-consciousness divested of organic wholeness, one's integration of intellectual commitment and of observance reflecting a juxtaposition of differentiated segments of self. It was not intellectual openness *per se* which worried Rabbi

Israel, but the shattering of the wholehearted love of man and God which intellectual struggle with secular ideas and ideals could entail.

Rabbi Lipovitz, as a thinker and a person who carried on Rabbi Israel's tradition of both explicit confrontation with Western ideas and the harmonious integration of those ideas with one's whole being, was, to the best of my knowledge, the most authentic transmitter of Rabbi Israel's musar tradition. The Novorodok musar school clearly narrowed the tradition of intellectual encounter; the Slobodka musar school carried on the tradition underground; the Kelm musar school carried on the ideal in theory, but most Kelm disciples veered either to a genuine and profound but self-enclosed piety or to the conflicts of self-consciousness. In Rabbi Yosef Zev Lipovitz, Salanterian musar in its most profound form lived and breathed. To be evident this must be witnessed not just in his writings but in his life. Which bring us to the final reason for his obscurity—his personality and life in Palestine.

II

Yosef Zev Lipovitz was born in 1889 in a small town near Bialystok, Poland, to parents who were Kotsker *hasidim*.¹⁶ When Yosef was 16 or 17 he learned of the Slobodka yeshiva from students who passed through town. After enrolling in Slobodka it became clear that he was gifted in both intellect and sensibility. He became close to Slobodka's renowned dean of talmudic studies, Rabbi Moshe Mordechai Epstein. Rabbi Epstein asked the young student to take his place in delivering the daily lecture for Slobodka's talmudic study circle (*hevra shas*) when he was out of town. The preeminent scholar, Rabbi Meir Simhah of Dvinsk, author of *Or Same'ah*, visited Slobodka in 1912, met Lipovitz, and generously praised his talmudic learning. Rabbi Epstein wanted him to become his son-in-law, but the Saba of Slobodka discourage the match apparently because he felt that the young man did not have sufficient talent to administer the Slobodka yeshiva (the expected future task of a son-in-law of the yeshiva dean).

Rabbi Lipovitz married a girl of indistinguished lineage in 1912, settled in Rituva, Lithuania, and opened a leather store with the help of his father-in-law. Mostly his wife ran the store, while he spent most of his time teaching Talmud in a yeshiva which he had founded and then administered. He served without pay. Each year he returned to the Slobodka yeshiva for the month of Elul and the high holidays. Sometime before 1924, he spent one-and-a-half years in Rabbi Hayyim Heller's Bet Midrash Elyon, and at the University of Berlin. In 1924,

the Lipovitz's closed their business, "went up" to Israel, and settled in Tel Aviv.

While at this time two Slobodka yeshiva graduates—Rabbis Avraham E. Kaplan and Yehiel Y. Weinberg—were, in Berlin, the first to teach Talmud in the East European manner in German, Rabbi Lipovitz was perhaps the first in Tel Aviv to teach Talmud in the East European manner in Hebrew, at the Tahkemoni school. The ideology of this Mizrachi school was close to his heart. His religious Zionism reached deeper than a love for the Land of Israel and a willingness to dedicate his life to rebuilding it. Part of his intellectual achievement was something unusual for one with deep roots in the modern Musar tradition. It was a particular kind of expansion of horizons, a consideration of the possibilities not only of individual but of communal growth. The Musar movement had been neither Zionist nor anti-Zionist; it was pre-Zionist, its major focus was the individual, its major lines of thinking laid down before the Zionist movement arose.¹⁸ What Rabbi Lipovitz did was not to transgress the Musar movement's interest in the individual, but to broaden that interest to include the community, not simply as an aggregate of individuals, but as a collectivity, an entity unto itself, worthy of a pietist's attention and subject to political and social (not just psychological) analysis. Notwithstanding his comprehensive religious Zionism, Rabbi Lipovitz was fired from his teaching position with the Tahkemoni school shortly after he assumed it, and for the following reason.

A Western woman had immigrated to Palestine and sent her young son—unruly, undisciplined—to Tahkemoni. No one could handle him. Rabbi Lipovitz took an interest in him but he failed, too. When Elul arrived he took the boy to the Slobodka branch in Hebron, Palestine (it was before the massacre of 1929). There the boy acclimated, so Rabbi Lipovitz left him there. When he returned to Tel Aviv without the boy, the officials at the school fired him since he had helped the "enemy" by "stealing" a student from a modern religious Zionist school and transferring him to a traditional yeshiva. Rabbi Lipovitz's concern had had nothing to do with the politics of the two different educational institutions, and he himself was a confirmed religious Zionist. His concern was with the student, who, in one place, had stumbled, and, in another, had succeeded. Some years later in the streets of Tel Aviv Rabbi Lipovitz took another young man, an orphan, under his wing, made him religious, but concluded that he would succeed in neither a modern nor a traditional yeshiva, and advised him to study medicine. The first boy grew to be the father of eminent talmudic scholars in Israel; the second boy grew to be a respected lung surgeon. Rabbi Lipovitz did not let his commitments—to Zionism, to

Slobodka, to his own job—stand in the way of counseling individuals according to what was best for them. But in Palestine then (as in Israel today) this had a price—a price he paid but did not talk about. (The boy who stayed in Hebron never did learn why Rabbi Lipovitz had been fired. Rabbi Lipovitz told the story to one person, who told it to me.)

After leaving Tahkemoni, Rabbi Lipovitz taught with Rabbis Meir Bar-Ilan and E. D. Berkovski at Yeshivat Tel Aviv. The classes were in Hebrew; the curriculum was a combination of secular and sacred studies. For health reasons he resigned in 1935, becoming the uncrowned *maggid* (preacher) of Tel Aviv, giving as many as five talks in five different synagogues on Shabbat—all without pay, all to large audiences, both religious and nonreligious. He also delivered musar talks in Yeshivat Or Zore'ah, then one of two post-high school yeshivot in Tel Aviv (the other was the Novorodok yeshiva, founded by students from Mezrich, Poland, one of the five centers of Novorodok musar in interbellum Poland.)

Like many other early settlers in Palestine, the Lipovitzes lost their savings in abortive investment schemes. In their case it was worthless land in Afula, then touted as “the next Tel Aviv.” To make a living, the Lipovitzes opened a small restaurant in 1935 on Lilienblum Street just off the main thoroughfare, Allenby Street. A short stroll down Lilienblum in front of what was once the Lipovitz home brings one to two large banks, United Mizrachi and Hapoalim. Across the street is a replica of the Lipovitz home, a small two-story building, a last remnant of what Tel Aviv once was. The home, its porch beams exposed and rusted, its cement finish peeling away, its wooden shutters rotting, now witnesses pot-bellied middle-aged men in T-shirts arguing about prices and stock options. A brand new white Volvo sits on the sidewalk; signs—“Wrangler”; “Daniella Confection”—protrude; Sneh Insurance Building, 15 stories high, towers above; people rush, walk, scurry by, alight from buses, buy and sell. Sunlight barely squeaks between the buildings; a cool, clean breeze from the nearby Mediterranean moves nimbly through the spaces as if in compensation.

Here, 50 years ago, this site became one of the very few kosher restaurants in the new Palestinian city, “Hill of Spring”—effervescent, confident, coarse, and driving forward. It was hardly the site from which to launch a uniquely integrated ideology of modern Orthodoxy. And yet, with Rabbi Tarfon, if Rabbi Lipovitz could never complete the task, he was not thereby exempt from undertaking it. In this little restaurant for the next quarter century, yeshiva deans, workers, literary figures, factory owners, young and old, weak and hearty, occupied the Lipovitzes, she bringing the food while he brought the Torah—irrepressibly, continually, as an unstoppable fountain, “opening new

worlds,” “making the biblical figures come alive,” “bringing the Patriarchs close,” “enabling us to see them unmediated, intimately, personally.” Around the restaurant table any subject of discussion was transformed into a lens through which to refract a lesson of Torah. “Nothing was foreign to him”; “his thirst for knowledge was unquenchable”; “he spoke to those living ‘in the world’”; “even after the *Shalom* and *lehitra’ot* he had another word, another point.” He was joyful, giving, and expansive, at peace with his study of Torah and teaching of Torah. For him, Torah was everything: Bible, Talmud, politics, ideas, new agricultural schemes in Palestine. “He was the very opposite of narrowness.” But he could narrow his range to listen to another person. He shared in others’ happiness, and in their trouble—many a bitter soul poured out his heart to him. “I do not know what it is that attracted me to him, but I could not let go.”¹⁹ In the new city, Hill of Spring: a small restaurant, a bursting community, a noble *talmid hakham* who lived “in the world.”

Besides the informal lectures in the restaurant and the formal ones in the synagogues (and, later, in his home), Rabbi Lipovitz undertook communal responsibilities. He gathered together the nucleus of what, in 1931, became the first *kolel*, or institute of higher rabbinic studies, in Tel Aviv (“Heikhal ha-Talmud,” which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary). He later administered much of the finances of the Ponevezh yeshiva. His informal teaching and communal responsibilities (both undertaken without pay), and the restaurant, occupied him until the late 1950’s.

From then until his death, he was confined to his home with heart disease. At this time his friends and followers urged him, *pressured* him, to publish. They brought a tape recorder to the lectures which he now gave in his home, and which continued unabated notwithstanding his pain and suffering until two weeks before he died. There were unique overtones to the pressure. It was not just that a respected friend and teacher had never published. The Lipovitzes were childless. His friends wanted something of their remarkably modest colleague and teacher to be left after him (his posthumous volumes, entitled *Nahalat Yosef*, would be the only “heritage of Yosef”). When he died in 1966, his wife eulogized him, saying that the orphans whom he had left behind were all of the words of the talmudic sages which he had not yet interpreted (*kamma divrei Hazal hisharta meyuttamim*). Baylah Lipovitz died in 1978 after selling virtually everything she owned—down to her wedding ring—to finance the publication of her husband’s transcripts.

Only one volume issued from Rabbi Lipovitz’s pen during the years he was confined to his home. This was the short, masterful commentary on the book of Ruth, *Megillat Rut*. After his death, his

wife urged his friends, primarily Rabbi Hayyim Z. Finkel (grandson of the Saba of Slobodka and son of the longtime dean of the Mir yeshiva), to transcribe, edit, and publish the tape recordings of the lectures delivered during the years Rabbi Lipovitz was confined to his home. Three volumes (*Nahalat Yosef*) issued: volume 1 (1966), including both short and extensive essays on the biblical portions (*parashiyyot ha-shavu'a*); volume 2 (1969), short essays on the holidays, the Prophets, the Writings, and a number of other topics such as prophecy, prayer, philosophy of history, political theory, and the like; and volume 3 (1972), short essays on the biblical portions, mostly in Genesis and Exodus. A fourth volume of *Nahalat Yosef* (1972) consists of novellae on the Talmud and Maimonides's code, *Mishneh Torah*.

Two of the three tributes to Rabbi Lipovitz which are prefaced to Volume 1, and his own comments in volume 3, assert that while much commentary which passes for the true meaning of Torah actually uses scriptural verses as props, or prooftexts, for the author's own idea, the method of the musar masters generally and of Rabbi Lipovitz particularly is to begin and end with the text, to read meaning out of it rather than into it. Remarks of this sort will naturally make the critical reader wary (and, in fact, Rabbi Israel himself explicitly suggests that some of his homiletics might be eisegesis),²⁰ but Rabbi Lipovitz's writings really do probe the text carefully. In fact, if one were unsympathetic to his writings, it would be because they are too literal, too closely tied to the text in what it does or does not say or imply, and not because they are fanciful.

The methodological starting point of modern musar's treatment of aggadah and midrash, starting with Rabbi Israel himself and stretching particularly through the Saba of Slobodka down to Rabbi Lipovitz, is that just as halakhic texts are of a piece, so are aggadic and midrashic texts. Just as Halakhah is, at least potentially, a tightly interwoven and unified corpus, so are aggadah and midrash. Consequently, Rabbi Lipovitz examines not just the ideas or the upshot of aggadah and midrash, but their terminology, word for word. Some of his ideas, such as those on prophecy, stem from the perception of significance in a seemingly superfluous word.²¹ He applies the technique of searching for inclusions and exclusions in the phraseology of halakhic texts to aggadic and midrashic texts. Some of Rabbi Lipovitz's ideas, on the other hand, emerge only after the sustained interweaving of numerous texts into a central theme. Still other ideas, such as his interpretation of the biblical Abraham, combine a number of separately developed themes (all rooted in aggadah and midrash) into a sweeping essay which surveys the personality of a biblical figure as a whole.²² In the first three volumes of *Nahalat Yosef*, the movement from the microscopic to the macroscopic follows no dis-

cernible pattern for the simple reason that the arrangement of Rabbi Lipovitz's writings, published posthumously, do not necessarily reflect his preferences, and, of course, some of these writings are not finished products.²³

His commentary on the book of Ruth (*Megillat Rut*), on the other hand, is essentially his own product.²⁴ Its structure, content, and style are masterful. It is one of the few works produced in the modern musar tradition which constitutes a running commentary on an entire biblical book. The introduction consists of two parts: (1) a three-part answer to the question, "Why is Ruth read on Shavuot?"; (2) a discourse on the period of the judges. A number of verses merit extensive comment. Rabbi Lipovitz delicately probes the language of Ruth, often against the background of a number of talmudic and midrashic statements gathered under one rubric, as a single principle, serving not as a conclusion, but as a springboard for extended analysis. Rabbi Lipovitz's *Megillat Rut* is not an elegant interweaving of rabbinic sources with a certain degree of commentary loosely tying together events, deeds, and narrative (as in Yehoshua Bachrach's *Mother of Royalty*),²⁵ not a random selection of talmudic, post-talmudic, and modern rabbinic sources (as in Artscroll's *The Book of Ruth*),²⁶ not a critical philological, textual, or historical enterprise (as in a number of recent scholarly works on Ruth),²⁷ but a sustained psychological interpretation of the personalities in the book, a relentless probing of motivation, inner conflict, and moral decision, an attempt to etch the main actors in their full complexity—in their quandaries, mixed emotions, culpable behavior, and ennobling virtue. *Megillat Rut* is Rabbi Lipovitz's most complete work.

III

I have translated two passages from Rabbi Lipovitz's writings in order to give the reader a more concrete feel for the range of tone and method in Rabbi Lipovitz's corpus, although, of course, two brief selections cannot illustrate either the full diversity or the unself-consciousness of his corpus. The first selection, "The Task of the Jewish Historian," is taken from *Nahalat Yosef*, volume 2, pp. 205–10. The second selection, "Why the Book of Ruth is Read on Shavuot," is the first section of the introduction to *Megillat Rut*. Both selections are slightly abridged.

THE TASK OF THE JEWISH HISTORIAN

A.

The concept of history is explained by the average man as the sum total of events which have transpired throughout the life of mankind—especially momentous and exceptional events, such as the wars and social dislocations which leave their imprint on the paths of human development. Most of the historical knowledge which has accumulated in chronicle literature is limited to these events, for the “great-event” perception of history is the lot not just of the average man but of the historians themselves. This is true for writers of world history as well as of the history of particular peoples.

Now, in the last 100 years a new understanding of the concept of history has arisen. The world’s best thinkers have assigned to history the status of a science as important and elevated as philosophy. The evaluation of historical knowledge has undergone a radical transformation in the hands of the more recent historians and of the intelligentsia. If we wish to dig into the substantive roots of this new historical science, we must familiarize ourselves with the concept of philosophy. Here we encounter a word which is beyond the average man, a term which exceeds the bounds of his sensibility and pushes his consciousness to an unnatural level of abstraction. To him, the term “philosophy” belongs to a unique group of words (including also “eternity”) which he does not apprehend at all. The root of the noun philosopher is in the Greek, while in Hebrew it is translated by a word known to all: sage (*hakham*). The term philosophy is identical with the term wisdom (*hokhmah*): the definition, the limits, and the natural laws of any phenomenon. For example: Two people, the one untutored and the other a technician, view an electrical appliance. The former sees the appliance as a ready fact while the latter perceives its marvelous inner technology. The simple man *sees* the machine while the technicians *knows* it, understands its secrets with utter clarity.

And so it is with historiosophy,²⁸ the philosophy of history. Historians of earlier generations saw and understood the great events—great externally or internally—and recorded them for the generations to come. One does not assemble a machine from knowledge alone: rather, one’s knowledge fashions the raw materials into a complex, multifaceted machine. Similarly, the historians before the last century prepared the raw material which would be given shape and form by the historians or “technicians” of our own generation.

What are the requisite qualities for a “technician” of this kind? He must know the fundamental laws of the material to which he aspires to give shape and form. These laws constitute the moving

factors of history, the causes of all events and occurrences. Causality breathes life into an inanimate body—a chronicle of events. Causes are neither created nor manufactured but uncovered and revealed—such is the artistry of the historical scientist. That which the simple man does not grasp—the axis of a series of occurrences and of the configuration of historical periods—the expert historian discerns and locates as the focus of history.

We may now summarize the definition of history according to presently accepted concepts. History is to discern the essential and characteristic root of the causal factors of history and of the moral conclusions which they teach. When we contemplate the history of a particular people from this point of view, there comes to mind not simply scattered details but the general configuration which unites them—the whole picture. While the historian of the past saw before him only temporal occurrences tied to dates, the contemporary researcher sees the events of history in their general scope. Would the ancient historian have recognized the problematic of “monism versus dualism”? Would he have formulated any position—from the study of history—with regard to the creation and the governance of the world, such that that position be “idealist” or “materialist”? As understood today the science of history generates these kinds of considerations. In any case, it is clear that to the extent that one deals with the history of any people the concern is not with the dates of the events which have transpired throughout that people’s existence, but with the causes and background of these events.

B.

It is a difficult challenge to write the history of any people, for the historian must build his own “home”—his own conceptual construct—without the help of a paradigm or model. The historian builds by creating and reconstructing with his own imaginative power, just as the biblical Adam built his own home, or construct, exclusively with the aid of his imagination without the slightest knowledge of the architectural craft. The historian who sets out to construct an historical pyramid (according to his own conceptual grasp) from informative but unstructured material knows in advance nothing of the scientific structure which will emerge from the material. In spite of all these difficulties the historian does succeed in penetrating the nooks and crannies of the nation’s soul, and in discovering its body, in the historical material. The historian digs deeply into thousands of events in all their detail; he scrutinizes them with his own special historical outlook—his own perspective—until he unveils their inner and outer

essence, the substantive kernel which envelops everything. In this manner the science of history takes shape and final form.

It is seven times harder to write the history of the Jewish people. Any historian who aspires to investigate the innermost soul of his own people cannot ignore the fact that its individuals are fruits which ripen against the background of time and place which has nurtured the history of the entire people. This being the case, the investigator of Jewish history will write a scientific work of unique stature: the history of the Jewish exile whose many way-stations, vicissitudes, and multifaceted meanings interweave reciprocally with the general history of humankind. The historian of the Jewish exile must particularly stress an astonishing phenomenon—that simultaneous with the wanderings, the calamities, and the extreme political weakness of the Jewish people, its influence—in all its originality and universality—on all of the cultured nations of the world did not cease. One example: the influence of the Jewish sages in Spanish and Arab lands. Throughout this period, the nations in whose midst Israel dwelt did not succeed in influencing Israel with their own substantive uniqueness, but they did absorb much of Israel's. This rare phenomenon brings us of necessity to an investigation of Jewish history from its source, that is, from its universality; and this universal aspect of Judaism cannot be recognized or identified as other than the universalist spirit of the people. This spirit, in turn, is undoubtedly hidden in that unique treasure, the book of books—the Hebrew Bible (*Tenakh*)—as the talmudic sages understood and interpreted it.

C.

The agenda of the historian who seeks to study the inner qualities of a people whose history requires much investigation, and who seeks to understand the people's spirit and soul—its ways of thinking and expression, its pattern of life in the individual and the community—is to derive from all this a structure of its history. The gentile historian who writes the history of his own people is generally a part of that people, a limb of its body, such that only his contemporaneity divides him from the earlier links in the chain of his people's history. His objectivity is intermixed with his subjectivity. His inner essence is tied to the period about which he writes even as his existence is tied to a later period, subsequent to that about which he writes. It is just the dating which divides him from his subject, while in place, climate, language, and other marks of unification there is no division between him and his subject; he and the earlier generations are one.

Not so in the writing of Jewish history, which is utterly diverse.

Jews have taken part in world history in every corner of the globe; Jews have scattered to the ends of the earth; universality, our lot and portion, has never slackened. A popular saying states: "If you want to know the poet, go to his land." Know the nature of the land, its conditions, its people—their characteristics, history, and soul. All this is embodied in the poet laureate—and also in the authentic historian. He cannot measure each phenomenon according to a single, rigid criterion nor can he scrutinize influences according to a fixed law. Each development requires its own criterion of measurement. [But this is impossible for the historian of Jewish history since it has encompassed so many lands, languages, climates, customs—so many developments. Thus the Jewish historian has no choice but to write "from the inside."] He cannot get to know the history of the Jewish people if he lacks the sensibility of a Jewish soul.

To know Jewish history, then, one must know above all the spirit of Judaism. To know the spirit of Judaism one must live and breathe in a pure Jewish atmosphere, for it is this which has created the sublime Jewish spirit. It is altogether appropriate here to sound an alarm against the architects of a new pseudo-Jewish history. They endeavor to draw our countenance with false strokes which locate the qualities of the Jewish soul in the context of a Semitic race, and the like—this they do since the way to the inner recesses of the true Jewish soul is hidden from them. As I said, one cannot discover the spark of the soul in the body of a nation except through giving shape and form to its historical material, and that requires the intensification of the attachment between the researcher and his material. It was under this kind of influence that the best of the world's historians worked. And although it is true that in order to understand the essence of Jewish history one must first really know the world, even this kind of comprehensive knowledge cannot acquit the historian who aspires to investigate Jewish history of the need for personal identification with the soul of the chosen people.

WHY THE BOOK OF RUTH IS READ ON SHAVUOT

The talmudic sages call the book of Ruth "a book of retribution." In this sense it is like the book of Job, for each work tells of great tragedies which overcome a wealthy and distinguished family. Indeed, if we examine the book of Ruth, we find that it encompasses all types of human tragedy—national, familial, individual. Nonetheless, there is a ready difference between the impressions left by Ruth and Job. The book of Job is imbued with a spirit of pain and distress, while Ruth, permeated as it is with famine, exile, death, and impoverishment,

nevertheless does not leave one feeling its sorrow and lament. The very subject of the book of Job is suffering and pain in their full embrace, while Ruth includes its tragic events not for some intrinsic purpose but for their consequences—the book's conclusion—which overshadows its beginning. Thus the sages describe the book of Ruth as “retribution with a positive end.” “For Rabbi Johanan said: Why was she called Ruth (*rvt*)? Because David was descended from her, and he in turn saturated (*rivvahu*) the Holy One, blessed be He, with songs and praises” (*Bava Batra* 14b).

Now, to all appearances, the sufferings of Job also had a positive end, for Scripture states plainly, “And God blessed the end of Job's life more than at the beginning” (Job 42:12). And yet, any ultimate comparison between Job and Ruth is untenable, for the blessings of Job did not derive from his suffering; the two—his blessing and his suffering—were wholly separate phenomena. The book of Job sets forth the suffering of a man: suddenly it seizes him and then just as suddenly it leaves him. One perceives no consequences of the suffering which in retrospect make it all worthwhile. Job's suffering may be compared to a horizon darkened by black rainclouds, clouds of wrath, which then clear; the clouds never yield rain, never replenish the furrows of the fields. In the book of Ruth, however, the clouds give forth bountiful rain and nurture a seedbed from which springs a wondrous shoot: David.

Now we can understand Rabbi Johanan's statement—Why was she called Ruth? Because David was descended from her . . .” The Talmud, of course, did not need to cite Rabbi Johanan to establish that David was descended from Ruth, for the book of Ruth itself narrates the ancestry of the House of David. Rabbi Johanan's point here is that there is an integral link between David and Ruth, that the plenitude of song and praise for God in David finds its origin in Ruth. How did Ruth earn this privilege? Through suffering and poverty. For 10 years she dwelt with the family of Naomi in all its wealth and was unable to bring herself to say, “your people are my people; your God, my God.” Only after her soul was purified in the crucible of suffering and sorrow did she reach the spiritual ascents of her life.

It would have been logical, one might think, to expect Ruth's attachment to the people of Israel to have come in her period of wealth and comfort. But no; the remarkable chain of events began with suffering and impoverishment. In this very way—through grief and affliction—did Naomi, too, return to her people and her land and earn the privilege of having the kingship of Israel established through her. All vegetation and growth require rainfall, but rain is efficacious only when preceded by proper seeding, and, similarly, suffering is efficacious only for that heart in which a sound seed is hidden. The

suffering which had no positive impact on Mahlon and Kilyon bore fruit in Naomi, and, especially, in Ruth, to such an extent that she became the mother of royalty and the mother of the messiah. This is the consolation in the book of Ruth for all of the suffering and all of the hardship of the people of Israel.

The Torah is one of three gifts which the Holy One, blessed be He, made available to Israel through suffering, and the international tragedy of the Jewish people is linked to its having accepted the Torah, for at that moment of revelation and acceptance “eternal hatred for the eternal people” was born. On Shavuot, the anniversary of the giving of the Torah, the people of Israel might fall prey to doubts, to questions about the affliction visited upon them for thousands of years—all because of their acceptance of Torah. Therefore, the book of Ruth is given to the people of Israel on Shavuot as a cup of consolation. The book of Ruth demonstrates that from out of suffering and misery grow the greatest achievements. It is worthwhile for each Jew and each Jewish household to ponder the story of Ruth, to extrapolate from the consequences of this woman’s suffering the remarkable end reserved for the Jewish people in the bosom of the future.

NOTES

1. Louisiana State University Press (Baton Rouge and London, 1980).
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 101, 103.
3. Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (New York, 1968); *idem*, *Freud, Jews, and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture* (New York, 1978); Frederick V. Grunfeld, *Prophets without Honor* (New York, 1979); Walter Z. Laqueur, *Weimar: A Cultural History, 1918–1933* (London, 1974).
4. Dov Katz’s treatment of the Saba and his yeshiva in volume 3 of *Tenuat ha-Musar* (Tel Aviv, 1967) is the best of his six volumes on the Musar movement. Because of Katz’s personal connection to the Saba and the Slobodka yeshiva, his instincts were better than in his writing about other schools of musar, and, regarding Slobodka, he needed to rely less on secondary or tertiary oral traditions than he did in the other volumes of *Tenuat ha-Musar*. For an example of the problem in Katz’s use of nonprimary oral traditions outside the Slobodka context, see “Did Israel Salanter Study Philosophy and Kabbalah?” in my *Israel Salanter: Text, Structure Idea—The Ethics and Theology of an Early Psychologist of the Unconscious* (New York, 1982), esp. pp. 218–19. Katz’s connection to Slobodka entailed not only advantages but also a partiality to it; see, for example, volume 3, pp. 35, 56, 66, 70.
5. Goldberg, *Israel Salanter*, *ibid.*, pp. 95–96.
6. A memoir of Rabbi Lessin, longtime *mashgiach* at Yeshiva University, is my “From Berkeley to Jerusalem,” *Midstream*, August, 1982.
7. See note 5, and Katz, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp. 84–85, 99–100, 112–13, for a list of the Saba’s other noteworthy disciples in Europe, Palestine, and the United States.
8. Although Alexander Altmann, a Central European Orthodox Jew who became a leading young instructor at Hildesheimer’s Berlin Rabbinical Seminary, is clearly part of the cross-cultural Orthodox search in Berlin, I classify him with the scholarly and not the ideological figures of that period because much of his work then and most of his subsequent influential endeavors were in Jewish scholarship. This is meant neither to derogate

Altmann's rabbinical career nor to overlook the complexity of his life and thought. A wealth of interesting information about the wellsprings of Altmann's early career remains to be woven into a meaningful whole. Two examples: (1) at the University of Berlin Alexander Altmann and Joseph B. Soloveitchik switched dissertation advisors; (2) Rabbi Soloveitchik was called upon to formulate the *ketav* (the formulaic letter of appointment) to be given to Rabbi Altmann on his assuming his first rabbinic post.

9. Besides the critical edition of *Sefer ha-Mitzvot*, Heller published the Samaritan Bible (1923), an annotated *Peshitta* of Genesis and Exodus (1927–29), and *Mishneh Torah* (Schulsinger edition, 1947). He also published *Untersuchungen ueber die Peshitta* (1911), *Al ha-Targum ha-Yerushalmi la-Torah* (1921), *Le-Hikrei Halakhah*, 2 vols. (1924–32), *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta* (1932), *Al Targum ha-Shivim ba-Konkordantsya Heikhal ha-Kodesh* (1944), and *Kuntres be-Hilkhot Loveh u-Malveh*.

Older students of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik recall him standing in honor of Rabbi Heller for the entire duration of the latter's lectures, during which Rabbi Soloveitchik amplified and expanded the compressed remarks of Rabbi Heller. Rabbi Soloveitchik's eulogy of Rabbi Heller is "*Peleitat Sofereiheim*," *Be-Sod ha-Yahid ve-ha-Yahad*, ed. Pinchas Peli (Jerusalem, 1976).

10. At the age of 25 R. Hutner published a brilliant rabbinic work, *Torat ha-Nazir* (1932), which aroused the admiration of the leading halakhic scholars of the day. A posthumous collection of his letters, *Pahad Yitzhak: Iggerot u-Ketavim* (Jerusalem; 1981), sheds some light on his relationship to the Saba of Slobodka and his attitude toward musar generally and the Slobodka and Hebron yeshivot particularly.
11. Samuel C. Heilman, "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy," *Modern Judaism* (Feb., 1982), is quite right in identifying the starting point of what he calls "syncretist" (and what I call here "cross-cultural") Orthodoxy as self-consciousness. Cf. Werner Dannhauser, "Leo Strauss: Becoming Naive Again," *Masters*, ed. Joseph Epstein (New York, 1981), p. 262.
12. The validity of the concept of "climate of opinion" is most persuasively argued in Carl L. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven and London, 1932). One who considers the concept too vague to be useful is Isaiah Berlin, *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1980). I have argued that the concept partially explains Israel Salanter's understanding of the unconscious; see my "An Early Psychologist of the Unconscious," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, April, 1982; Lancelot L. Whyte, *The Unconscious before Freud* (London, 1962), chapters 7, 8; and Yitzhak Ahren, "Rabbi Israel Salanter das Unbewusste," *Udim*, 1976/76.
13. Dov Katz, "Al ha-Rav ha-Mehabber Zt'l," introduction to Yosef Zev Lipovitz, *Nahalat Yosef*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1966). In this article, all information not found in Katz's introduction was gathered in personal interviews with Ephraim Borodianski (Jerusalem, June, 1982), Moshe Ullman, Shmuel Gurman, and Avraham Yeshurun (Tel Aviv, June, 1982). Each one of these disciples of Rabbi Lipovitz knew him at different times and in different capacities. Here I wish to express my gratitude to all of these men for their marvelous cooperation and complete candidness. Our understanding of Rabbi Lipovitz would be considerably less rich without the diverse recollections and other kinds of aid kindly extended by these men. They are, of course, not responsible for the interpretation of Rabbi Lipovitz expressed here. The present point—Rabbi Lipovitz's presence and activities in Berlin—was substantiated by Rabbi Borodianski in a variety of ways, including direct communications with Rabbi Lipovitz himself. Rabbi Borodianski ventures that the reason for the omission by Katz of Rabbi Lipovitz's study in Berlin is that such activity is "presently considered uncomplimentary"—presumably in the circles among which his posthumous volumes were expected to sell. See also note 16.
14. He left Kovno, Lithuania, for Prussia in 1857 or 1858 for medical treatment, but then decided to remain in Western Europe. Except for one two-year and other short return visits to Lithuania, he remained in Western Europe until his death in 1883. Extant letters from Rabbi Israel's German period were written in Memel, Halberstadt, Koenigsberg, Paris, Berlin (1864, 1873), and Paris. There are also references to his stay in Friedrichsdatt and a number of other letters from this period which do not identify their place of origin. See Shraga Wilman, *Iggerot u-Mikhtavim* (Brooklyn, 1970).
15. This theme runs throughout Soloveitchik's writings. It is most systematically expressed in "The Lonely Man of Faith," *Tradition* (Summer 1965), esp. sections IX, X. The theme

is most passionately expressed in "Sacred and Profane: Kodesh and Chol in World Perspectives," *Gesher*, 1966: "Creation springs from primordial chaos; religious profundity springs from spiritual conflict. The Jewish ideal of the religious personality is not the harmonious individual determined by the principle of equilibrium, but the torn soul and the shattered spirit that oscillate between God and the world. In his substrata of spiritual experience, the *homo religiosus* endures constantly the diastrophic forces of mental upheaval and psychic collision."

16. Like Rabbi Israel and many of his disciples, Lipovitz spoke very little about his childhood, or, for that matter, about his life at all. When musar masters spoke of open righteousness—of show or display or even private communication—as contaminating religious integrity, they took the matter most literally and seriously, in contrast to hasidic masters such as R. Nahman of Bratzlav who also believed in hidden righteousness but still managed to leave over enough information about themselves for subsequent historians to construct rather thorough, lengthy biographies.
17. Kaplan, who died suddenly in 1924 at the age of 35, was replaced by Weinberg as chief instructor of Talmud at the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary. The lure to cross-cultural encounter among East European yeshiva students was so strong that of the 38 students enrolled at the Berlin Seminary in 1924, 22 were Eastern Jews (Isi Jacob Eisner, "Reminiscences of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 1967, p. 41). Besides the lure of the West for the East, there was an opposite pull (beyond the scope of this article)—the attraction of the East for the West. American, West European, Australian, and South African Orthodox rabbinical students gravitated to East European yeshivot. In the Mir yeshiva in the 1930s, for example, about one-quarter of the students were of nonPolish origin: 40 Americans, 30 Germans, six Austrians, three French, one Swede, one Dane, eight Englishmen, two South Africans, four Belgians, two Scots, three Irishmen, and two Canadians (Cyril Domb, ed., *Memories of Kopul Rosen*, London, 1970, p. 56; see also Alexander Carlebach, *Adass Yeshurun of Cologne*, Belfast, 1964, pp. 121–25). The pull of the East signified a narrowing of cultural horizons for a deepening of spiritual experience and talmudic learning. Physicians, lawyers, and other Western Orthodox Jews "did not think a journey of thousands of miles from modern cities to a small remote village in Poland too much, or the exchange of the modern amenities of life for a more primitive mode of living, too great a sacrifice. Some had even brought their wives with them and settled down in this small, outlying village [Mir]. They were willing to forego the pleasures and conveniences to which they had been accustomed, for the discomforts of this village because they knew that they were acquiring timeless and eternal ideals" (*Memories of Kopul Rosen*, pp. 56–57). See also S. Wolbe, *Ha-Adam bi-Yekar* (Jerusalem, 1982), p. 17.
18. Like the disciples of the founder of Hasidism, the Baal Shem Tov, and of the founder of Mitnaggedut, the Vilna Gaon, the disciples of the founder of the Musar movement immigrated to Palestine without the religious-Zionist purpose of reconstituting a Jewish corporate society there. Rabbi Israel's own mentor immigrated to Palestine in 1838. Of Rabbi Israel's three major disciples, two immigrated to Palestine, Yitzhak Blazer in 1904 and Naftali Amsterdam in 1906. The third major disciple, Simhah Zisl Ziv, wished to immigrate to Palestine but could not due to ill health. He did send many of his disciples who, upon his instructions, opened a musar room (*muser shetibl*) in Jerusalem. Similarly, one major second-generation Musar disciple, the Saba of Slobodka, immigrated to Palestine and successfully urged many of his disciples (including Rabbi Lipovitz) to do likewise; and another major second-generation Musar disciple, the Saba of Novorodok, had five major disciples, one of whom immigrated to Palestine, two of the others sending their own disciples to Palestine. One of the main reasons why Dov Katz was able to gather the information upon which he based his 6-volume *Tenuat ha-Musar* was because of the abundance of Musar disciples who, like him, had immigrated to Palestine.
19. All of the quotations in this paragraph are from Lipovitz's disciples listed in note 13, and from another colleague of his who wished to remain anonymous. I have also benefited from A. Avigad, "Sefer Toda'ah Toranit," *Ha-Tsofeh*, Feb. 4, 1972 (review of *Nahalat Yosef*, volume 3).
20. I have identified 14 such suggestions in his early German-period writings. See Goldberg, *op. cit.* (note 4), Part Four, note 13.

21. *Nahalat Yosef*, volume 2, p. 96; Cf. volume 1, pp. 254–57.
22. *Nahalat Yosef*, volume 1, pp. 69–100.
23. The editing and arrangement of classroom lectures and other forms of oral presentation have produced some of the most significant Jewish literature throughout Jewish history, from the Talmud to medieval philosophic works to modern musar tracts. Cf. Harry A. Wolfson, *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle* (Cambridge, 1929), pp. 29–31, and Goldberg, *op. cit.* (note 4), Bibliography, IV.
24. Rabbi Lipovitz produced the book in conjunction with the Israeli poet, essayist, translator, and critic, Avraham Y. Kariv, an admirer of Rabbi Lipovitz who attended his classes, and whom Rabbi Lipovitz had a large part in making religious. Kariv reformulated and edited the original drafts and transcripts produced by Rabbi Lipovitz, who then reviewed and revised Kariv's draft.
25. *Imah shel Malkhut* (Jerusalem, 1954, 1974).
26. Meir Zlotowitz, *The Book of Ruth—Megillas Ruth: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources* (New York, 1976). Zlotowitz identifies the source of Rabbi Lipovitz's commentary as *Nahalat Yosef*, whereas the source is *Megillat Rut*.
27. A much abbreviated bibliography of recent critical literature on the book of Ruth includes the following books: D. R. G. Beattie, *Jewish Exegesis of the Book of Ruth* (Sheffield, 1977); Etan Levine, *The Aramaic Version of Ruth* (Rome, 1973); Sid Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* (Hamden, 1976), pp. 106, 190 (n. 504), 132–33; and Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation* (Baltimore, 1979); and the following articles: A.A. Anderson, "The Marriage of Ruth," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (1978); E. F. Campbell, "The Hebrew Short Story: A Study of Ruth," in *Old Testament Studies in Honor of J. M. Myers* (Philadelphia, 1974); Andre Larocque, "Date et milieu du livre de Ruth," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* (1979); E. Lipinski, "Le Mariage de Ruth," *Vetus Testamentum* (1976); A. Meinhold, "Theologische Schwerpunkte im Buch Ruth und ihr Gewicht fuer seine Datierung," *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1976); G. Nigal, "Perusho shel R. Yosef Yavets le-Rut," *Sinai* (1975); Bezalel Porten, "The Scroll of Ruth: A Rhetorical Study," *Gratz* (1978); *idem* and E. Strouse, "A Reading of Ruth," *Commentary* (Feb. 1979); D. F. Rauber, "The Book of Ruth," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, ed. Kenneth R. R. G. Louis, *et al.* (Nashville, 1974); Kiyoshi K. Sacon, "The Book of Ruth—Its Literary Structure and Theme," *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* (1978).
28. "Historiosophy," a favorite term of Israeli intellectuals, is a word which in fact does not exist in any of the major dictionaries which I have consulted. Hence Rabbi Lipovitz's appositional phrase, "philosophy of history," is not expansive but essential. The only attempt to define "historiosophy" which I have found over the years is in Isaiah Berlin, "The Life and Opinions of Moses Hess," *op. cit.* (note 12), p. 217: "... the majority sought [substitutes for religion] in history as the progressive revelation of the ways of God or the Absolute Spirit, and this led to the schools of what is best called historiosophy—the attempt to make history do the work of theology or speculative metaphysics. . . ."