

The author of this study, a candidate for a doctorate in modern Musar thought at Brandeis University, teaches at the Jerusalem College for Women.

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF RABBI ISRAEL SALANTER

Perhaps it is an indication of the radicalism of his life and thought that R. Israel Salanter, nearly one hundred years after his death, is still misunderstood. Moreover, to all but segments of Orthodoxy and devotees of musar or Lithuanian Jewish history, he is unknown.

Is it by sheer accident or neglect that the life of R. Israel Salanter has evaded comprehensive analysis? What was the Musar movement he founded, that smallest and least understood of the attempts in modern Jewish history to cope with the forces unleashed at the time of Emancipation? What are the elements of Salanterian musar which require elucidation before an adequate outline of R. Salanter's thought can emerge?

We hope to explore these and related issues in this article, with particular attention given to the long introduction by Mordechai Pachter to the most recent anthology of R. Salanter's writings, *Kitve R. Yisrael Salanter*.¹ This introduction has attracted attention in Israel as a penetrating synopsis of R. Salanter's life and thought.

Born in 1810, Israel Lipkin (later surnamed Salanter after the first town, Salant, Lithuania, in which he settled) was heir to a family tradition of Talmudic scholarship. Exceptionally gifted, Israel began to surpass his progenitors intellectually even in his childhood years, and he was sent by his father from the city of his birth, Zagory, to Salant to study with a renowned scholar of the day, R. Tzvi Braude. The young Salanter was greatly aided in his Talmudic studies by a close relationship with R. Braude, but it was another man in Salant who had a more profound impact on his personality and created the framework through which

Israel later sought to alter the fundamental course of Lithuanian Jewry. Possessed of a sensitive heart, Israel discerned profound piety in a Salant townsman who dressed as a common, impoverished laborer. The man, R. Yosef Zundel, a leading student of R. Hayyim of Volozhin, consciously attempted to conceal his greatness in the interest of humility.

Israel Salanter noted that R. Zundel observed every jot and tittle of the Code of Law (*Shulhan Arukh*), including myriad dicta pertaining to ethical behavior. By stealthily following him during his customary walks in the woods, Israel witnessed him in moments of articulated, acerbic self-criticism and soul-searching. To Israel, R. Zundel was unique: an amalgam of intellectual acumen and the behavioral ideals dictated by the immense corpus of Judaic tradition; and a man who, despite his high grasp, strove to raise himself ever higher. The example of R. Zundel fired within the precocious lad an all-consuming dedication to achieving similar spiritual heights, but how, Israel must have asked himself, could he achieve them? If a man of R. Zundel's stature could find so much in himself to criticize, what could Israel do?

Against this backdrop, the emotional power of the central experience of Israel's childhood may be understood. One day, R. Zundel detected Israel—perhaps not even thirteen years old—stalking him during one of his private missions of self-scrutiny. Sensing the boy's questions and aspirations, he turned to him, stunning him, and declared, "Learn musar, and become a *Yere Shammayim* (one who fears Heaven)."²

Musar: This was the key, the secret, the way to emulate R. Zundel—to acquire "Fear of Heaven," that all-encompassing religious state in which awe of the Creator engenders dedication to an intellectual understanding of Jewish tradition, and, equally strongly, to implementing its norms both ethical and ritual.

Musar: This was the systematization of the ethical teachings of the Talmud, put into literary form over the past 900 years under the impact of neo-Platonic, Kabbalistic, German Hasidic and rabbinic intellectual currents.³

Musar: to the young Israel, electrified by R. Zundel's words, this was a term which suddenly meant far more than mere systematized ethics. Refracted through the prism of this decisive

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

encounter with R. Zundel, musar assumed new meaning to Israel which became the source of later innovative characteristics of the Musar movement: the musar personality, in private moments, as the supreme, the most effective implement of ethical education; and, emotion as a necessary concomitant to the study of musar literature. R. Zundel's words, as R. Salanter himself later put it, pierced his heart as if they were an emblazoned arrow, not only because of *what* they conveyed, but also because of *how* they were conveyed and *by whom*. By whom: a man, a model, who in good measure had come to embody all of the ethical values of Judaism. How: with all the passionate force attendant upon a sudden, deeply personal communication between admired mentor and impressionable pupil.

Israel Salanter radically altered his curriculum. While he continued to study the Talmud and its host of commentaries with great devotion, he began to examine all classic musar works. He pursued his new musar involvement under the tutelage of R. Zundel for approximately the next fifteen years, until R. Zundel emigrated to the Holy Land.

I

If Israel Salanter's commitment, forged under the impact of R. Zundel, formed R. Salanter's entire intellectual and emotional configuration, then R. Zundel, not R. Salanter, would rightly be called the founder of the Musar movement. However, R. Salanter later expanded R. Zundel's approach in at least two ways. First, he broadened and deepened the theoretical foundations of R. Zundel's concept of musar study. Second, he pursued the goal of making musar study and growth an occupation which all Jews—men, women and children, scholars and untutored alike—could beneficially pursue.

The literature on R. Salanter does not contain comprehensive analyses of his life and thought, especially of his concept of musar study and growth. One of the essential reasons for this paucity of scholarship is embedded in R. Salanter's tutelage under R. Zundel. From him, R. Salanter learned that the goal of musar was more the reshaping of human behavior than the fashioning

of correct ideas; the essential means toward this goal was more of one's personal involvement and observation of a musar master than one's intellectual grasp of the musar tracts. R. Salanter largely eschewed the written word; he left a small number of articles, letters and Talmudic discourses. In the main, his students neither studied these writings assiduously nor produced any of their own. The understanding of Salanterian musar was in the practice of it. For the most part, an inverse relation obtained: pursuit of musar ideals meant neglect of literary expression of these ideals,⁴ while the recording of musar tenets and history implied lack of intimate familiarity with them.⁵

In the post-modern world, characterized in part by the possibility of viewing one's own past or even present commitments with a critical eye, more perceptive appraisals of the Musar movement have been attempted. Dov Katz's six volume *Tenuat ha-Musar* is a monumental collection of biographical and historical data, but it is far less accomplished as a systematic assessment of the movement and its thought. In the latter area, the attempts of Rosen, Glenn and others do not even measure up to Katz.⁶ A valuable assessment of the early period of the Movement and of some of its later practitioners is found in Yehiel Y. Weinberg's series of articles in *Seride Esh*.⁷ A limited but distinct step forward in understanding R. Salanter's thought is Mordechai Pachter's long introduction to his anthology, *Kitve R. Yisrael Salanter*.

Pachter attempts to identify and structure the key points in R. Salanter's thought. Pachter's most valuable contribution is his lucid presentation of the theoretical foundations of one of the most important aspects of R. Salanter's thought, the combination of, in R. Salanter's words, *sekhel* or *kohot hitzoni'im*, and *kohot kehim* or *kohot penimi'im*. Simply to give the English-speaking reader an idea of what these words mean, we will render them as the intellectual faculty and the subconscious, respectively, but in the remainder of this article, we will use only R. Salanter's Hebrew terminology, for translating his terminology in the context of his thought on behavior training would inevitably invite interpretation of his terminology in light of one trend or another in modern psychology. For example, *kohot kehim* could be rendered, alternatively, as "dark forces," "subconscious,"

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

"deepest layer of the psyche," "deeper layers of the psyche" or "instincts." What Pachter attempts is an exposition of Salanterian *musar* on its own terms, and likewise, the fundamental criterion according to which we will evaluate Pachter's efforts is the extent to which he accurately reflects R. Salanter's teachings. Pachter's shunning of comparative psychology is sound methodology; he avoids premature identification of R. Salanter with one or more theories of modern psychology. Before one may determine whether Salanterian *musar* may be profitably viewed in relation to Freud, Frankl or other significant twentieth century psychologists, what R. Salanter himself said must be clear.⁸ As yet, no work (including Pachter's) has systematized all of R. Salanter's ideas according to their own internal structure.

To paraphrase Pachter, there appears throughout R. Salanter's writings a distinct distrust of the adequacy of *sekhel* in generating ethical behavior, and a distinct awareness that *kohot kehim* are the real determinants of behavior. R. Salanter said that commitment within the *sekhel* to what is right and proper can never in and of itself guarantee behavior consonant with that commitment, no matter how loftily it may be expressed, no matter how intricately it may be understood. "What can we do?" asked R. Salanter. "The imagination [*kohot kehim*] is a churning river in which *sekhel* drowns . . ."⁹

If the power of the *kohot kehim* can generate the violation of moral principles held by the *sekhel* (such as the principles and specific teachings of the Torah), *kohot kehim* are also an essential tools by which proper behavior is perpetuated. This apparent contradiction finds one of its resolutions in R. Salanter's concept of *musar* study, called *limud ha-musari*. *Limud ha-musari* is far from calm, deliberate intellection; it must be carried on with great emotion, in a state of rapture, "with lips aflame," as R. Salanter characterized it.¹⁰ The Torah's dictates must be grasped by stating them aloud, by repeating them over and over, by singing them, even by shouting them—all at regular intervals. The *sekhel* will drown in the churning river "unless"—as R. Salanter concluded the simile cited above—"we give it direction in the ship which is the impassioned soul and the stormy spirit." In short, the printed words on the page must become firm commit-

ments within the soul. The written word, capable of being grasped by the *sekhel*, must be transmuted into a deep-seated will, a deep-seated acquisition, possessing the same power as the native *kohot kehim*. Once this transmutation occurs, the principles held by the *sekhel*, not the native *kohot kehim*, determine behavior.¹¹

Pachter believes that the emergence of the relation of *sekhel* and *kohot kehim* as the focal point of R. Salanter's thought was related to the historical forces with which R. Salanter grappled. To paraphrase Pachter, Lithuanian Jewry in the nineteenth century faced a double challenge: Hasidism, an emotional force which struck roots in areas East and South of Lithuania, whose power was past its peak; and Haskalah, a secular, intellectual force which emanated from the West, whose power was on the rise.

Pachter claims that R. Salanter understood the weakness of Lithuanian Jewry in his time to be identical with the weakness of the Jewries which Hasidism had captured many decades earlier. The weakness was twofold: an overemphasis on intellection at the expense of emotion, and a damaging gap in status between the learned elite and the untutored masses. While the twofold weakness was identical, the character of the Lithuanian and pre-Hasidic Jewries was not. Lithuanian Jewry, dour, individualistic, intellectually-oriented, could not be captured by a largely emotional force, and, therefore, Lithuanian Jewry successfully repelled Hasidism; but Hasidism did, in its struggle with Lithuanian Jewry, bring to fore the narrow basis of Lithuanian Jewish religiosity and thus weaken Lithuanian Jewry. Haskalah, inherently more kindred in spirit than Hasidism to Lithuanian Jewry, could exploit this weakness and erode the classic Lithuanian Jewish character. Haskalah could undermine a religious, intellectual enterprise which commanded an allegiance not rooted in the deepest realm—the *kohot kehim*—of the Lithuanian Jewish psychic; intellectual beauty of a fundamentally non-religious, secular nature could readily supplant the religious, intellectual Lithuanian propensity. R. Salanter felt, says Pachter, that Lithuanian Jewry, subsequent to the historic clash with Hasidism, did not realistically assess the fact that it was ripe for attack.

It is here that Pachter relates R. Salanter's efforts to buttress

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

Lithuanian Jewry with his manifold musar program. Lithuanian Jewry, by taking the Salanterian musar program seriously, could redress both the imbalance between the intellectual and the emotional components of its religiosity and the corresponding social antagonism between the intellectual elite and the uneducated masses. It could become aware of the superficiality of its involvement in Torah study and observance of halakhic norms, could deepen this involvement with the needed emotional foundations, and then be able to meet the challenge of Haskalah. While this same musar program assured an emotional reinvigoration of Lithuanian Jewry, it also promised a continuing centrality to Torah study, thus insuring that Lithuanian Jewry, in its reinvigoration, would not commit the emotional excesses of Hasidism. Moreover, a number of programmatic qualities of Salanterian musar fit the capacities of the untutored masses and could draw them back into the mainstream of Lithuanian Jewish life. These Salanterian-musar qualities were: its emotional elements and its curriculum (the musar tracts), both more palatable than the intellectually arduous unraveling of Talmudic intricacies; its personal, individualistic dimensions of soul-searching and other attributes sufficiently down-to-earth for the common man; and its subsuming the musar teachings under the heading of Torah, enabling the masses to feel an equal sense of participation in the highest Lithuanian religious ideal, Torah study. If implemented, the Salanterian musar program would solve at once all of the intellectual and social problems of Lithuanian Jewry.¹²

II

Pachter's introduction is a groundbreaking effort to structure R. Salanter's thought and to relate it to R. Salanter's historically significant activities. Pachter's exposition of the relation of *sekhel* to *kohot kehim* is, as far as it goes, a careful rendering of difficult portions of R. Salanter's writings. The introduction is written with due regard for literary economy, and, for the most part, well-expressed. Besides analyzing R. Salanter's thought and how it related to the emergence of the Musar movement, he makes a number of miscellaneous, important points, among them the

obvious but all too frequently ignored or unknown fact that the Musar movement did not diminish in vitality or in quality with R. Salanter's death, but simply modified its character. The movement adapted to new historical conditions right up to World War II and the destruction of European Jewry.

This introduction is, however, drastically oversimplified. Although inclusive constructs have been sorely lacking in attempts to understand R. Salanter's life and thought, Pachter goes much too far. If most previous works on R. Salanter and the Musar movement have conveyed the barest grasp of the interconnections within his writings or between his thought and life, Pachter draws a narrow picture, foreshortening the intricate contours of R. Salanter into a profile which depicts a man far more uniform in his thought, far more consistent in his methods, far more mechanical in his social mission than he really was. Pachter obscures a man whose thought was too creative and whose writings were published too accidentally to be adequately encompassed by a single analytical framework. Pachter obscures significant elements of R. Salanter's historical motivations, his willingness to experiment, his inner struggles and paradoxical inner tranquility.

Our analysis of Pachter's introduction will deal, first, with his treatment of R. Salanter's life and historical efforts, and, second, with his treatment of R. Salanter's thought.

A.

In Pachter's eyes, R. Salanter's determination to change Lithuanian Jewry was pursued with undeviating singlemindedness. This view seems to result from Pachter's imbalanced portrayal of a number of pivotal incidents in R. Salanter's life. In R. Salanter's early days in Vilna, he served as Rosh Yeshiva in one of the city's famed *yeshivot*. The position carried great prestige; R. Salanter's stature as a Talmudic scholar became widely known and he attracted numerous pupils. The position thus contained great potential for the propagation of musar, but R. Salanter resigned the post not long after he had assumed it. Pachter writes that R. Salanter resigned primarily with the intent of embarking on his first steps in spreading musar methods and ideals.¹³ How-

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

ever, it was not because of but in spite of his desire to spread musar that he renounced his position, a move which also entailed a drastic drop in his income. The reason for his inauspicious departure was his desire to avoid further embarrassment to R. Mordechai Melzer who—the historical record is not clear—either served simultaneously with R. Salanter but was overshadowed by him, or sought to regain the position which R. Salanter then held but which he had held some time prior to the offer made to R. Salanter to take up the post.¹⁴

Pachter characterizes the five letters of 1849, which R. Salanter wrote upon his arrival in Kovno to the followers he had left behind in Vilna, as a notable technical advancement in his determined efforts to foster the growth of the Musar movement.¹⁵ However, these letters were addressed only to individuals, were not distributed widely, were not published until long after R. Salanter's death, were intelligible only to those who had already come under his influence, and, in R. Salanter's own estimation, did not influence his followers as deeply as he had hoped they would. The letters were penned to protect against collapse of the teachings which he had already imparted.¹⁶

Pachter relates that when R. Salanter left Vilna in 1849, he merely picked up in Kovno where he had left off and expanded and diversified his activities in his new location until the Musar movement reached its zenith.¹⁷ However, Pachter does not relate that the turn of events which led to R. Salanter's departure from Vilna was one of the most upsetting experiences of his life, and the move itself—the spurning of Vilna, cradle of his dreams—was a wrenching ordeal. R. Salanter felt impelled to reconsider his entire tactical approach to buttressing Lithuanian Jewry. In Kovno, he temporarily abandoned almost every method he had used in Vilna, such as public sermons and musar conventicles for laymen, concentrating instead on the establishment of a seminary in which he could devote himself to a limited number of highly talented, young pupils.

R. Salanter's numerous shifts in tactics and methods stemmed from complex motivations. Through them, we can discover which social strata he attempted to reach and the impress of historical circumstances upon these attempts.

Upon entering Vilna, R. Salanter had envisaged his musar doctrine as the foundation of a mass movement. This was evident in his working directly with all levels of the local society, a practice unheard of before then among Talmudic scholars of his rank. He delivered highly emotional, popular sermons to the poor;¹⁸ he established musar conventicles for the middle class (the *ba'ale battim*);¹⁹ he delivered Talmudic discourses to the young elite, the aspiring Talmudists.²⁰ All the while, he assumed no official position among the reigning rabbinic establishment (except for his brief service as Rosh Yeshiva during his first year in Vilna); he refused to decide by himself even those halakhic questions which arose within his own kitchen.²¹ It was his aim to generate a movement which would cut across the existing social and religious strata, and he worked successfully toward that end until 1849, when one, or possibly two, events convinced him that this course was no longer viable.

The incident which certainly affected him was the offer extended to him by Vilna *maskilim* (advocates of Haskalah) to accept the deanship of a rabbinical seminary, to be opened with the blessings of the Czar. The *maskilim* felt that his critical view of Lithuanian traditionalism placed him in their camp, while his impeccable credentials as a Talmud scholar would give the school just the imprimatur it needed in the traditional Lithuanian context. R. Salanter rejected the offer not simply because such a seminary could not fulfill its intended purpose of producing competent rabbis, but also because he was alarmed by the methods and broader aims of the *maskilim*. As to the seminary itself, its inclusion of science and Russian language precluded, he felt, the training of scholars capable of ruling on halakhic questions, for this capability required a preparatory course brooking no distractions. Further, a school of Jewish learning designed to produce only practicing rabbis would become a "rabbinical factory." The seminary-trained rabbi, oriented from the beginning to esteem his own professional goals, would be far more likely to devalue his services through compromise on issues where his personal interests, financial or otherwise, were involved.

What particularly concerned R. Salanter was the collaboration by the *maskilim* with the Russian government in exerting pressure

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

on him to accept the post. This was, after all, the very government whose Cantonist edict and other decrees had wreaked havoc throughout the Pale of Settlement. He discerned within Haskalah a growing power, and it had, he felt, detached itself from its people and heritage. He felt that Haskalah placed ultimate value on achieving broader economic, intellectual and political horizons, and that this value system would, if left unchecked, unleash a wave of assimilation in Lithuania, as it had in Germany. R. Salanter believed that Haskalah could no longer be dealt with through the slow, broad, experimental tactics which he had utilized in Vilna. Rather, he was impelled to accelerate his buttressing of Lithuanian Jewry, to concentrate his efforts, meeting Haskalah on its own ground by founding a "counter-seminary," as current parlance would have it, and by unequivocally removing the taint that he felt had marred him simply by his having been offered the deanship of the proposed seminary. This radical disassociation would be achieved, he believed, only by leaving Vilna.²²

R. Salanter remained in Kovno nine years. It was here that the future of the Musar movement was secured. For a few years, he concentrated on molding disciples of preeminent intellectual caliber in the frame of his musar doctrine, and afterwards he attempted once again to establish the Musar movement on a mass basis through several means, such as opening musar conventicles.²³

In 1857, he shocked his followers by suddenly, and seemingly without reason, deciding to take up permanent residence outside Lithuania, in Germany. This is the one event in his life which is too radical for Pachter to regard unequivocally as another of R. Salanter's straightforward, confident steps to propagate musar. Even as Pachter vacillates between two explanations of R. Salanter's move,²⁴ unmentioned by Pachter are R. Salanter's intense struggles to find the proper medium through which his musar doctrine could be realized. Until the very last years of his life, R. Salanter struggled mightily but without success to find the medium through which musar would best take hold. Historical circumstance, the rapid rise of Haskalah, had derailed his comprehensive tactics in Vilna. In Kovno, his successes were more or

less confined to the city limits. Even at his death, he was unaware that the last medium he tried, the yeshiva, was destined to be the most successful. As Ezriel Carlebach put it, R. Salanter, by virtue of his numerous experiments in implementing the musar doctrine, could be compared to a physician testing a toxic drug on himself: "The poison weakens the physician, but he continually improves it and retests it on himself. In the end, he produces a marvelous drug, but he takes sick and dies from all of the injections."²⁵

It is clear why R. Salanter initially visited Germany. He sought a cure for his severe migraine headaches and fits of melancholia, which may well have been a hereditary disorder.²⁶ What, however, was the rationale behind his decision to take up permanent residence outside Lithuania—his most potent "experiment"? R. Salanter expressed himself in the form of a parable:

When horses panic on a mountain top and begin to gallop downhill, they cannot be restrained. Whoever tries to halt them will endanger his life; the horses will surely trample him. Once the horses have reached level ground, however, it is possible to bring them under control and bridle them. So it is with rejuvenation of Judaism. In Russia, the Jewish communities have been thrust onto a downward spiritual slope; it is impossible to halt or retard them. But the German communities have been on level ground for some time; it is possible to work with them and restore them.²⁷

R. Salanter apparently felt that the triumph of musar in Lithuania would not be achieved so long as the glittering attractiveness of Haskalah—its historical power—held sway, whereas in Germany, Haskalah, precisely because it had already taken its toll and was predominant, was no longer uncommonly attractive. Haskalah in Germany had been a movement of promise; it had offered enticing visions of intellectual, religious and occupational emancipation, but a promise fulfilled is not quite as exciting and widely assented to as a promise envisioned, felt R. Salanter. Haskalah in Germany, therefore, was capable of being directly confronted. Further, R. Salanter apparently attributed great power to an idea. Although German Jewry numbered in the thousands and Russian Jewry in the millions, he felt that if Haskalah could be successfully combatted at its ideological roots in Germany,

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

the danger to Russia would be reduced or even eradicated. To generate the ultimate, widespread success of musar, R. Salanter felt the necessity to alter radically the course of his life once again.

In Germany, the range and radicalism of his attempts to develop media by which musar could take hold deepened considerably. He initiated a journal (the first of its kind) which disseminated musar thought and Talmudic discourses, including a good deal of his own writings in these fields. The journal was short-lived. He proposed the preparation of an Aramaic-Hebrew dictionary to facilitate the study of Talmud; the translation of the Talmud from Aramaic to Hebrew and European languages; the elucidation of methodological principles for Talmud study; the introduction of Talmud into university curricula to increase respect among assimilated Jewish students for the Talmud. Nothing came of these proposals because of their radicalism or because of insufficient cooperation.²⁸ He traveled frequently, criss-crossing Germany, striving to lay the foundations of Jewish life anew. He devoted much time to teaching common laborers and assimilated students. Only a few of his efforts had a lasting impact, such as the Orthodox communal council he organized in Memel.²⁹

Pachter does not grasp R. Salanter's preoccupation with devising media through which musar could take root on a mass basis, for he is stymied by R. Salanter's decision to settle in Germany: "The reason is not at all clear."³⁰ Shifting gears, Pachter notes that it is possible, if not completely satisfactory, to attribute R. Salanter's departure from Lithuania to his estimation that his work was finished there, that it was time to seek a new area in which to promote the Musar movement.³¹ Again, the familiar Pachterian picture (albeit qualified) of undeviating, mechanical organizing. It is plausible that R. Salanter, having nurtured a number of talented disciples in Kovno, was less distressed by his departure from Kovno than from Vilna. However, he did not feel that his work was completed in Lithuania; he remained deeply involved with the movement there even after 1857. He did not even move his wife and family from Russia to Germany. He corresponded with his followers, he constantly sent emissaries to them, and, until 1871, he visited Lithuania almost yearly,

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

often remaining there for a number of months and once for two years. Even after 1871, when his wife died, he continued to visit Lithuania, though less frequently, until the year of his death.³²

Such, then, is the constellation of factors in the complex character of R. Salanter's public life—a frequent unsureness of stance, a willingness to experiment, a keen sensitivity to historical forces, an awareness of failure combined with a willingness to break fresh ground over and over again.

And yet, even these factors do not exhaust the complexity of R. Salanter's public life. Not only were programmatic motivations at work in his decision to reside in Germany, but also personal ones. The latter were the outcome of a struggle which was neither historical nor tactical but internal within R. Salanter. The struggle stemmed from the tremendous psychic pain he often felt when revealing "too much" of himself and when determining whether, and to what extent, to "reveal himself" at all as the opportunity arose to aid or guide others. To understand these concepts, we must refer once again to R. Salanter's relationship with R. Zundel.

The dynamics involved in R. Salanter's decision to abandon his hidden pursuit of perfection were in one way identical and in another way diametrically opposed to the dynamics involved in his earlier decision to follow the hidden path of R. Zundel. The young Salanter's acute awareness of his unworthiness before the Creator, stimulated by the lofty example of R. Zundel, had led him to the pursuit of perfection in secrecy.³³ However, when he later pursued the opposite course, when he decided that he was not free to ignore communal problems and therefore revealed himself by assuming positions of communal leadership, it was his worthiness which he became aware of, his own lofty ethical, spiritual and intellectual standing. This awareness stemmed from the admiring eyes of those whom he led, who were awestruck by his saintliness and genius; it dictated the necessity of redoubled effort to preserve his sense of humility, a goal best achieved by extreme care in revealing no more of himself than he had to: in revealing his Talmudic genius no more frequently, and to no greater extent, than was required to establish his cre-

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

dentials or to train disciples; in revealing his inner spiritual sensitivity no more frequently, and to no greater extent, than was required to touch the heart of the lower strata of Lithuanian Jewry; in revealing his ethical commitments no more frequently, and no more forcefully, than was required to instruct his followers or to right an injustice.

The hidden and the revealed Salanter were identical in their pursuit of humility and private service of God; they were opposed in that the external sources which generated this pursuit were opposite: the sense of unworthiness imposed upon him in his youth; the sense of worthiness imposed upon him in his manhood. Let us illustrate his personal, internal struggle engendered by this sense of worthiness, and then suggest how he ultimately resolved this uncommon problem by residence in Germany.

R. Salanter first became active publicly by delivering Talmudic discourses throughout Lithuania in order to establish his credentials. He would post the sources of his lecture in advance, and the local scholars would delve into them and related material in order to devise difficult questions with which to challenge his acumen. Yehiel Y. Weinberg described these confrontations:

As soon as he would start lecturing, a host of scholars would encircle him, showering him with questions. The struggle was on, but R. Israel always emerged the victor. His reputation grew and his fame began to spread. He dazzled the scholars with his brilliance and the common people with his modesty and warmheartedness.³⁴

Weinberg further related that once R. Salanter posted a list of over one hundred references, but two young men tore it down and substituted their own list. When R. Salanter ascended the podium and was handed what he thought would be his own list, he was taken aback and turned pale. He stood silent for ten minutes, shaking and wan, but slowly his tranquility returned and he began to lecture on the basis of the list composed by the jesters. He proceeded with his usual brilliance, to the amazement of all who knew what had transpired.³⁵

Even if this incident may be exaggerated in some of its details, such as the number of references, the point demonstrated by the incident remains the same. This point is elucidated by a

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

comment made by R. Salanter many years later to one of his closest students, R. Naphtali Amsterdam, in whose name Weinberg cited the incident. R. Amsterdam related to Weinberg that R. Salanter hadn't needed any time to prepare a new lecture. The ten minute interval represented a period of intense inner struggle as to whether to announce that he'd forgotten the lecture and to descend the podium, disgraced but not having revealed how great was that acumen of his which could devise a masterly lecture without preparation; or whether to remain loyal to his original intentions and go ahead with the discourse.³⁶

"These hours of 'revelation,'" concluded Weinberg in the name of R. Amsterdam,

were the most difficult ones in his life. He was greatly concerned lest he unduly reveal his soul where it had best be hidden. He was equally troubled, on the other hand, lest he neglect his duty and insufficiently use his powers of influence for good. Once—so his students relate—he was honored by the heads of the "Mishnah society" in the Bet Midrash in Kovno with delivering the "Hadran" [a lecture demonstrating the continuity between the inception and conclusion of a Talmudic tractate, requiring great knowledge and mental ingenuity]. Acceding to this request, he surprised his audience by his wondrous spiritual treasure. After the discourse, his students found him angry and depressed. To their question, why he was so dejected, he replied, "I seem to myself to be like a clown on the podium, showing off my knowledge for no evident purpose."³⁷

"For no evident purpose": that time, R. Salanter had revealed "too much" of his knowledge. Hence, his anguish.

Given R. Salanter's unrelenting trials stemming from tactical experimentation, historic circumstances, melancholia and self-revelation, to characterize his adult life as greatly troubled would seem superfluous; to suggest that it was also tranquil might appear preposterous. However, as we have seen, his life is complex and often surprising.

The image of R. Salanter attested to in many sources is that of an enormously tranquil man, who sought nothing in material terms, complained about nothing even when deathly sick and was steeped in Torah study and musar study.³⁸ The testimony of his closest students indicates that in his old age—just the time when, as Pachter surmises, his sickness and his ultimate failure to gen-

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

erate a massive reinvigoration in Lithuania and Germany created a drastic sense of isolation and dejection³⁹—R. Salanter, to the contrary, demonstrated a singular lack of bitterness, and his presence drew attention to his inner peace and cleavage to God.⁴⁰

There was distance between R. Salanter and his children, and Pachter surmises that this generated loneliness and dejection within him, but here, too, there are indications to the contrary. In R. Salanter's thought, to love one's own children more than other children was viewed as inability to prevail over one's *kohot kehim*. True service to humanity was predicated upon the personal capacity for equally intense dedication to all. It became imperative to try to uproot the instinctual filial sense, and if one could do so in the most exalted manner of elevation known to Salanterian musar (called *tikkun ha-middot*), the resultant state was not a sense of loss or of unnaturalness, but a commitment to humanity characterized by wholeness and intensity.⁴¹

The sheer spiritual fortitude required of R. Salanter to choose to continually uproot himself for the last twenty-six years of his life in order to serve Jewish communities in both Eastern and Western Europe would seem to indicate his partaking of some of the highest musar ideals he envisioned. Moreover, the realization of these ideals may have been aided simply by his extended presence in Germany. Among the confluence of factors in his decision to settle in Germany may have been his desire to reduce the probability of spiritual trials owing to self-revelation.

Commitment to and knowledge of Jewish tradition in Germany was incomparably weaker than in Lithuania. R. Salanter may have found it far more possible in Germany to avoid events which tried his humility. He may have found it far easier to veil his vast knowledge and rich spiritual sensitivities to a greater extent than he could in Lithuania. Yehiel Y. Weinberg has pointed out that, midway through his stay in Kovno, R. Salanter appointed a successor to head the academy he had founded, and from that time onward, the self-imposed "eclipse of R. Salanter" as a towering Talmudic luminary and educator set in, never to be revoked.⁴² It may well have been spiritually far more comfortable for R. Salanter to work with Jews whose Jewishness was quite diluted. Traveling from place to place further reduced the

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

risks of excessive self-revelation. If such tactics were spiritually less trying, they nonetheless allowed R. Salanter to feel that he had not abandoned the public responsibility which he judged to be incumbent upon all Orthodox Jews capable of guiding their brethren;⁴³ and in terms of the more common, mundane criteria by which one tends to evaluate sacrifices, R. Salanter's last years, which took him as far as Paris, were an extreme physical drain.⁴⁴

In portraying R. Salanter's tranquility, we do not suggest that he was essentially placid and serene, with his personal (and programmatic) struggles being of secondary importance. In his tranquility and equilibrium, he never ceased to scrutinize himself and his activities and to pursue higher goals, both in Lithuania and Germany. Conversely, in the face of challenge and difficulty, he was able to maintain strength and presence of mind to radiate a serenity which impressed those close to him. R. Salanter was at once tranquil and dissatisfied. Pachter fails to appreciate R. Salanter's tranquility while he merely notes his internal struggle without proper elucidation or stress.⁴⁵ Yet, both are crucial in understanding him. We witness neither static equilibrium nor limitless turbulence, but a vital, or dynamic, equilibrium.

Paradox was the touchstone of R. Salanter's life in so many other ways. He was a revolutionary in a traditional world; an innovator who sought, by his innovations, to preserve tradition; a man admired by those whose ideals he rejected; a fighter for material benefit for others while rejecting it for himself; a teacher who instructed his pupils to judge others leniently, themselves harshly; and a man who died alone, but whose passing evoked profound mourning by religious and secular Jews alike.

B.

Pachter's treatment of the historical context which played a role in stimulating R. Salanter to found the Musar movement proceeds from an analysis of the problems to which Hasidism responded. Pachter informs us that the Musar movement was devised to grapple with the identical problems: an undue regard for intellectual religious values to the neglect of emotional ones, and a corresponding social antagonism between intellectuals as

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

a class and the untutored masses. The direction of his analysis is clear: from Hasidism to the Musar movement.

Though historical comparisons are interesting and can be useful, much thinking on the Musar movement suffers from an unwillingness to grapple with the movement in its own right. The results are analyses which may be helpful in understanding Hasidism but which distort Musar. Pachter, too, has made this blunder. What is more, at least one important modern scholar, Jacob Katz, rejects the view that it was a damaging class antagonism, or the existence of an intellectual elite, which stimulated the rise of Hasidism.⁴⁶

To argue that the Musar movement was intended to heal a factious social and religious gap requires, first, citation of historical evidence verifying the existence of such a gap in Lithuania, and, second, citation of sources indicating that R. Salanter recognized this gap and acted out of a motivation to close it. Pachter cites no historical evidence in support of his sketch of pre-Musar Lithuanian Jewry. Whether, and in what ways, a schism in Lithuanian Jewry overshadowed the unifying lineaments of a specifically Lithuanian Jewish character is a question we leave for future examination. What is particularly germane is Pachter's failure to demonstrate that R. Salanter intended primarily to heal such a schism.

In charting R. Salanter's alleged historically-rooted motivations to heal a religious and social antagonism, Pachter jumps to conclusions. He proffers a highly eisegetical reading of a paragraph in R. Salanter's Musar Letter, in which R. Salanter rails against contemporary non-observance of commandments between man and man, such as those pertaining to business ethics, in contrast to the laudable observance of commandments between man and God, such as dietary laws. Included in this criticism is the lament that even Talmud scholars and pietists (*Yerei Shammayim*) are lax in the observance of commandments between man and man. Pachter's claim is that R. Salanter's criticism of the religious elite, taken together with a "general examination" of R. Salanter's writings (sources uncited), justifies the deduction that what R. Salanter really lamented was the existence of an imbalance between intellectual and emotional aspects of Lithu-

anian Jewish religiosity, in favor of the former and of those social strata which perpetuated them.⁴⁷ Insofar as we can read between the lines of a deduction dotted with lacunae, Pachter is arguing that since Talmud scholars and pietists represented only intellectual forces in Lithuanian religiosity, R. Salanter primarily intended to criticize an imbalance between intellectual and emotional forces and the ascendance of the intellectual class.

But it is clear in the Musar Letter that R. Salanter makes a general critique of Lithuanian Jewry. Mostly devoted to the theoretical foundations of his musar methods, the Musar Letter refers to Lithuanian Jewry only once, and when it does, it criticizes "most people [in our districts] . . . even the Talmud scholars and almost also (sic) the pietists."⁴⁸ It is clear that R. Salanter included Talmud scholars and pietists in a general critique of Lithuanian Jewish religiosity; he pointed to defects which had left their imprint on all levels of Lithuanian Jewry. Pachter's reading opens a pandora's box. His essay is liberally studded with references to damaging imbalances, crises and conflicts between intellectual and emotional religious forces, and between intellectual and untutored classes—all unverified, and, in any case, extraneous to the motivations of R. Salanter, whose vision was not bifurcated, but was a unitary critique encompassing all levels of Lithuanian Jewry. As such, it indicated that his real motivation was countering Haskalah, that force capable of undermining all levels of Lithuanian Jewry, that force whose character alone could be combatted by one of the main solutions R. Salanter devised to cope with the breakdown of Lithuanian religiosity.

To R. Salanter, the most prominent characteristic of Haskalah in Lithuania was its inability to effect unity of thought and action. Its emphasis on the widening of intellectual horizons rendered intellectual achievement alone a supreme value. Haskalah's nourishing the mind without cultivating the will spelled the collapse of traditional behavior norms, in R. Salanter's view. The impetus to observance among Lithuanian Jews was becoming less rooted in the *kohot kehim* and more present in the *kohot hitzoni'im*. The particular Lithuanian configuration of these *kohot hitzoni'im*—the emphasis on Torah study—could easily be exchanged for a similar configuration, dedication to secular study

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

and its theoretical underpinnings, unless these *kohot hitzoni'im* were transmuted into *kohot kehim*.⁴⁹ In significant measure, this transmutation was effected by R. Salanter's special concept of musar study, *limud ha-musari*. The role of emotion in *limud ha-musari* is apparently equated by Pachter to the role he ascribed to emotion in Hasidism, that of an absolute value. This is the only way we can account for Pachter's repeated attribution to R. Salanter of the desire to revamp the value system of Lithuanian Jewry by restoring emotion to its proper place alongside intellection on the scale of fundamental religious values.⁵⁰ What emotion's role was in Hasidism is not our present concern, but, to R. Salanter, emotion was not an absolute value; it was a technique. His absolute value was the mastering of *kohot kehim*, the forging of an iron will which could foster the observance of the ethical and ritual imperatives of the Torah under all circumstances, be they intellectual challenge by Haskalah, war, hunger, epidemic, embarrassment, ridicule or physical strain. His goal was the forging of Jews whose commitment to Torah was reduced to second nature, as elemental as the capacity to remember or read.⁵¹ The realization of this value through *limud ha-musari* required emotional techniques, such as singing or shouting precepts of the Torah. In this refashioning of the personality which R. Salanter advocated, emotion became part and parcel of the musar Jew's life, for constant involvement in *limud ha-musari* was required to develop and then perpetuate an iron will. Emotion, however, was not the goal of *limud ha-musari*; emotion was not the value base on which *limud ha-musari* rested.

Pachter argues that the sole difference between R. Zundel and R. Salanter was the latter's renunciation of the hidden character of R. Zundel's involvement in musar. R. Salanter, he says, transformed his master's personal teachings into a movement, thereby completing a steady chain of development which had originated with the Gaon of Vilna. The Gaon's leading disciple, R. Hayyim of Volozhin, carried on the thought of his master. R. Zundel, a close disciple of R. Hayyim, transformed the teachings of both, in the form of his person, into a living creation, with R. Salanter completing the task by propagating musar-as-life to the

Lithuanian masses.⁵²

This view overlooks both the research on differences between the thought of the Gaon and of R. Hayyim,⁵³ and the musar-as-life aspects of R. Hayyim's concerns.⁵⁴ Moreover, it means that R. Salanter's creativity was limited to organizational and educational areas. The intellectual background of the Musar movement will not be clarified until a thorough examination of the numerous works of R. Hayyim and the students is carried out.⁵⁵

At the other end of the historical spectrum, Pachter, while recognizing the continued existence of a vigorous movement from the time of R. Salanter's demise (1883) until the outbreak of World War II, misconstrues its overall character. He refers to the movement between the two world wars as an "educational technique rather than a movement."⁵⁶ This period was the single most fruitful epoch of the Musar movement both in terms of numbers and, as I hope to demonstrate in a future study, as an application of R. Salanter's thought. The movement of this period attracted more people, was spread over a wider geographical area, and stimulated more literary comment than of any other period.^{56a} A major factor in this expansion was the movement's Novorodock branch, whose history in this period is ignored by almost every commentator of note on the Musar movement, including Dov Katz and Yehiel Y. Weinberg.⁵⁷

C.

Far more valuable and enriching than Pachter's portrait of R. Salanter's life, of his historically significant activities and of the background of the Musar movement is Pachter's analysis of R. Salanter's thought. However, this, too, requires evaluation.

Though the unanalytic nature of almost all of the literature on R. Salanter's thought prior to Pachter's introduction strongly suggested the need for a more systematic approach, the disorderly quality of the earlier literature is somewhat understandable. The disorderliness paralleled R. Salanter's own writings. These writings, the main source of his thought, are not systematic in form; they were not published in logical sequence; and they are scant. His published writings consist of eighty-five private letters

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

(many of them extremely short and of no particular significance), two journal articles, one contribution to an anthology, a few Talmudic discourses, eight homiletical discourses, his Musar Letter and a number of short miscellaneous writings.⁵⁸ The dates when he authored nearly half of his writings are unknown, and, consequently, it is largely unknown what events or specific intellectual currents influenced him.⁵⁹

R. Salanter's writings are disorderly not only according to various technical criteria but also in terms of content. Certain central themes of his thought are related to one another while others are unrelated, and still others seem to be related but the links which would make the relation clear are not supplied by R. Salanter's parsimonious pen.^{59a} A fully adequate portrayal of R. Salanter's thought would not only have to make explicit the relationships between those strands of his thought which are, in fact, related, but also explicate the other strands while identifying precisely where they fail to relate to the more structured elements of his thought.

Pachter, however, claims to have established a framework capable of elucidating everything central to R. Salanter's thought. The framework is structured in a multi-tiered manner, encompassing "Fundamental Postulates," themselves subdivided into "principle" and "actual" aspects, and "Practical Aspects," also subdivided into "principle" and "actual" aspects. Multi-leveled as it may seem, this scheme is fundamentally an amplification of the "principle" aspects of the "Fundamental Postulates," in which R. Salanter's understanding of the relation of *sekhel* to *kohot kehim* is expounded. The rest of the structure fleshes out the essential point, and includes a lucid exposition of the role of sublimation and repression in the transmutation of *kohot hitzoni'im* into *kohot kehim*. It also includes what Pachter calls "actual" methods for effecting this.

Pachter concedes that with his unitary presentation he ignores several rich and influential areas of Salanterian musar thought.⁶⁰ He justifies the omission on three grounds: these omitted areas were not central to R. Salanter's thought, or they were formulated in no more than an embryonic way, or they represented early stages of his thought which bear little if any relation to his ma-

ture work.⁶¹ We differ with Pachter on each of these three points, for a number of foci in the mainstream of R. Salanter's thought, expressed as adequately as his ideas on *kohot kehim* and *kohot hitzoni'im*, are not mentioned by Pachter. Further, Pachter errs not by omitting certain central ideas in R. Salanter's thought but by misunderstanding them and miscasting them as minor and of little significance. His errors of omission and commission have resulted in a narrowing of the true frame of Salanterian musar. The scope of this article permits us to cite but two of many possible examples, but even these will, hopefully, show Salanterian musar to be broader than Pachter demonstrates. These examples will significantly alter our present perspective on *kohot kehim* and on *limud ha-musari*.

R. Salanter writes in the Musar Letter of forces for good and for evil which he characterizes as, alternatively, "spiritual," "higher," and "impure" (*tameh*). Pachter regards the references to these forces as a supplementary linguistic device by R. Salanter to drive home the enormous power of the *kohot kehim*—what R. Salanter calls in the Musar Letter the *yetzer ha-ra*, the Opposer of man's moral-religious quest.⁶² However, mention of these forces is not a mere supportive, homiletical device. The language of the Musar Letter carefully depicts these forces as constituting a distinct category of evil, with a distinct origin and capable of being countered by distinctive means. Delineated in the Musar Letter, then, are two categories of evil, one describing psychically-rooted forces for evil—what Pachter expounds throughout his introduction—and the second describing the "spiritual, higher, impure" forces for evil, not rooted in the psyche. R. Salanter writes that the strength and makeup of the forces for evil of the first category, those rooted in the psyche, are subject to variation from person to person, depending on locale, heredity and environment, and vary within each person at different times. The other spiritual, higher or impure forces are, however, subject to none of these variations; they affect all people equally.⁶³ They are apparently universal and demonic, though R. Salanter states explicitly only that they are not of man's psyche.⁶⁴

R. Salanter further explains that because the two categories of forces are different in essence, their evil influence can be coun-

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

tered only by essentially different types of methods. *Limud ha-musari*, a primary method for coping with the psychically-rooted, native *kohot kehim*, has been described. The non-psychic, impure, forces are warded off by non-psychic "holy" forces which are brought to bear by study of any section of the Torah.⁶⁵ Restricting one's musar involvement to utilizing the method or methods suitable for struggling against only one category of evil will produce a moral and ethical cripple. Yet, Pachter makes only perfunctory reference to the role of the non-psychic category of evil in Salanterian musar.⁶⁶

The value of Pachter's psychically-oriented framework is further attenuated by his neglecting to present everything central to understanding even the psychic category of evil in Salanterian musar. He omits one of the main elements of *limud ha-musari* for countering the *kohot kehim*, namely the in-depth study of those sections of Halakhah which govern the transgressions which one has committed. In the middle of the Musar Letter, R. Salanter designates this directed study of Halakhah as "the essential" means of countering the Opposer, and a few paragraphs earlier he even calls it "the most exalted and essential means."⁶⁷ This type of intricate Torah study has the same effect as *limud ha-musari*, according to R. Salanter, but in terms of form, it is in no way to be equated to it.⁶⁸ Finally, it is pertinent to note that, on a hierarchy of values, R. Salanter ranked Torah study in and of itself—unrelated to its value in warding off non-psychic forces for evil—above the obligation of *limud ha-musari*.⁶⁹

Salanterian musar, then, was more conservative, more complex, and broader than Pachter tells us—conservative in its stress on the supreme value of Torah study, understood in the classic sense; complex in its advocacy of study of Halakhah, not only of *limud ha-musari*, for overcoming psychic obstacles to proper behavior; and broader in its recognition of non-psychic forces for evil and of ordinary study of Torah as the sole means of exorcizing them.

Pachter loses control over his material at the end of his introduction as he explicates the final tier in his framework, R. Salanter's methodology. Pachter regards belief in divine reward and

punishment, fear of divine punishment, and repentance as R. Salanter's three essential "methods." In portraying R. Salanter's presentation of belief in and fear of divine punishment, Pachter vacillates between regarding these two principles as deeply rooted in the psyche and thus capable of aiding in the transmutation of other ideals into *kohot kehim*, or as doctrines which themselves should be the object of *limud ha-musari* in order to become transmuted into *kohot kehim* (the latter is the case). In citing R. Salanter's fourth letter with regard to fear of punishment, he incorrectly relegates to secondary importance another principle enunciated in the same letter (worldly wisdom) which R. Salanter regards as equally important as fear of punishment. Pachter dubbs *limud ha-musari* "the third cornerstone" in R. Salanter's methodology—strange language in the context of a presentation which has already supposedly articulated the three methods of R. Salanter. The confusion is complete when Pachter, in characterizing the general nature and atmosphere of the Musar movement as a movement of repentance, identifies repentance as the third "method" of R. Salanter.⁷⁰

A method, in plain English, is a practical means for achieving a goal. Some of the specific means by which R. Salanter's general method of *limud ha-musari* was put into effect included the intimate musar talk (*musar shmues*), ecstatic prayer, the shouting, weeping, moaning or humming of maxims or of sentences from the Bible, the Talmud or the classical musar literature, group analysis, self-appraisal in geographic isolation, and, above all, close observation of a musar master.⁷¹ As indicated above, R. Salanter also advocated the study of those sections of Halak-hah relevant to the transgressions one had committed, and the study of any section of Torah as a means of combating non-psycho forces for evil.

Ironically, it is precisely in the context of the techniques of *limud ha-musari*, largely ignored by Pachter, that his psychically-oriented framework might have benefited from greater stress and explanation. Most of these techniques involved intense emotional outpouring. Pachter characterizes the emotional nexus of modern musar as derivative of a gloomy outlook on the world, whereas hasidic emotion, he writes, derives from a jubilant view of the

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

world. Hence, he considers the nature of emotion in musar and in Hasidism as distinct.⁷²

If in Pachter's comparison of the Musar movement and Hasidism he pointed out unverified historical similarities, in his contrast here between the two movements he may have blurred existential congruities between them. Were we to focus on the nature of the actual ecstatic experiences in the Musar movement and Hasidism rather than on their divergent springboards, we might find them strikingly similar—this, at least, is the hypothesis which informs a study we are working on.

By way of conclusion, it is fitting to note that the basis of any attempt to depict R. Salanter's thought in its full expression must be the uncommonly close scrutiny of each word of R. Salanter's literary legacy. His style in many of his writings is difficult and convoluted; his writings abound with antecedents lacking apparent referents, with rare Hebrew terminology, with hidden references to Biblical passages and Talmudic disputes, with ideas that are, without warning, broken off in the middle of sentences and picked up sentences or paragraphs later. Pachter contributes to the decipherment of R. Salanter's writings by noting classic Jewish sources which R. Salanter's words are based upon, but an enormous amount of source and interpretive work is yet to be done. If, in the language of the Mishnah, the reward is proportional to the effort, great shall be the intellectual and spiritual reward of those who toil in the fertile vineyard of the works of R. Israel Salanter.

I am most grateful to Prof. Nahum N. Glatzer for his continued encouragement of my study of the thought of the Musar movement. My thanks to the following people who read this article in whole or in part and made valuable comments: Rabbis Herschel Berger, Nathan Bulman, Aaron Rakefet-Rothkoff; Drs. William L. Elefant, Richard Katz, David Roskies; Shaul Stamper and Charles Vernoff. Of course, they bear no responsibility for the views expressed. My gratitude to Rabbi Benjamin J. Zilber for aiding in my understanding of R. Salanter's letters in *Or Yisrael*.

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

NOTES

1. Mordechai Pachter, *Kitve R. Yisrael Salanter*, Jerusalem, 1972.

2. Yitzhak Blazer, *Or Yisrael*, pp. 31, 124. *Or Yisrael* is the most valuable (though not a comprehensive) collection of R. Salanter's writings and the best single source of information about his life. *Or Yisrael* has undergone numerous printings. The page numbering is the same in all of them, except for the widely used *Torat ha-Yirah le-R. Yisrael Salanter*, Bene Brak, 1967, which omits Blazer's "Kokhve Or," not pertinent to R. Salanter's life or thought, and sections of "Shar'are Or." All references in the present article are to the original edition of *Or Yisrael*.

The actual relationship between R. Zundel and R. Salanter described here is based on *Or Yisrael*, pp. 31, 124; our particular rendition of the relationship is based in part on Ezriel Carlebach, "R. Yisrael mi-Salant," *Sefer ha-Demuyot*, Tel Aviv, 1959, and on Joel Harris, "Study and Struggle: The Musar Movement," *Encounters in the Month of Elul*, ed. Joel Harris, Philadelphia, 1971.

For a detailed account of R. Salanter's childhood, see Dov Katz, *Tenuat ha-Musar*, vol. 1, Tel Aviv, 1974, pp. 137-144; and Israel Salanter, "Introduction," *Tevunah*, Memel, 1860, pp. 2-4.

On R. Zundel, see Eliezer Rivlin, *Ha-Tzaddik R. Yosef Zundel mi-Salant u-Rabbotav*, Jerusalem, 1926; Blazer, *ibid.*, pp. 30, 31, 69, 70, 122-124; and Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 93-136.

3. Isaiah Tishbi and Joseph Dan, *Mivhar Sifrut ha-Musar*, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, 1971, pp. XI-XXIV.

4. R. Salanter published precious little during his lifetime, namely two articles in *Tevunah*, *op. cit.*, the introduction to *Tevunah*, *op. cit.*, and *Igeret ha-Musar*, Koenigsberg, 1858. After his death, publication of musar literature by leading personalities of the Musar Movement most frequently was motivated by considerations other than the creation of literature for the purpose of inculcating musar. The publication of *Or Yisrael* in 1900, which included twenty-two previously unpublished letters of R. Salanter, was a polemical act designed to counter opposition to the Musar movement, which had reached heights in the late 1890's (see Katz, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 249-252). Publication in 1918 of the first parts of the Novorodock musar treatise, *Madregat ha-Adam*, was designed to meet different needs. The swift expansion of the Novorodock branch of the Musar movement over a large geographical area reduced the opportunity for direct contact between students in Novorodock yeshivot and Novorodock leaders, particularly the founder of Novorodock, R. Yosef Y. Hurvitz. It was thought that a written tract containing his thought would serve a valuable, if secondary, role in maintaining the character of the Novorodock yeshivot. As it was, the separately issued chapters of *Madregat ha-Adam* were never published in one volume until twenty-nine years after the publication of the first chapter (see Katz, *ibid.*, vol. 4, pp. 219, 220).

Virtually all great musar works by the Musar movement's most important leaders were not published until after their deaths and after the immolation or degeneration of the musar communities they nourished. In this category fall the

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

works of R. Simha Z. Ziv, *Hochma u-Musar*, vol. 1, New York, 1957, vol. 2, Jerusalem, 1964, and *Or Rashaz*, 5 vols., Jerusalem, 1960-65; R. Yitzhak Blazer, *Kokhve Or*, Jerusalem, 1974 (his much shorter article, also called *Kokhve Or*, was published in his lifetime in *Or Yisrael*, *op. cit.*); R. Natan Z. Finkel, *Or ha-Tzafun*, 2 vols., Jerusalem, 1958, and *Sihot ha-Saba mi-Slobodka*, Tel Aviv, 1955; R. Yeruham Levovitz, *Da'at Hokhma u-Musar*, vol. 1, New York, 1966, vol. 2, New York, 1969, vol. 3, Jerusalem, 1972; R. Yosef Yehudah Leb Blokh, *Shiure Da'at*, vol. 1, New York, 1949, vol. 2, New York, 1953, vol. 3, Tel Aviv, 1955; R. Avraham Grodzinski, *Torat Avraham*, Jerusalem, 1963; R. Yitzhak Issac Shor, *Leket Sihot ha-Musar*, Bene Brak, 1968; and R. Avraham Yaffén, *Ha-Musar v'ha-Da'at*, vol. 2, Jerusalem, 1973 (the first volume of *Ha-Musar v'ha-Da'at* was published in his lifetime, New York, 1957). Articles or letters by Rabbis Salanter, Ziv, Blazer, Amsterdam and Hurvitz appeared posthumously in *Sefer Hayye ha-Musar*, 3 vols., Bene Brak, 1963-64, and in *Sefer Or ha-Musar*, 2 vols., Bene Brak, 1965-66.

Most of these volumes represent the publication of notes taken during these leaders' actual musar lectures (*musar shmuesn*); the material for all of the volumes was collected and edited by the leaders' students or offspring, not by the leaders themselves. This great flowering of modern musar literature, qua literature, owes its existence to the desire to either memorialize the movement's leaders or recapture to some extent their impact in the absence of that which gave the movement its historic vitality—the living musar community. There exists a great number of volumes, also issued posthumously, by rabbis who occupied lesser positions in the Musar movement than did the eight leaders whose works we have just cited. These volumes include R. David Bliacher, *Divre Bina u-Musar*, Tel Aviv, 1970; Eliyahu Meir Blokh, *Shiure Da'at*, Jerusalem, 1972; R. Ben Tzion Brook, R. David Zaritsky (editors), *Gevile Esh*, Jerusalem, 1973; E. E. Dessler, *Mikhtav mi-Eliyahu*, 3 vols., Bene Brak, 1974; R. Yehuda Leb Hasman, *Or Yahel*, 3 vols., Jerusalem, 1973; R. Hizkiyahu Eliezer Kahan, *Nahalat Eliezer*, Jerusalem, 1971; R. Eliyahu Lopian, *Lev Eliyahu*, 2 vols., Jerusalem, 1972, 1975; R. Yitzhak Elhanan Waldshein, *Torat Yitzhak*, Bene Brak, 1974; R. Shmuel Weintraub, "Kuntres Kore'e Shemo," *Yesodot Ne'emanim*, Bene Brak, 1970; and David Zaritsky (ed.), *Torat ha-Musar*, Tel Aviv, 1959.

The present expansion of musar literature is also due to the publication of musar works by the movement's last adherents or their disciples (three of whom, Rabbis Yaakov Moshe Lesin, Yehezkel Levinstein and Hillel Vitkind, have passed away). A by no means exhaustive list of this literature includes R. Ben Tzion Brook, *Hegiyone ha-Musar*, 3 vols., Jerusalem, 1947, 1969; R. Yosef Dov Epstein, *Mitzvot ha-Musar*, New York, 1948, *Mitzvot ha-Bayit*, 2 vols., New York, 1966, 1972, and *Mitzvot ha-Shalom*, New York, 1970; R. Mordechai Gifter, *Pirke Emunah*, Jerusalem, 1969; R. Yaakov Moshe Lesin, *Derekh Hayyim*, Jerusalem, 1947, *Ha-Maor sheba-Torah*, 4 vols., New York, 1947-1966, *Orah la-Hayyim*, New York, 1952; R. Yehezkel Levinstein, *Kovetz Inyanim*; R. Hayyim Shmuelovitz, *Kovetz Sihot*, Jerusalem, 1971, *Sihot Musar*, Jerusalem, 1972; R. Moshe Shtingal, *Mevakshe ha-Shlemut*, Bene Brak, 1970; R. Hillel Vitkind, *Musar ha-Torah*, Jerusalem, 1944; R. Shlomo Volbe, *Ale Shur*, Be'er Yaakov, 1972; R. Yitzhak

TRADITION: A Journal of Orthodox Thought

Weinstein, *Imre Hochma*, Jerusalem, 1959, *Imre Da'at*, Jerusalem, 1962, *Imre Bina*, Jerusalem, 1965; R. Hayyim Ephraim Zaitchik, *Ha-Madda veha-Hayyim*, New York, 1952, *Orot ha-Hayyim*, New York, 1954, *Torat ha-Nefesh*, New York, 1957, *Or ha-Nefesh*, 2 vols., New York, 1958-59, *Peri Hayyim*, New York, 1961, *Peri ha-Ha'aretz*, 2 vols., Haifa, 1965, *Or Hadash*, 3 vols., Jerusalem, 1968-69, *Va-ani Tefilah*, 4 vols., Jerusalem, 1971-74; and R. Binyamin Zilber, *Torat ha-Yirah*, Jerusalem, 1954.

The only writers we are aware of who published musar works, in their own lifetimes, before World War II, when the Musar movement was still a dynamic force with its behavioral underpinnings, were R. Yehoshua Heller, *Divre Yehoshua*, Vilna, 1855; R. Alexander Moshe Lapidus, *Divre Emet*, Jerusalem, 1966 (reprint). R. Shneur Zalman Hirshowitz, *Even Yisrael*, Warsaw, 1883, and R. Yehudah Leb Ginzberg, *Yalkut Yehudah*, 5 vols., Dvinsk, 1931-35, *Musar ha-Mishnah*, 2 vols., St. Louis, 1939-1943 (he also published *Keter ha-Shabbat*, St. Louis, 1941, and *Musar ha-Nevi'im*, 2 vols., St. Louis, 1945). The only branch of the Musar movement which actively encouraged its students to write and publish articles on musar was the Novorodock branch in the period between the two world wars. Articles of Novorodock students and leaders appear in *Sefer Hayye ha-Musar*, 3 vols., Bene Brak, 1963-64 (reprint) and *Sefer Or ha-Musar*, 2 vols., Bene Brak, 1965-66 (reprint). Two volumes issued separately by a Novorodock leader in his lifetime, before World War II, are R. Yerahmiel Shulman, *Penine ha-Hochma* and *Penine ha-Shlemut*, Jerusalem, 1964 (reprint). Whether certain works of R. Yisrael Meir Hachohen (e.g., *Hafetz Hayyim*), of R. Avraham Yitzhak Kuk (e.g., *Orot Hateshuvah*) and of R. Binyamin Zilber (e.g., *Torat Hahistaklut*) may be included here involve methodological questions beyond the scope of this article.

5. See, for example, E. E. Friedman, *Sefer Zikhronot*, Tel Aviv, 1926, and *Le-Toldot Kittat ha-Musaraim*, Jerusalem, 1926; and R. Shmuel Rosenfeld, *R. Yisrael Salanter*, Warsaw, 1914. An exception are the insightful articles by Ezriel Carlebach, who had extensive contact with several branches of the Musar movement. See "Musar-Notizen zur Geschichte einer Bewegung," *Jarbuch der Jüdisch-literarischen Gesellschaft*, Frankfurt a.M., 1931-32, and "R. Yisrael mi-Salant," *op. cit.* The earliest writings of Yehiel Y. Weinberg on the movement, written shortly after his most intensive contact with the movement was broken, are of little value. See "Rabbenu Yisrael ve-Torato ha-Musarit," *Halevanon*, Warsaw, 1912. It was as his contact with the movement became progressively weaker that the quality of his writings on the movement increased, culminating in his valuable series in *Seride Esh*, written when virtually all that remained at his disposal were memories and documents of a decimated musar world. See "R. Jisroel Salanter u. die Mussarbewegung," *Jeschurun*, 1920-21, and his eight articles in *Seride Esh*, vol. 4, Jerusalem, 1969.

An intermediary category characterized by a certain degree of contact with the modern musar world and a certain understanding of it is represented by Louis Ginzberg, "Rabbi Israel Salanter," *Students, Scholars and Saints*, Philadelphia, 1928.

6. See Jacob Agus, *Guideposts in Modern Judaism*, New York, 1954, pp. 20-

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

31; Gedalyahu Alon, "The Lithuanian Yeshivas," *The Jewish Expression*, ed. Judah Goldin, New York, 1970, pp. 455-464; H. H. Ben-Sasson, *Divrei ha-Kinnus ha-Olami le-Madda'ei ha-Yahadut*, vol. 1, Jerusalem, 1952, pp. 446-9; Lester Samuel Eckman, *The History of the Musar Movement, 1840-1945*, New York, 1975; Joseph Elias, "Israel Salanter," *Jewish Leaders*, ed. Leo Jung, Jerusalem, 1964; Menahem G. Glenn, *Israel Salanter*, New York, 1953; Zvi Kurzweil, "Rabbi Israel Salanter and the Mussar Movement," *Modern Trends in Jewish Education*, New York, 1964; Arnold Rachlis, "Musar and Psychotherapy," *Judaism*, Summer 1974; Kopul Rosen, *Rabbi Israel Salanter and the Musar Movement*, London, 1945; Zevi Scharfstein, "R. Yisrael Salanter," *Gedolei Hinukh be-Amenu*, Jerusalem, 1964; Joseph Dov Soloveitchik, "Ish ha-Halakhah," *Talpiot*, 1944, pp. 697-699; and Zalman Ury, *The Musar Movement*, New York, 1970, and "Salanter's Ethical Teachings," *TRADITION*, Fall, 1970.

These articles and books, in portraying modern musar thought, either rely too heavily on secondary sources or fail to realize the complexity of the primary sources. Some of these works utilize their incomplete or incorrect conclusions as bases for comparing Salanterian musar with various trends in modern psychology, with the results being doubly unsatisfactory. In terms of R. Salanter's thought, Rosen's work is the most adequate, valuable in what it presents but marred by the omission of important elements in R. Salanter's thought. At the other end of the spectrum, Rachlis' article makes use of only secondary sources in English, except for two alleged statements by R. Salanter which, in fact, don't exist in the sources as cited by Rachlis.

7. Weinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-332.

8. The observation that R. Salanter antedated Freud in the discovery of the subconscious is found in Yehudah Leb Ginzberg, "Shene Harim Gedolim," *Talpiot*, 1947, pp. 35-36; Hillel Goldberg and Shoshana Perr, "The Emergence of the Musar Movement," *Musar Anthology*, ed. Hillel Goldberg, Hyde Park, 1972, p. 14; Menachem Glenn, "R. Yisrael mi-Salant ve-Dr. Menahem (Max) Liliyental," *Perakim*, 1969, pp. 182-83; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 250; and Weinberg, *ibid.*, pp. 333-34. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 39, also makes this observation, but his treatment of R. Salanter's thought from beginning to end is still an attempt to understand Salanterian musar on its own terms.

Short discussions of R. Salanter's thought and of Coue, Frankl, Freud and Jung are found in Katz, *op. cit.*, pp. 254, 257; Kurzweil, *op. cit.*, pp. 82, 83, 86, 91, 92; and Ury, "Salanter's Ethical Teachings," *op. cit.*, p. 39, and *The Musar Movement*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

In a context of psychotherapy, the application of Adler, Ferenczi, Frankl, Klapman, Rogers, Sullivan and Thorne to R. Salanter, "Musar," "the Mashgiach," "the students in a Musar *shtibel*," and "the Baal Musar" is found in Rachlis, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-45.

An attempt in the comparative genre which is more successful than the articles cited above is Mel Gottlieb's "R. Salanter and Therapeutic Values" (*TRADITION*, Summer 1975). Whether this article does justice to the views of Rogers, Maslow, Moustakes and others on the "modern helping process" is not our province, but Gottlieb's elaboration of the necessity of patience, empirical

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

confrontation, self-exploration, self-discipline and other traits is a sensitive re-statement of sections of R. Salanter's writings. However, the elaboration is not always accurate, and it suffers from the absence of a comprehensive analysis of R. Salanter's writings; this article, too, selectively utilizes phrases or sentences from R. Salanter and jumps to conclusions. Gottlieb has wrongly concluded that R. Salanter believed that God's goal for the Jew, as it were, was that he strive to become a "vulnerable open *mensch* . . . an empathetic human" ("Therapeutic Values," p. 121). In fact, in R. Salanter's second letter, which Gottlieb refers to in his elaboration of R. Salanter's advocacy of empirical confrontation, R. Salanter articulates a far broader goal for the Jew. In the second letter (and other sources), we learn that as R. Salanter sought, in his commerce with people, to invoke the humanity present within them, he sought to do it in such a way that they experienced not simply a greater sense of humanity but a greater sense of closeness to God. R. Salanter did not think that God would be satisfied, as it were, with the realization of the humanity of each Jew in accordance with his individual capacity; R. Salanter did not advocate a secular humanism with the added tenet that God demanded it. As Louis Ginsberg put it, R. Salanter not only raised people to the rare plateau "where their souls stood revealed to themselves," but he nurtured self-knowledge through the prism of "the clear atmosphere of heaven . . . where their hearts were aglow with unwonted desire of the higher life" ("Rabbi Israel Salanter," *op. cit.*, p. 193). Likewise, when R. Salanter took humanism in its ethical, interpersonal sense, he understood its authentic practice to be not merely an interpersonal, human achievement, but great cleavage to God via the "Divine Image" (*tzelem elohim*) of both subject and object.

9. The quotation is from Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 103. On the inadequacy of *sekhel*, see Blazer, *ibid.*, pp. 49, 103, *et passim*, and R. Israel Salanter, "Ma'amar be-Inyan Hizuk Lomde Toratenu ha-Kedoshah," *Etz Peri*, Vilna, 1881, pp. 13-16. For Pachter's exposition, see Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-46.

10. Blazer, *ibid.*, p. 43.

11. The quotation is from Blazer, *ibid.*, p. 103. For Pachter's exposition, see Pachter, *op. cit.*

12. Pachter, *ibid.*, pp. 10-14, 40-43, 46-51.

13. Pachter, *ibid.*, p. 25.

14. Katz, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-49; Asher Yitzhak Katsky, Introduction to *Tehellet Mordechai*, Vilna, 1889, pp. 13, 14; Hillel Noah Maggid Steinsneider, *Ir Vilna*, 1900, pp. 123, 24, 28; Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

15. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

16. The letters were first published in *Or Yisrael* in 1900. That the letters were addressed to his followers is indicated by the salutations with which they began; that they were intelligible only to initiates is indicated by their very difficult style; that they were intended to protect against collapse of his teachings and were not as influential as he had hoped they would be is indicated by their contents throughout. The first letter, for example, begins, "My words go in one ear and out the other."

17. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

18. Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 248; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 152, 53.

19. Katz, *ibid.*, p. 154. That the musar conventicles were intended for the middle class is indicated by R. Salanter's frequent utilization of metaphors from the business world in stressing their importance. See Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 42. Also, people who frequented the musar conventicles were characterized as middle class by writers of R. Salanter's time. See, for example, E. E. Friedman, *Sefer Zikhronot*, *op. cit.*, pp. 79, 89.

20. Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 149-51.

21. Katz, *ibid.*, p. 159; Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

22. Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 162-169; Weinberg, *ibid.*, p. 290. The second incident which may have influenced his decision to leave Vilna flowed out of his organization of a medical brigade to cope with a severe cholera epidemic. Never in Vilna had he been involved in non-educational activities, but in light of the high death toll, he deemed it his religious duty to rent a 1500 bed hospital, to persuade doctors to work without remuneration, and to mobilize a corps of some sixty-five yeshiva students to aid in all phases of the medical work. He issued extremely lenient halakhic rulings with regard to the preparation of food on Shabbat so that the students and the sick alike would not weaken and die. Once, a respected Vilna elder challenged R. Salanter concerning the propriety of his rulings. Greatly fearful that non-compliance with the halakhic dispensations would result in more deaths, R. Salanter, though never having been known to violate the dignity of his fellows or to praise himself, turned on the elder in icy fury: "You idiot (*du prostak*)! You're going to tell *me* what is permitted and what is forbidden?! I gave my solemn promise to the parents of sixty-five young men that I would return them to their homes safe and sound, and you would deny them hot food on the Shabbat, which could result in death?"

By Yom Kippur, the epidemic had not subsided. R. Salanter issued a halakhic edict that the entire community must not fast, must reduce the recitation of liturgical poems and take walks in the open air. As noted, he had never once made an halakhic judgment on the smallest question which arose even in his own kitchen, but now, before he had reached forty, he was defying virtually the entire rabbinate of Vilna, seat of the Gaon. He publicly made *kiddush* and ate cake in the synagogue, and despite opposition, did not descend the podium until each commoner present did likewise. Then he went from synagogue to synagogue to encourage the people not to fast.

In the ensuing uproar, R. Salanter announced that he would deliver a public, Talmudic discourse. Against expectations, he made no mention of the bases upon which he had issued his lenient rulings, but delivered a discourse on other topics which was the most profound and dazzling display of his genius in Vilna up to that time. Though his detractors were silenced, and though his name spread throughout Russian Jewry, R. Salanter may have felt that the viability of his continued musar activity in Vilna was significantly diminished. See Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 156-162, 338; Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

23. Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 169-181; Weinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-93.

24. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

25. Carlebach, "R. Yisrael," *op. cit.*, p. 229. Carlebach distinguishes between

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

R. Salanter's efforts to deal with a small number of elite students in his *bate midrash* in Vilna and Kovno and his late attempt at founding a yeshiva (it was actually a kollel) which was envisioned as broad-based educational center, though not a means to reach masses.

26. Jacob Mark, *Be-Mehitzatam shel Gedole ha-Dor*, Jerusalem, 1958, p. 81. Mark comments that he knew a brother of R. Salanter who suffered from the identical sickness. R. Salanter's daughter-in-law, Sarah Elka Horowitz, comments that R. Salanter's son suffered from a similar sickness. See Arye Leb Horowitz, *Hayye Aryeh*, Vilna, 1907, p. 3.

27. Mark, *ibid.*, p. 78.

28. Emil Benjamin, *Rabbi Jsrael Lipkin Salant*, Berlin, 1899, pp. 27-29; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 201; Mark, *ibid.*, pp. 92-94.

29. Benjamin, *ibid.*, pp. 17, 18; Katz, *ibid.*, pp. 181-190, 218-230.

30. Pachter, *op. cit.*

31. *Ibid.*

32. Katz, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-199, 201-212, 237-240.

33. Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 111; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 144, footnote 21; Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

34. Weinberg, cited in the partial translation of the articles in *Seride Esh*, "The 'Mussar' Movement and Lithuanian Jewry," *Men of Spirit*, ed. Leo Jung, New York, 1964, p. 229.

35. Weinberg, *Seride Esh*, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

36. *Ibid.*

37. Weinberg, *Men of Spirit*, *op. cit.*, p. 230. See also Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 120, and Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

38. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 113-15; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 376; Yosef Feldberg, *Kedosh Yisrael*, Vilna, 1884, p. 30.

39. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 37.

40. Blazer, *op. cit.*; Katz, *op. cit.*; Moshe Zilberg, "Kat ha-Novarodoka'im," *Ha-Aretz*, 26 Kislev, Tel Aviv, 1932.

41. For R. Salanter's relationship to his children, see Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 118; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 324. For his understanding of *tikkun ha-middot*, see Blazer, *ibid.*, pp. 80-98.

42. Weinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 293. See also the significant comment of R. Salanter's student, R. Simha Zisl Ziv, cited by Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

43. Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

44. Katz, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-44.

45. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 24, 32. Pachter regards R. Salanter's melancholia as a product primarily of R. Salanter's desire to conceal himself and secondarily of the heavy demands made upon him by his intense public involvement. However, it appears that R. Salanter's sickness was hereditary (see footnote 26). If the identical sickness appeared in relatives of his not subject to being called one of the greatest men of their generation and not subject to the strains of public leadership, it is reasonable to regard R. Salanter's desire to conceal himself as a healthy phenomenon characteristic of musar religiosity rather than as a source of illness.

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

46. Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, New York, 1961, pp. 225-30. Katz notes that the severe economic dislocation within Polish Jewry in the eighteenth century, combined with the disintegration of organized Jewish communal life, resulted in the undermining of the institutions of the rabbinate and of higher Jewish education, not, on the one hand, a beleaguered populace, and, on the other, an intellectual elite left untouched by historical forces. Standards of rabbinic scholarship dropped radically as a result of the economic and political decline. "The requirements for this title [of *moreinu*] and for that of *haver* were constantly lowered from the end of the seventeenth century until they became honorary titles bearing little relation to the scholarship of the holder." (P. 229.) Katz concludes:

The eighteenth century can thus hardly be described as a period in which the gap between the scholars and the uneducated widened, a description which has been employed to explain the revolt of the uneducated which presumably expressed itself in the Hassidic movement. (P. 229.)

Moreover, the linkage of even an overall degenerate economic, political and religious situation to the rise of Hasidism is only partial. Writes Katz:

Admittedly the rise of the new movement was facilitated by certain conditions and it developed as a continuation of religious processes and changes which preceded it. But in its content, values, structure, and historical course, the new movement represented such an innovation that all that went before did no more than pave the way. The movement itself was a new "historical creation" that displayed its true nature only after its emergence. (P. 230.)

47. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 42.

48. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 106, 107.

49. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-30, 103-108, particularly 106-107; Salanter, "Ma'amar," *Etz Peri*, *op. cit.*; Abraham Menes, "The Yeshivot in Eastern Europe," *The Jewish People Past and Present*, vol. 2, ed. Salo W. Baron et al, New York, 1948, p. 115.

50. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 11, 13, 14, 41, 42, 48, 49, 57.

51. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 84; Salanter, "Ma'amar," *op. cit.*, p. 13.

52. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 16, 23, 24.

53. See, for example, Nahum (Norman) Lamm, *Torah Lishmah*, Jerusalem, 1972, particularly chapter 7.

54. Weinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-84.

55. Two works, recently republished privately, attributed to students of R. Hayyim, include *Minhat Shmuel* (author listed as "R. Shmuel"), Jerusalem, 1965; and *Menuhah u-Kedushah* (author anonymous), Jerusalem, 1967.

56. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

56a. The literary works are Shmuel Ben Artzi, *Shivti*, Jerusalem, 1967; Ben Tzion Gershuni, *Bi-Metzuda ha-Perusa*, Jerusalem, 1962; parts of M. Gertz (Gershon Mowshowitz), *Musarnikes*, Riga, 1936; Hayyim Grade, "Musernikes," *Musernikes—Mayn Krig Mit Hersh Raseyner*, Jerusalem, 1969, *Tzemah Atlas*, Tel Aviv, 1968, *Milhemet ha-Yetzer*, Tel Aviv, 1971, "My Quarrel with Hersh Raseyner," *A Treasury of Yiddish Stories*, ed. Irving Howe and Eliezer Green-

TRADITION: A Journal of Orthodox Thought

berg, New York, 1968; Yehiel Perr, "Reb Yisrael—Who Was He?", *Musar Anthology*, *op. cit.*; and David Zaritsky, *Gesher Tzar*, Bene Brak, 1968.

57. Dov Katz, *op. cit.*, vol. 4; Weinberg, *op. cit.* The only available article on this period of Novorodock history is Yehudah Leb Nekritz, "Yeshivot Novorodock," *Mosdot Torah be-Eropah be-Vinyaman uve-Hurbanam*, ed. S. K. Mirsky, New York, 1965. Eckman's chapter on Novorodock in *The History of the Musar Movement, 1840-1945*, *op. cit.*, is based almost exclusively on Nekritz's article.

Biographies of Novorodock leaders in this period are contained in Bliacher, *Divre Binah u-Musar*, *op. cit.*; Brook, Zaritsky, *Gevile Esh*, *op. cit.*; Kahan, *Nahalat Eliezer*, *op. cit.*; Shulman, *Penine ha-Hochma* and *Penine ha-Shelemut*, *op. cit.*; Waldshein, *Torat Yitzhak*, *op. cit.*; and Hayyim Ephraim Zaitchik, *Ha-Meorot ha-Gedolim*, Jerusalem, 1969.

A few primary sources are available in the YIVO archives in New York, in *Sefer Hayye ha-Musar*, *op. cit.*, in *Sefer Or ha-Musar*, *op. cit.*, and in Shulman, *Penine ha-Hochma* and *Penine ha-Shelemut*, *op. cit.*

58. No single volume contains all of R. Salanter's writings. The most expeditious way to obtain a complete collection of his musar writings is supplementing *Or Yisrael*, *op. cit.*, with *Even Yisrael*, *op. cit.*, and with Shraga Wilman, ed. *Iggrot u-Mikhtavim*, Brooklyn, 1970.

59. Pachter asserts that it was under the influence of the philosophical and psychological currents which were, so to speak, in the air in Germany during the period of R. Salanter's residence in Germany that he developed his distinction between *kohot kehim* and *kohot hitzoni'im*. However, several of his writings dating from his pre-German period, including his very first letters written in 1849, contain unpolished but clearly recognizable statements of most of his later, more developed expressions in *Tevunah* and *Etz Peri*, published during his German period. Conversely, writings dating from his German period, such as his seventh letter in *Or Yisrael*, continue to stress many of the themes he developed in his very first writings.

59a. Perhaps gaps in his writings occurred because his creativity was of an uncontrolled nature which didn't always enable him to express himself systematically. The scantness of his writings may be explained, as indicated above (pp. 4, 5), by the fact that he didn't view the written word as all that important to his life work. Contributing to the scantiness may have been the fact that he was generally a poor writer and didn't view the literary medium as effective in spreading his ideas (cf. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 35).

60. Pachter, *ibid.*, p. 62.

61. *Ibid.*

62. *Ibid.*, pp. 51, 52.

63. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-106.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

66. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 52. R. Salanter doesn't write anything about the possible relation between the psychic and non-psychic forces themselves. He merely hints at a possible relationship between the means of countering each type of force, namely that Torah study cannot effectively exorcise the impure,

Toward An Understanding of Rabbi Israel Salanter

external forces without the musar practitioner's prior involvement in *limud ha-musari* (for the purpose of countering the internal, psychic forces of evil). *Limud ha-musari* is apparently a catalyst, not a cause and not an element, of the efficacy of Torah study. We do not know whether to R. Salanter there was some more detailed way of understanding the phenomenology of the two different categories of evil and the methods to counter them. See end of *Iggeret ha-Musar*, Blazer, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

67. Blazer, *ibid.*, pp. 106, 107; and see p. 54. Whole theories of and treatises on musar have been constructed on the basis of this Salanterian musar method. See Epstein, *Mitzvot ha-Musar*, *Mitzvot ha-Bayit* and *Mitzvot ha-Shalom*, *op. cit.*; Grodzinski, *Torat Avraham*, *op. cit.*; and Avraham Yeshayahu Karelitz, *Sefer Hazon Ish*, Jerusalem, 1944, chapter 3. See also Hillel Goldberg, "Commandments of Peace—Commandments of the Home," *Musar Anthology*, *op. cit.*

68. Blazer, *ibid.* Here, too, our knowledge is incomplete. We don't know how R. Salanter conceived directed study of Halakhah to have the same effect as *limud ha-musari*.

69. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

70. Pachter, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-62.

71. Blazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 30, 31, 43, 46, 49, 50, 61, 124, *et passim*; Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

72. Pachter, *op. cit.*, p. 49.