

TORAH UMADDA AS A WAY TO SHELEMUTI. INTRODUCTION.

A) I am grateful to Rabbi Aharon Soloveitchik for his recent lecture in this series on the halakhic parameters of TuM. Although there is still much more that can and should be said about TuM even from a purely halakhic perspective, and I hope to add to it in time, his masterful treatment leaves me free to discuss other aspects of this endlessly fascinating subject as the focus of this lecture.

B) TuM has a long and honorable history, even though it has usually not been the majority expression for long periods. An important volume is now being written, commissioned by us, presenting this history from the days of the Tannaim and Amoraim through the period of the Rishonim and Acharonim. This book will provide for us documentation of the precedents of our שיטה from the very beginning through Rav Hirsch and Rav Kook. I know that these chapters, being prepared by distinguished scholars, will prove fascinating and mind-expanding both for faculty and students.

C) Y.U. is the home of TuM in our times. TuM is an idea and ideal which defines our mission and gives meaning and purpose to our institutional existence. I say, with regret, that there is no other major center of Torah Umadde in our period of history. As a short exercise of imagination, try this: if the Rambam were alive today, where would he teach if not here at Y.U. Indeed, who else would invite him to teach without worrying either that he was the author of the משנה תורה or the מורה נבוכים?...

D) Interestingly, the Sephardi experience, especially during the Italian Renaissance, included a very natural, relaxed, unapologetic acceptance of what we now call TuM, without even bothering much to explain and defend it as an ideology. The Ashkenazi experience was, for a variety of historical reasons, much more tense, anxious, and withdrawn. In today's lecture, we shall attempt to find an ideological grounding for our שיטה of TuM not so much in the writings of the Sephardic Rishonim, where we might expect to find it, but דוקא in the very center of the Ashkenazi world, in 18th and

19th century Eastern Europe, when there flourished such giants as the Gaon of Vilna and RH Volozhiner on the Mitnagdic side and the Besht and the Maggid and RSZ of Lyadi and countless other luminaries in the Hasidic world.

E) In this *שעור*, therefore, I shall deliberately avoid invoking the Sephardi Rishonim who were the fathers of Jewish philosophy, and so avoid the charge that the source of TuM, ultimately, is Greek or Islamic philosophy. No such accusation can be levelled at 19th century Eastern European *חכמים*. I shall also not be referring to, the imposing and impressive *שיטה* of *דרך ארץ* by R. Samson Raphael Hirsch, or to any of the major and extremely insightful writings of Rav Kook on the subject -- both of whom I have written about in one of my books and which is available for those who may be interested.

F) One more prefatory comment: I am not including in the rubric of TuM two prevalent views which factually motivate some members of the YU family. They are, first, those who come here basically looking for a place where, while they get themselves a good college education, will have a congenial Jewish atmosphere and a sprinkling of "Judaic Studies" courses. This may include those who are genuinely searches, looking for the meaning of Judaism to their lives -- but at not too frenetic a pace. To the searchers I say: you are welcome here to probe and inquire and enjoy the environment we provide for you. To all those in this category I add: remember that this is only a first small step, and is not the essence of YU -- not by any means! We are not a college with with the added conveniences of a few Judaic courses and a Jewish dormitory ambience. What I have just described is not TuM. *ו"ן* that *orah* should be regarded by any of us as merely an added convenience.

The second view that I will not treat at any length tonight is that university studies are permissible because they provide for a livelihood, for *פרנסה*. This is a position with a respectable pedigree and deserves serious consideration. Those who advocate it are certainly welcome and cherished here. But it is not the TuM that is characteristic of YU or expressive of its essence. Towards the end of this talk I shall briefly sketch some reasons why I disagree with this point of view and consider it inadequate. For the present, let me just say that *דרך ארץ* or *חכמה* or *מדע* -- whatever term we use -- is not identical with *אומנות* or *פרנסה*. TuM is more than an excuse for circumventing the Halakha in order to prepare for a more lucrative career.

Rather, after some preliminary remarks I shall suggest three approaches to TuM that I derive from implicit assumptions first of the Mitnagdic world and then of the Hasidic world. Finally I hope to show how TuM can be internalized and lead

to the ultimate desideratum of שלמות.

II. Torah and Madda as Divine Revelations.

Some critics of TuM are fond of saying that they are the purists -- they believe in "Torah only" and deride any kind of "Torah and --" such as TuM. That has an appealing ring to it, but it is grievously mistaken -- simply, because it ignores the facts. Such a facile dismissal has to explain a host of תורה עבודה such as those referring to תורה עבודה or תורה שאין עמה מלאכה, תורה עם דרך ארץ, תורה ודמיון, and even the greeting ולמעשים טובים, and the exaltation of Torah does not require contempt for all other forms of wisdom or experience. Indeed, the Talmud taught that כל האומר אין לו אלא תורה, אפילו תורה אין לו (Yev. 109b).

When we speak of Torah and Madda it is not because we found an imperfection or inadequacy in Torah unintended by its divine Author, but because we affirm that both Torah and Nature are the results of divine revelation; and even as ה' is One, so is there no split between His self-revelations in Torah and in Nature. Hence ת"ת is the study of God's revelation of Himself as Teacher (תלמוד, as in תלמוד לעמו), and בורא (יוצר) is study of Him as Creator (בורא, יוצר). Latter is focus of ספר בראשית, former -- of ספר שמות. These two are parallel to first two ברכות of ק"ש: 1st, ברכת יוצר, acknowledges Him as Creator of Nature; 2nd -- as Teacher of Torah. (Thus, the Halakhah considers the second blessing as a form of התורה. So do we read in ברכות ד"א ע"ב, א"ר יהודה אמר שמואל, השכים לשנות עד שלא קרא ק"ש צריך לברך. (משקרא ק"ש א"צ לברך שכבר נפטר באהבה רבה אלקים: This unity of both aspects of אלקים is reflected in the ק"ש itself: denotes God's creative office as the Sovereign of Nature (hence, e.g., בראשית ברא אלקים את וכו'); and ה' refers to Him as the Teacher of Torah (thus, e.g., וירד ה' על הר סיני).

We must now pose two questions: 1) How do they relate to each other; and 2) Does Madda, in terms this relationship, play a role in our striving for personal שלמות?

III. The Larger Context.

A) As I indicated earlier, we find very little direct support for TuM in this very fertile period of the end of the 18th to the end of the 19th century Russia, Lithuania, and Poland. For a variety of reasons, secular education was anathema to most groups, with some notable exceptions. However, these reasons were historically conditioned -- they had to do with the rise of the Haskalah which was inimical to the Tradition, with the hermetically closed conditions in which most East European Jews lived, etc.-- and do not to my mind go to the

essence of Torah Judaism in either of the two versions represented by the Hasidim and the Mitnagdim. I believe that normative Halakhic Judaism as taught by the Mitnagdim, and Hasidism (especially Hasidism!) contain a wealth of material which, if its implications are spelled out imaginatively but respectfully and responsibly, can support alternative versions of TuM. But I repeat that TuM did not in actual fact flourish in this era and this area, one from which today's Orthodox Jewish community largely stems.

B) Before proceeding, however, let us limn the larger ideational context of the divergence on certain fundamentals between Hasidism and Mitnagdimism.

Judaism posits both transcendence and immanence -- קק"ק ה"צ and מכה"כ....

However, in assessing the relative importance and significance of these two dimensions of Divinity, we find a substantial difference between the Mitnagdim, represented by the Gaon of Vilna and RH, and the Hasidim, especially of the school of the Maggid, and most forcefully expounded by RSZ.

C) For Mitnagdimism, man relates to God via His transcendence. In his transcendence, He spoke to Israel and gave them תורה ומצוות. Because of this, it is possible for man to grasp the divine Will both intellectually and spiritually. Whereas divine immanence, which is uniformly present in all creation, and which man must be aware of and acknowledge, is unavailable to man's cognition. We can know about it, but not it. Now, since we do not relate to God's immanence via תורה ומצוות, the world as such fails to achieve the level of קדושה. Hence, Madda, as the study of the world, would seem to have no special claim on religious value, any more than פרנסה does. There seems to be no plausible rationale for secular education in a Torah context. (We shall return to this later.)

D) Hasidism, however, took the diametrically opposite view. It placed the greatest emphasis on divine immanence and on our relating to Him through that immanence: מכה"כ, לית אתר פנוי מיניה, ואתה מחיה את כולם... We must acknowledge divine transcendence but can have no personal relationship with it. Torah and מצוות are the expression of divine immanence as they deal with this-worldly matters. Thus, while transcendence is inaccessible, this material, phenomenal world is the stage on which the drama of man's encounter and dialogue with his Creator takes place. Hence, the stories of Besht communing with nature, etc. And hence too the narrowing of the gap between קודש וחול with the consequent idea that nature is pregnant with spiritual potential. From here it is only a short step indeed to positing that the study of this world in all its richness is or can be an act of great religious value -- a rousing affirmation of TuM

(although I repeat that, of course, these consequences and implications were not at all spelled out by the Hasidic masters for a variety of reasons.)

Let us now treat in greater detail each of these great versions or expressions of Torah Judaism.

IV. The Mitnagdim.

A) The element of קדושה is reserved for Torah only, which is the exclusive channel for relating to הקב"ה. This principle was enunciated by RH as a foundation of his (Mitnagdic) outlook and was a consequence of his assertion of a vast qualitative difference between the supernal origin of Torah and that of the other "worlds." Nature has its origin in God, of course, but it is the result of long השתלשלות, a kind of reverse evolution, whereas Torah is a direct manifestation of Deity and hence preserves its primordial קדושה. He created Nature; but He is in Torah.

Now, while Nature is, according to this view, utterly profane or חול, it does not mean that מדע is necessarily prohibited or inherently evil or that it is always, as a matter of course, an instance of ביטול תורה.

B) There are several ways of analogizing the relationship between Torah and מדע or טבע according to the Mitnagdic view. First and perhaps the simplest and most direct way, is that of מדע as מצוה. This way envisions Madda as having instrumental value. Torah, as said, always possesses קדושה. Nature, while it never attains that level, does have the potential of attaining the rank of מצוה if it is pursued with the intention of leading to an act of מצוה; for any profane act can be ennobled if it is performed לשם שמים. This is the normative meaning of the Talmudic dictum, וכל מעשיו יהיו לשם שמים. Just as eating or drinking or working can be ennobled, if performed לשם שמים, in the sense that it is intended as a spur to a מצוה to be executed at some later time, so can לימודי חול be viewed as an auxiliary to the life of מצוות, and in this sense it is an expression of כל מעשיו לשם.

This accords with the view of the Vilna Gaon who encouraged his disciples to translate the masterpieces of secular knowledge into Hebrew so that they could be used to enhance Torah learning. It is worth repeating the words of the Gaon as cited by his great תלמיד, R. Baruch of Shklov: כי כפי מה שיחסר לאדם ידיעות משארי החכמות, לעומת זה יחסרו לו מאה ידות שארי בחכמת התורה, כי החכמה והתורה נצמדים יחד. The corpus of החכמות or מדע thus helps one better to understand the depths of Torah. It is a הכשר מצוה (although from the final clause of the quotation from the Gaon, כי התורה והחכמה נצמדים יחד, in the quotation from the Gaon, one would grant far greater value to חכמה or Madda than, for

instance, to פרנסה).

Now if, as stated, we accept the premise that study of מדע has positive value, at least that of הכשר מצוה, it is not open to the charge of ביטול תורה -- even without the excuse of פרנסה. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that T and M do not have equal value (in either or any of the perspectives we are dealing with).

C) Another way of looking at this theme of M as הכשר מצוה for תורה is by referring to T and M respectively as חיי תלמוד and חיי עולם. Madda, in its most comprehensive definition, is a matter of חיי שעה, for one is engaged in it as long as he lives, but it does not survive him to עוה"ב, for in the world of utter spirituality there is no need for this kind of wisdom. Not so, obviously, for Torah which is חיי עולם.

Moreover, we define Madda as חיי שעה because the subject matter of Madda, namely the world, is finite. It may take another thousand years to unravel all of nature's secrets, but the "secrets" are no more infinite than the created world itself. Torah, however, is נצחיות, and therefore the study of Torah is endless (thus, Talmud on צדיקים studying Torah in Heaven) -- which articulates nicely with RH's distinction between Torah and creation.

But if indeed T/M are equivalent to eternal/temporal life, how can we assign any innate value, even of lowest rank, to M alongside T? Answer: of course we can. חיי שעה too is a value. Talmud, comparing prayer to Torah, refers to former as חיי שעה, latter as חיי עולם. So, while this inequality guarantees the subordination of חיי שעה to חיי עולם, and hence מדע to תורה, it does affirm a place of honor for מדע alongside of תפילה.

In this regard I specifically have in mind a special definition of this pair of terms offered by Rav Kook (quoted by Rabbi Zevin in his "אישים ושיטות"). He defines חיי שעה as that which gives life and meaning to the ephemeral aspects of existence, and חיי עולם as that which contributes life force and energy to eternity. I believe that this highly interesting definition by Rav Kook has its roots in the teaching of RH, for whom ת"ת is an empowering and vitalizing of the highest mystical or spiritual "worlds." Hence, חיי שעה in turn must mean the vitalization and endowing of meaning to this phenomenal, empirical, mundane sphere of existence, what in Kabbalistic terminology is known as the עולם העשייה -- a lower world, but a world none the less, and no less a creation and thus expression of the Creator. Madda, from this perspective, means not only the (passive) study of secular wisdom, but it implies creativity and leadership in Madda -- the infusion of חיים into such studies -- as a meritorious religious act. And Torah implies not only

learning, but actively expanding and energizing Torah and Yiddishkeit, putting your heart and soul, your very נשמה into it. I commend this approach most strongly.

D) The second model of TuM also makes use of a characteristic Mitnagdic view, enunciated by R.Hayyim Volozhiner, with a generous helping of support from the Rambam.

If, indeed, the world is an emanation of God, although far lower and more indirect than Torah (it has been pointed out that עולם comes from העולם, because the world is a disguise of God, He is hidden, as it were, within it), then may not the study of this עולם under certain set conditions be considered a form of ת"ת, albeit of a much lower rank than the study of actual halakhic texts? If השמים מספרים כבוד א-ל, is not astronomy or astrophysics a form of intellectual worship of הקב"ה, and does not such "intellectual worship" imply a form of ת"ת?

RH (in NH 4:2) posits a hierarchy of texts and their values within ת"ת. He approvingly quotes from מדרש תהילים that David pleaded that learning תהילים should be considered on par with learning ונעים ואהלות, i.e., regular halakhic study. Since there is no indication that his prayer was answered, RH assumes the response of הקב"ה was negative. Hence, the highest value is assigned to לימוד ההלכה. Thus, while ת"ת includes variety of subjects and texts, they do not necessarily have equal rank.

Interestingly, RH also asserts that just as each verse, indeed each letter, in a ס"ת is equally holy with any other, so is all of Torah of uniform and equal sanctity and one may not make invidious distinctions within Torah. Thus, for instance, he considers the study of arcane and apparently irrelevant sections of קדשים to be as holy and significant as the learning of ש"ע או"ח. Now, this seemingly contradicts what we said earlier in his name concerning תהילים. However, I believe there is no inconsistency if we accept that what he is saying is that there is a hierarchy of values in the various branches or מקצועות of Torah, so that Halakhah is superior to תהילים, indeed it is preeminent among all such branches or מקצועות התורה, but within each discipline one may not assert priorities in value and sanctity.

Thus, if one studies Agadah, does he have שכר מצות ת"ת? The answer is: of course, though not same level as Halakhah. What of ספרי מוסר? I believe we can agree that if they contain quotations from Bible, Talmud - yes; but what if not? Is there קיום מצות ת"ת? I believe there is, and we shall call upon the Rambam for assistance in this matter. With his help, and according to R.Hayyim's hierarchical view of ת"ת, we may find a role for the study of Madda within the realm of Torah.

For the Rambam, it seems clear that Madda, or at least some form of it, has ת"ת value -- and, moreover, not quite as low

on the scale as RH puts תהילים! Thus, in הל' ת"ת פ" הי"ב he recommends dividing one's time into 3: 1/3 תושב"כ, 1/3 תושב"פ, and 1/3 גמרא. In last category he includes "פרדס". Normally, we assume this term to refer to Kabbalah. Not so, however, for Maimonides. In earlier passage (הל' יסוה"ת פ"ד) he defines "פרדס" as consisting of מעשה מרכבה ומעשה בראשית, which he in turn defines as metaphysics and natural science. Thus, for Maimonides, Madda (what he calls, more accurately, חכמה) has ת"ת value. (Indeed, he often couples תורה and חכמה with regard to a number of הלכות where others speak only of תורה. Thus, with especial regard to ת"ת, he writes in הלכות ת"ת פ"ג הי"ג that while one must study Torah both by day and by night, nighttime is preferable, and מי שרצה לזכות בכתר התורה יזהר בכל לילותיו...אלא בת"ת ובדברי חכמה. And, as we know from elsewhere, the term חכמה for Maimonides specifically refers to secular wisdom.)

With this position of the Rambam in mind, we now return to RH and his hierarchical view of ת"ת. We may now say that just as RH envisions a hierarchy of texts of ת"ת, so is there a category of ת"ת that is textless, a form of Torah study that refers to intellection only without a formal, "canonized" text upon which such thinking is focused. Madda is that textless subject of ת"ת.

Now, if Madda is to be accepted as a form of ת"ת, we are presented with some immediate questions, namely: would anyone suggest that one recite a ברכת התורה over organic chemistry? Or, equally absurd, may one study calculus all day and thereby be פטור from all "other" ת"ת that day?

The first question can be answered quite simply. The ברכת התורה is restricted to texts of Torah -- whether Written or Oral Torah -- and is not to be recited in the absence of a specific text. Nevertheless, the study of such matters as the Rambam classifies as פרדס or what we call מדע remains a case of ת"ת. In halakhic terminology, the ת"ת מצות is executed through the intellectual service of God, עבודת השם, מעשה השכל, whereas the prescribed form it must take, the תושב"כ, is restricted to formal texts of the corpus of תושב"כ. Hence, the study of physics, for instance, in the proper manner, is an act of study of Torah but requires no ברכה.

The second question, about the division of one's time, can be dealt with similarly. The Rambam's teaching about dividing one's time into three equal parts holds true, he says (הל' ת"ת) (פ"א הי"א והי"ב), only for the early part of his career in studying Torah, but once a student has made reasonable progress so that he has learned all of תושב"כ and does not have to spend all that time in תושב"פ, he ought to set a certain amount of time aside for these branches of Torah "so that he does not forget any of the laws of the Torah" and then he ought spend the rest or bulk of his time in Gemara according to the range of his interests and the acuity of his

mind. Here are his words:

במה דברים אמורים בתחילת תלמודו של אדם אבל כשיגדיל בחכמה ולא יהא צריך לא ללמוד תושב"כ ולא לעסוק תמיד בתושב"פ, יקרא בעתים מזומנים תושב"כ ודברי השמועה כדי שלא ישכח דבר מדברי דיני תורה ויפנה כל דבריו לגמרא בלבד לפי רוחב שיש בלבו ויישוב דעתו

Thus, after one has learned תנ"ך well and has made an earnest start on Mishnah, he can devote larger amounts of time to Gemara which, according to the Rambam, includes not only original creative thinking in Halakhah but also פרד"ס which, again according to Rambam, means natural science and speculative philosophy. Hence, for the more advanced student, the learning of תושב"פ and תושב"כ is not to fulfill the mitzvah of ת"ת as much as to avoid violating the law of שכחה. But the קיום of ת"ת is primarily in the area of גמרא which now includes what we would today call תלמוד and, as well, the subjects included in the rubric of Madda, especially the sciences and humanities.

Hence, if we define our university studies as primarily career preparation (whether in a straight vocational sense as training for פרנסה or as הכשר מצוה for ת"ת), the time so spent is not at all to be included in the schedule of TT; and all the rest of one's time -- the hours spent in קודש למודי and on the "afternoon" courses in תנ"ך -- ought to be divided by the subjective criterion proposed by Rambam, namely, in addition to Scripture and Mishnah, the Madda courses, depending upon שיש בלבו ויישוב דעתו. But if we define our "secular" subjects (excluding clearly vocational ones such as accounting) as fitting into the category of גמרא, then our division of time should arouse no special criticism. That is, so long as we continue to learn תנ"ך and תושב"פ to acquire new knowledge and to refrain from forgetting what we know, then the study of the sciences and humanities is in effect the study of גמרא and thus a fulfillment of the study of Torah.

Hence, my proposal that מדע might be assigned ת"ת value under certain conditions is not really that outrageous or not even that novel.

Of course, all depends on one's attitude in such study. The Talmud (ברכות) teaches that Torah must be studied ביראה באימה. For Madda, this is critical in determining if it has any ת"ת value, no matter how low down the scale. If it is present, then this subjective attitude converts a neutral or indifferent cognitive exercise into ת"ת, albeit of a rank far below that of Halakhah.

V. The Hasidim.

A) We now turn to the Hasidic world, so rich and original in מחשבת היהדות, to see if we can mine some of its treasures for

nuggets of guidance in the area of TuM.

We pointed out at the beginning the emphasis by Hasidism on divine immanence, His closeness to man and "withinness" in the world -- His *מכה"כ, לית אחר פנוי מיניה, ואתה מחיה את His* כולם. "I'll give you a kopek if you'll tell me where God is," said a stranger to the little boy destined to become the great R. Naftali Ropshitzer. He answered immediately, "and I'll give you two if you'll tell me where He isn't!"

This vision invested the world, far more than did the Mitnagdic approach, with the possibility and promise of קדושה. The ordinary, trite, mundane, prosaic world was suddenly opened up to the creative spiritual energies of Hasidim brimming with a divine enthusiasm, with an unquenchable flame of faith.

B) The religious energies released by this new form of *עבודת ה'* carried with it the dangers of antinomianism, of overrunning the Halakhah with its fundamental distinctions between *קודש וחול*. But its fires were banked and its excessive enthusiasm dampened, and Hasidism remained within the fold (that is, until Rav Shach has, these past few years and months, stirred up the embers of the 200-year old polemic between Hasidim and Mitnagdim).

C) A corollary of Hasidism's emphasis on immanence which became one of the most significant and characteristic contributions of the *לש"ס* and was elaborated upon by the Maggid of Mezeritch and R.Yaakov Yosel of Polonnoye, by R.Elimelech of Lizensk and R.Nachum of Chernobyl, is the concept of ABG, of serving *הקב"ה* with and through our very corporeality, with our *גשמיות*.

The concept of ABG is that God's immanence in all creation -- in *טבע* as well as in *תורה* -- means that the mundane, physical order represents a legitimate avenue of approach to *הקב"ה*. An oft quoted source for this theory is to be found in *מדרש חנוך* to the effect that *תפירה* כל *תפירה* *היה* *אומר* *בשכמל"ו*. My *עבודת השם* can be expressed not only through the formally sanctioned means of *תפילה ומצוות*, but also "informally" by involving myself with certain specific attitudes in the whole realm of creation and the corporeal world. Thus, we have two forms of *עבודת השם* -- *עבודה ברוחניות* (the standard halakhic means) and *עבודה בגשמיות* (the informal, extra-halakhic way). And each is a legitimate way of serving the *רש"ע*.

(In elaborating the idea of ABG, Hasidism was not offering cut-rate entree to the circle of saints; it was not a bargain for potential recruits as an easy way to Heaven. On the contrary, it was a more difficult and onerous way. It insisted that the perimeters of *עבודת ה'* be expanded to include all life and all times so that the Jew be pervasively God-conscious. So difficult was this form of *עבודת השם* that

the earliest *חסידי* to elaborate the theory of ABG such as R.Yaakov Yosef of Polonnaye sought to limit its practice to the elite, to *אנשי צורה*, and not *אנשי חומר*, *hoi polloi*.)

D) R. Zvi Hirsch Zhydachover, in his "סור מרע ועשה טוב," more than most other Hasidic thinkers, puts into bold relief the truly innovative aspect of Hasidism's doctrine of ABG. The classical rabbinic view, he tells us, is represented by R.Bachya in chap. 5 of his *חובות הלבבות*. There he speaks of *ייחוד המעשה*, the dedication of all one's activities to divine service. All bodily functions, all one's mundane activities, must be pursued with the thought that they somehow lead to *עבודת הבורא* by strengthening the body, achieving economic sustenance so as to serve Him the better, etc. It is this thesis which is codified in *אורח חיים*. Now, says the Zhydachover, while that certainly is commendable, it is not ultimate. There is a higher category, that of *עבודה תמה*, "perfect service." The Talmud declares this to be the highest form, beyond which there is no greater kind of service. The kind proposed by R.Bachya, however, cannot be that ultimate service, for while my activities are ennobled by my regarding them as necessary for *עבודת הבורא*, they are not now in and of themselves of any significance as are, e.g., prayer or study of Torah; they are instrumental, not intrinsically of value -- *הכשר מצוה*, not *מצוה* itself. Hasidic teaching, however, does provide that highest form and derives it from the Lurianic doctrine that all existence is sustained ontologically by the "holy sparks" of Divinity that are the vehicles of divine immanence. When one is involved in any worldly matter, he has it in his power, by virtue of his thoughts and intentions, to liberate those sparks, returning them to their divine Source. This act of *העלאת הניצוצות*, the redemption or elevation of the divine sparks, is in and of itself an act of the greatest religious significance, not merely as an instrument for some later fulfillment. (It is irrelevant for this thesis that Hasidism changed the nature of the thought processes that the *קדוש* recommended from mystical meditations to ecstatic enthusiasm.) The point is that I can perform genuine *עבודת ה'* by engaging in *גשמיות* here and now.

As mentioned, Nature or natural acts or the study of nature can attain significance as an act of *הכשר מצוה* according to the Mitnagdic view. But it has no innate, intrinsic value. For Hasidism, however, a profane act performed for *ש"ש* is considered in and of itself as worthy. If it is so consecrated, its value is intrinsic, it is a *מצוה* and not merely propaedeutic to some other good.

E) It should by now be obvious that there is a very small step from ABG to TuM. If Hasidism can find the promise of *קדוש* in eating, why not in the chemistry of carbohydrates

and the physiology of ingestion? If in working with a hammer and a chisel, why not with a theory and a hypothesis? If in conjugal relations, why not in the contemplation of the relations of the business cycle to various arcane mathematical models? Indeed, it is a fact that Hasidic Rebbeim have been far more open to their followers developing their talents in music and art than have been their counterparts in the Yeshiva or Mitnagdic world. מדע, on the basis of ABG, thus appears in a new dimension: as an authentic and autonomous form of עבודת השם. In this light, מדע is important not only because it helps to understand Torah, although it most assuredly does that; and not only because we can assign it a value of נ"ח of a lower level, which was the second approach we suggested, based upon RH and the Rambam; but because it is, in its own right, a sacred activity -- provided, and always provided, that it is pursued as an act of עבודת השם and not merely because of career reasons or cultural curiosity or because it is socially expected of me.

F) Surprisingly, therefore, Hasidism offers us a much more affirmative and dynamic vision of TuM than is otherwise available once its implications are properly spelled out. This is not merely a היתר for TuM. It is a divine imperative, a charge to seek inspiration in the broadest realms of the intellect and imagination.

In its highest, most necessary, and most successful application, this cognitive or academic variant of ABG will lead us to a sublime insight: that all of creation, in all its incredible complexity and fantastic richness is only an illusion, a disguise for the אין סוף, a mask for the divinity that pulsates through all of existence.

G) However, attractive and spiritually edifying as this doctrine is, it is quite dangerous too. It is replete with antinomian possibilities; taken too far, it can undermine the Halakhah. Thus, skirting the edges of such peril, R. Nachum Chernobyler writes that ABG is as significant as תפילין וציצית! A similarly bold statement is made by his contemporary, R. Elimelech of Lizensk:

כי [אצל צדיקים] אין חילוק בין תורה ותפילה או אכילה ושתייה, הכל הוא ... עבודת הבורא ואינו אלא חילוף מעבודה לעבודה (נועם אלימלך קרח, ד"ה ונחשב).

Unquestionably, there is more than a little exaggeration in these statements, yet the hyperbole does not cover up the fact that we here face the troubling conclusion that, for instance, tying your shoe laces or eating your Rice Krispies is of equal importance with performing one of the 248 מצוות. If doing one or the other is merely a matter of going לעבודה מעבודה, then who needs מצוות altogether? If you can come close to the בורא עולם by any act if you have

the right כוונה, then all formal מצוות are superfluous. Of course, neither the Lizensker nor the Chernobyler ever came to that conclusion, but it is uncomfortably close to an explosive consequence -- and, bear in mind, Chernobyl is a town where only recently there was a nuclear mishap... (This is a good reason why the early masters of Hasidism preferred to reserve ABG for אנשי צורה [Zaddikim] only, not for אנשי חומר.)

Hence, it should be made clear that when we propose a model of TuM based on this tenet of ABG, we rule out completely any equality between ABG and a formal mitzvah, and between T and M. ABR, the performance of an halakhic act informed by the proper intention, remains superior and absolute, and ABG or Madda is subordinate to and also contingent upon it. That is, אינו מצווה ועושה always takes primacy over מצווה ועושה. Indeed, it is ABR which legitimates ABG and, consequently, Torah which legitimates Madda. The pursuit of M without T is devoid of any innate Jewish significance. With Torah, Madda rises to unbelievable heights. It is the two of them in conjunction that give our religious experience, our עבודת השם, both breadth and depth. With T, M is not only instrumental but also of intrinsic value; never without it.

We are then left with the question: according to our extrapolation of the hasidic notion of ABG, with specific regard to TuM, how ought we formulate the relationship between תלמוד תורה in the normative, conventional sense, and Madda as an intellectual expression of ABG?

Perhaps an appropriate and helpful analogy is the difference between קרבן נדבה and קרבן חובה. The former, legally mandated independent of the volition and good will of the worshipper, retains a formal superiority as the result of מצווה ועושה. The latter, originating in the conscience and generosity of the worshipper as an act of faith and good will, אינו מצווה ועושה, becomes sacred by virtue of a special and conscious act of sanctification by man.

This may suggest a structure for the relationship between Torah and Madda after we have analogized from the basic Hasidic theory of ABG. But this is, for the present, merely a suggestion, and its elaboration must be left for some other occasion. For the present I must emphasize again and again: For us, no matter how we formulate the desirability of Madda, from a Torah perspective ת"ת must retain its absolute superiority and primacy -- metaphysically, axiologically, and practically (in how we manage our time).

VI. Practical Consequences

None of the above would dictate a radical change of our present curriculum, and we would continue to affirm the unquestioned centrality of TT, no matter which model we

adopt. But we would be left with the following significant consequences requiring of us to undertake a complete rethinking of our orientation to Madda, depending upon the model of TuM that we adopt:

a) If Madda is to be studied only for pre-professional reasons, *הנחת המטרה*, and no other motivation is considered acceptable, then you must restrict your curriculum to vocational courses only. Cut out all sciences, humanities, liberal arts, and scrape by with only the required courses in these areas -- that is, if you do not have the courage of your convictions and leave university studies altogether and register in a trade school. As is obvious to you by now, this is a position with which I do not agree. Even in SSSB we insist upon a liberal dose of the liberal arts because, we believe, there is nothing wrong with preparing for a career provided you do not allow it to interfere with your education! Moreover, even the business courses offered, or most of them, are presented in an academic fashion so that they become intellectually challenging and culturally edifying.

b) If you adopt the first of the three forms of TuM we have proposed, the instrumental model, then you must remind yourself, every now and then, that the purpose of your university education lies beyond itself, in the enhancement of your spiritual gestalt, in order to enable you better to understand the Creator's creation and your role in it, and in order to be able for the rest of your life to be *קובע עתים לתורה*. The failure to do so later in your life retroactively nullifies whatever religious value your Madda studies may have.

c) If the model you adopt is the second, that of Madda as a form of TT, then most especially your "impractical," non-career courses have to be studied with great respect and reverence, because such Madda is a *קיום ברת"ת* and demands of you the requisite subjective orientation. Moreover, for the same reason, you must study Madda *לשמה*, which means: to understand them, to master them, and to appreciate them because that is the will of *הקב"ה*.

d) If your pursuit of Madda is a contemporary version of the Hasidic ABG, then all your learning and all your deeds--whether T or M, whether accounting or philosophy, woodwork or calculus -- must be undertaken with an awareness that you are thereby engaging in *עבודת השם*; hence, you must take special care to avoid *הוללות דעת*, *גניבת דעת*, *לה"ר*, *ניבול פה*, etc. in the course of your *לימודי חול* no less than in your *לימודי קודש*.

VII. Shelemut.

Having spoken of TuM in objective terms, as a problem in

השקפה, let me now consider, with you, what this means to us subjectively, as individuals.

I deal with this issue because of autobiographical reasons. When I came to YU as an 18-year old freshman, the concept of TuM proved enormously attractive to me; indeed, it has remained a source of fascination for me to this very day. I saw before me a number of outstanding role models, most especially the Rav א"ש, and I yearned to both understand and perhaps some day emulate their remarkable synthesis of such apparently disparate worlds. TuM became for me not, as so many of our critics aver, a source of spiritual and religious schizophrenia but, quite to the contrary, an opportunity-- because of all its creative tensions -- for ultimate inner harmony, a way to unite my deepest Torah commitments with my growing experiences as a modern person living in a scientific technopolis in an open and democratic society and in a culture which, despite all its terrible failings, is vibrant and progressive. I could not accept the position of the critics of Yeshiva who nimbly excused going to college for פרנסה or career reasons but were horrified at the thought of actually getting an education. I was unimpressed by the easy acceptance of going to high school and yet resistance to a university; if it was forbidden to learn לימודי חול, then we should desist from it even on an elementary level and, if necessary, go to prison for our principles. No, that was the way of inner dissonance and self-delusion. It was TuM which held for me then and now the promise of spiritual healing, of inner reconciliation.

Could it be as well a way to spiritual growth? In the great Musar literature we read of the striving for שלמות, for wholeness and perfection. But this ideal is almost always tied up exclusively with גדלות בתורה and זיכרון המדות. Is there no place for Madda to be integrated in the goal of שלמות in a substantive manner?

I believe that there certainly is -- that, indeed, it gives new breadth to the ideal of שלמות, and I hope you will let me share it with you briefly.

Some of the most famous Rishonim offered various proofs for God's existence. This includes such eminences as R.Saadia Gaon, Maimonides, Gersonides, and even R.Bachya and R.Yehuda Halevi. Why did they engage in such philosophical speculations? Were they out to reenforce their own shaky אמונה? No, ח"ו, that was most obviously not their purpose. Was it, then, to strengthen the spiritual weaklings amongst their students, or the defecting masses?

Not at all, answers R.Yaakov Moshe Charlop, the famous תלמיד חבר of Rav Kook, and author of "מי מרום". The purpose of indulging in these efforts to prove the existence of God was to enhance גילוי אלקות בעולם, to reveal God through the medium of intellect. We reveal Godliness by acts of מצות or דין,

etc. But we must also reveal Him through our most precious and distinctive property, the mind.

Remarkably, just about the time I was reading this insight by Rabbi Charlop, I chanced upon an article by the late Prof. Frankel of Columbia, a famed expert in medieval philosophy, who said the identical thing about all the philosophers of the Middle Ages who undertook similar enterprises.

This "revelation" must not be understood as a function of religious propoganda. While it certainly is valid to preach and teach the existence of God to the world, that is not what motivated our Rishonim. Rather, the goal was primarily to reveal אלקות to one's self, to thus grow religiously and spiritually, to place all one's potencies including the intellectual at the service of God, to rise to greater מדרגות in ידיעת השם. This is a form of growth which leads to a kind of intellectual קידוש השם.

In a word, the purpose of marshalling all areas of experience, of using all one's talents towards this sacred goal, was the attempt to achieve שלמות. For the broader my intellectual horizons, the higher is my spiritual reach and the deeper is my religious commitment. The more comprehensive and inclusive The domain I conceive to be that of הקב"ה, the closer do I approach the asymptotic ideal of שלמות. This is שלמות with a wide angle lens instead of a zoom lens.

This is indeed a hint of what TuM can mean to us if it is structured on the basis of the Hasidic ideal of of ABG. Grasping a differential equation or a concept in quantum mechanics can let us perceive and reveal אלקות in the abstract governance of the universe. An insight into molecular biology or depth psychology or the dynamics of society can inspire in us a fascination with God's creation that the Rambam calls אהבת השם. A new appreciation of a Beethoven symphony or a Cezanne painting or the poetry of Milton can move us to a greater sensitivity to the infinite possibilities of the creative imagination with which the Creator endowed His צלם אלקים.

VII. Conclusion.

A) Summary.

B) Perhaps all we have said can be summarized in one פסוק properly understood: התהלך לפני והיה תמים.

התהלך, both etymologically and substantively, is the source of הלכה. The discipline of Halakhah is rooted in the effort to "go before" the רבש"ע, to live a life sanctified by carrying out the divine will. By its commitment to Halakhah, Israel achieves its mission of becoming a קדוש, and individual Jews thus live in consonance with the divinely revealed Law. And the highest activity in the halakhic life

is learning, the study of Halakhah itself. The primacy of ת"ת is the most salient, uncontested, and unimpeachable characteristic of the Halakhah.

לפני. However, an exclusive emphasis on Halakhah risks forgetting an important principle: that Halakhah is minimal Judaism, and not its totality. Halakhah always points beyond itself to higher achievements and greater challenges; to לפני; to מדת חסידות; to the ethereal realms of אנדה and the stringent demands it makes upon us spiritually and morally and psychologically, no less heroic than the practical demands made upon us by the Halakhah. That Halakhah is minimal Judaism is amply demonstrated by the Ramban's famous dictum about התורה נכללת ברשות התורה.

In this context it is worth mentioning a statement of חז"ל that is often offered as a rebuttal to our שיטה of TuM, and that it: מיום שחרב ביהמ"ק אין לו להקב"ה בעולמו אלא ד"א של (Ber. 8b). In that case, we are told, Halakhah is the exclusive repository of divinity, and everything outside of Torah is devoid of religious value.

I believe that this argument is fallacious -- and the quotation is misleading. It should be obvious that חז"ל were not exactly overjoyed by this diminution of the divine realms and the limitation placed, כביכול, on the רבש"ע. They considered this restriction of God's presence in the world to Halakhah to be a consequence of the חורבן, not a fact worthy of celebration! They meant to say: Here is a fact -- that the exclusion of God from the rest of the world is a result of the destruction of the ביהמ"ק -- but would that it were not so! Hence, even as we legitimately seek to undo the effects of the חורבן by means of בנין הארץ and קיבוצ גלויות, so may we -- indeed, must we -- seek to undo the constricting effects on אלקות of that national disaster by enlarging the boundaries of אלקות to include that which is beyond our sacred Halakhah, embracing in the divine purview those areas we call Madda as well.

Thus, as we said, Halakhah retains, as it always will, its primacy. But primacy is not exclusivity. And the pursuits called לימודי חול must be included in our larger and more comprehensive purview.

So, the התהלך must be followed by לפני, Halakhah must take the lead, but following it must be all the rest of God's creation.

Finally, שלמות, we must achieve wholeness, והיה תמים, and that internalization of both תורה and מדע is the most difficult task of all -- the most difficult and the most glorious.

So, we who follow the teachings of TuM have our challenge cut

out for us:

*to prove that one can stress and execute the primacy of .
ת"ת without denigrating Madaa;

*to demonstrate that embracing all of Wisdom in the
spiritual grasp of TuM does not deter from our יראת שמים; on
the contrary, it enhances it and gives it breadth as well as
depth;

*to let TuM inspire us to a vision that is truly חובק
עולם, that has a universal grasp -- that of attaining
תמימות-שלמות by "revealing" God in a manner both truly
sophisticated and exquisitely moral to a world that is drunk
with demonic arrogance, sick with its endemic skepticism and
secularist cynicism, reeling from a relativism that leaves it
without a grounding to grow from and a heaven to reach for,
pathetic in its parochial modernism and its spiritual
pusillanimousness.

ושמרתם ועשיתם כי היא חכמתכם ובינתכם לעיני העמים
אשר ישמעון את כל החוקים האלה ואמרו
רק עם חכם ונבון הגוי הגדול הזה
-- (דברים ד'-ו')

יקימן ה' לו לעם קדוש כאשר נשבע לך
כי תשמור את מצוות ה' אלקיך והלכת בדרכיו
וראו כל עמי הארץ כי שם ה' נקרא עליך
(...and they will respect you) ויראו ממך
-- (דברים כ"ח-י')

When we have combined התהלך and לפני in the proper spirit,
when we have offered up to Him the totality of our lives --
intellectual, moral, economic, esthetic, social, cultural,
all our many potencies and talents -- we will achieve that
always elusive goal of תמימות or שלמות worthy of the respect
of our fellow Jews and the admiration of all members of the
family of man.

A more sublime goal can hardly be imagined.