Nehemia Polen

REVIEW

Samuel C. Heilman and Menachem M. Friedman, *The Rebbe: The Life and Afterlife of Menachem Mendel Schneerson* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010). xx + 343 pp.

George Orwell began his essay on Gandhi by saying that ''Saints should always be judged guilty until they are proved innocent, but the tests that have to be applied to them are not, of course, the same in all cases.''[1] In their study of the modern Hasidic leader Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, revered by his followers as a saintly master, Samuel Heilman and Menachem Friedman execute the first half of Orwell's maxim with vigor, but they stumble over the second half. Repelled by what they see as a cult of personality, they deconstruct the cult but lose sight of the personality. Their effort displays the limits of a journalistic portrayal of a person of spirit that observes externals but vacates considerations of interiority.

The Rebbe provides a vivid portrait of Rabbi Schneerson's early days, beginning with his childhood in Russia, noting that he was sent to a relatively modern school, where the curriculum included grammar and poetry, including Bialik.[2] Later we find the future leader in Berlin, a place that the authors stress was not congenial to Hasidic life; they suggest that the choice of Berlin bespeaks an attraction to Western culture and cosmopolitan life. Countering some claims, the authors point out that Schneerson's academic achievements in Berlin were modest; although Friedrich Wilhelm University granted him a certificate of attendance, he never advanced beyond the status of auditor.[3] Later in Paris, he eventually did receive a degree, not from the Sorbonne, but from a second-tier engineering school. Also, his academic record was hardly distinguished; at one point, he had a class ranking of thirty five out of thirty seven.[4]

Focusing on the location of his residences in Berlin and Paris, the authors deduce that at some point the young Schneerson's attachment to the Hasidic way of life was tenuous and desultory; they speculate that he and his wife (Moussia, the daughter of the sixth Lubavitcher Rebbe Yosef Yitzhak Schneerson) likely spent time enjoying the cultural resources and bohemian atmosphere of Paris. Distancing

themselves from the Jewish quarter and a small Hasidic synagogue, they lived in a more avant-garde area, not far from Sartre and de Beauvoir, Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas, Picasso and Modigliani. The authors ask leadingly, "Could the Schneersons . . . have remained completely ignorant of this life around them? Did they want to be? Did they never walk the boulevards, stop in the cafés, visit the galleries, or feel the energy around them? Had this couple who stayed out late in Leningrad while they were courting and who may have attended the theatre there become homebodies in interwar Paris?"[5]

The second part of the book describes how Menachem Mendel Schneerson emerged to follow his father-in-law as the seventh Rebbe of Chabad, a process that they see as filled with posturing and intrigue, and the now familiar story of messianic fervor orchestrated by Rabbi Schneerson and the campaign to disseminate Chabad teachings and establish Chabad centers throughout the world, a campaign that has enjoyed astonishing success. But how did an aspiring engineer with a lackluster academic record and an uncertain connection to his Hasidic heritage, a displaced refugee who had barely avoided the Nazi vortex, make his way in a new country with an unfamiliar language and culture, eventually to become the leader of a flourishing worldwide religious movement? The answer according to Heilman and Friedman is self-reinvention and shrewd manipulation: "From being a somewhat mediocre mechanical and electrical engineer he would become an outstanding social and spiritual engineer who would offer his recipe for the redemption of the Jewish people."[6] He "outflanked" his brother-in-law for the leadership,[7] and then "he had to reinvent himself. He would do it by stressing his knowledge of Lubavitcher sources and by using mystification to enhance his charisma and the charisma of his office—audiences with him began at 10 p.m. and ran into the wee hours of the morning, so that people who came to see him had to walk through abandoned streets when the rest of the world was asleep and specially prepare themselves and remain awake for the encounter."[8]

The authors are keen to emphasize the discontinuity between his life in Western Europe, where they claim his aim was to "live as a Jew of Hasidic background pursuing a career in engineering,"[9] and his subsequent American leadership role. In Berlin he had lived, as they put it, a "double life,"[10] and while they note that his interest in Hasidism began to grow during his last years in Europe, they portray that interest as compelled by circumstance as much as by inner desire: "Clearly, as his prospects for a career as an engineer declined, Mendel's possibilities for and interest in a vocation in the court of ChaBaD grew. This, he surely recognized by the end of the 1930s, was something he could do."[11] And after the war, "he would become

a renewed almost reborn person in America [emphasis in original]; he would no longer be Mendel Schneerson, would-be French engineer and student. As we have seen, by 1951 he would be reinvented and remade. No longer the shy introvert, he became the self-confident extrovert and leader, emerging as Grand Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, *shlita* . . . , the seventh Lubavitcher rebbe.''[12]

Is this plausible, a mountebank as Hasidic master? Turning oneself into a rebbe by effort of will and *trompe l'oeil*? With the omniscient voice of a biblical narrator, Heilman and Friedman presume access to Schneerson's inner motivations, framed in flat and pedestrian terms. They write as if Schneerson's emergence as Hasidic leader was a make-over engineered by a career counselor. Why would anyone go along with such posturing, agreeing to see a minor engineer-turned-rebbe in the dead of night? It is here that Heilman's and Friedman's project runs aground: the first part of their book is so intent on deflating Schneerson's aggrandized image, bringing him down to earth, that one is at a loss to understand how his followers were inspired to spread his message to every corner of the earth.

It is even harder to see how he could have left a powerful impression on movement outsiders who were not sympathetic to the messianism and who were likely dismissive or even actively hostile to it. For such is the case. In his memoir *All Rivers Run to the Sea*,[13] Elie Wiesel writes of the influence of Rabbi Menahem Mendel Schneerson on his life and work. He tells of a visit to Lubavitch (i.e., to 770 Eastern Parkway in Brooklyn) one year during the holiday of *Simchat Torah*. The vignette of their encounter is richly drawn, conveying deep mutual affection and respect. At the end of their dialogue the Rebbe says, ''You deserve a blessing. Name it!'' Wiesel hesitates and the Rebbe continues, ''Would you like me to bless you so you can begin again?'' Wiesel was struck by the Rebbe's wisdom, since ''[t]o begin again could mean so many things: begin again to drink, to pray, to believe, to live. And then it was *Simchat Torah*, which is also my birthday.''

This episode affected Wiesel deeply. He presents the exchange as unplanned, spontaneous. The multivalent suppleness and playful capaciousness of the Rebbe's blessing, all delivered on the spur of the moment, disclosed penetrating discernment, and fresh possibility. Did the Rebbe know that *Simchat Torah* is Wiesel's birthday? Was it sheer luck, a stab in the dark, or prodigious memory of prior meetings summoned and applied in a flash? The *Simchat Torah* gathering was dominated by a mood of buoyant festivity, but elsewhere Wiesel writes of other meetings when the subject of the Holocaust came up. Wiesel states that his dialogue with the Rebbe on that topic ''was a turning point in my writing.''[14] Wiesel did not become a Lubavitcher, but that

is just the point: Schneerson's ability to touch souls was not limited to movement insiders, to those in thrall to his image and mystique. Encounters similar to the ones with Wiesel took place all the time, day after day, for decades. It is their incrementally cumulative effect that endowed the man with the stature he came to have.

Former Israeli Chief Rabbi Israel Meir Lau devotes a lengthy section of his memoir to the Lubavitcher Rebbe.[15] Rabbi Lau describes his first audience with the Rebbe, which began at 1:30 a.m. on a day in March 1974, lasting over two hours. Far from being annoyed at the time of the meeting, Rabbi Lau—hardly a Lubavitcher Hasid—describes it as "one of the highlights of my life."[16]

On another occasion Lau attended a gathering led by the Lubavitcher Rebbe with his (Lau's) father-in-law, Rabbi Yitzchak Yedidya Frankel. "As the rebbe strode quickly into the hall, a small book by Maimonides under his arm, the atmosphere was electric. The rebbe gave a class that lasted four hours, without using notes or opening the book, not even once. In his class, he referred to both classic and esoteric sources, early and late authorities, from all periods. He cited entire sections by heart."[17] Rabbi Lau informs us that his father-in law was "critical, difficult to impress, and rarely given to superlatives." But he had never seen ability such as that of the Lubavitcher Rebbe. He quotes his father-in-law as saying, "I witnessed the magnificence of Polish Jewry; I had the honor of visiting Rabbi Kook, who gave me a personal letter; and I have known most of the great scholars of recent generations. But I have never seen such command of the material. That is genius."[18]

Rabbi Lau credits the Rebbe with predicting Lau's election as chief rabbi of Israel and encouraging him to prepare for his role, assuring him of heavenly blessing.[19]

Another former Chief Rabbi who attributes to Schneerson a transformative epiphany that led to his ultimate vocation is Jonathan Sacks. Sacks recalls that, in the summer of 1968, while still a student at Cambridge University, he traveled to the United States, where he met "the greatest rabbis alive," Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik and Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneersohn. As he puts it, those meetings were "life-changing encounters. Rabbi Soloveitchik had challenged me to think. Rabbi Schneersohn had challenged me to lead....[T]hese were holy people. Somehow you felt larger because of them."[20]

These glowing words from savvy outsiders are not adduced here for reasons of pious sentimentality but to do justice to the historical record, to correct a category error. The small-bore portrait of a middling careerist is wildly at variance with the assessments of astute non-Hasidic observers. Reading Heilman and Friedman, one could not guess that Moshe Idel, in his study of recent Jewish mystical thought,

ranks Schneerson as one of the major Jewish cultural and intellectual leaders emerging from the Eastern European milieu in the twentieth century, alongside Agnon, Soloveitchik, and Heschel, and, for a slightly earlier period, Abraham Isaac Kook, Bialik, and Zeitlin.[21] Similarly, the eminent historian of American Judaism, Jonathan Sarna, in his description of Schneerson mentions, ''deep Jewish learning, native brilliance, personal charisma, boundless energy, extraordinary administrative skills, and intimate family connections that equipped him to succeed in his job.''[22] Sarna goes on to describe the fervent messianism and the mitzvah campaign in nuanced, balanced terms.

What has gone wrong? What has led to a flat, trivializing portrayal, focusing paparazzi-like on dubious sightings of a ''trimmed beard,''[23] while at the same time barely mentioning the sweep of Schneerson's learning and the depth of his spirit?

Here we come to a keyword in the authors' exposition: charisma. They write that ''Menachem Mendel Schneerson combined both the charisma of his office as Rebbe of ChaBaD Lubavitch and a more personal charisma, in virtue of his powerful personality and extraordinary individual magnetism.''[24] They explain charisma as ''the possession of extraordinary personal characteristics, charm, and magnetism that inspires people to admire or even love, follow, obey....''[25] Gesturing to Max Weber, they mention charisma's routinization and fret about how long borrowed charisma can keep the movement going in the Rebbe's absence. However, genuine as opposed to manufactured charisma cannot be conjured by an act of will to buttress a project of self-reinvention. As Clifford Geertz notes with dismay in an essay titled, ''Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power,'' in our day, a politician or a rock star may be called charismatic, ''mainly on the grounds that he has contrived to interest a certain number of people in the glitter of his personality.''[26] But it is precisely a quality of the numinous, not contrivance or self-presentation, that so many discerning people found in Schneerson and that served to propel his influence. Jonathan Sacks is at pains to point out that what one felt in the presence of Soloveitchik and Schneersohn was not a simulacrum of ''charisma''; rather one sensed ''a kind of humility. In their presence you could feel the divine presence.'' ''Both conveyed the gravitas and depth of the Jewish soul.''

Shmuel N. Eisenstadt writes in his introduction to Weber's *On Charisma and Institution Building* that charismatic fervor ''is rooted in the attempt to come into contact with the very essence of being, to go to the very roots of existence, of cosmic, social, and cultural order, to what is seen as sacred and fundamental.''[27] Eisenstadt quotes at length from Edward A. Shils, who notes that charisma depends on being

perceived as being closely connected to some central feature of the cosmos and its power. Shils remarks that charisma may be attained through "reflective wisdom," and that even those who do not possess it nevertheless may appreciate it and feel the need for proximity to those who more fully inhabit the cosmic center, since "their own weaker responsiveness is fortified and heightened" thereby.[28]

For Rabbinic Judaism in general and Habad Hasidism in particular, the cosmic center and source of power is knowledge of Torah in all its aspects. Drawing on Eisenstadt's work, the Israeli sociologist Aryei Fishman notes the charismatic power of Torah in Jewish religious life, and observes that Torah can be "the source of order and authority when a religious order breaks down,"[29] that is, when conventional religiosity proves inadequate for a new situation. Thus, "religious consciousness—the consciousness that perceives itself as knowing the will of God—can view Torah as charisma either innovatively or conservatively."[30] And as Shaul Stampfer writes, "The very possession of talmudic knowledge gave the scholar charisma and this was irrespective of more conventional sources of charisma, such as appearance, bearing, or personality."[31] Stampfer observes that this "charisma of knowledge" is enhanced by wide exposure to challenging classical texts, since it is firsthand knowledge of the difficulties that increases the prestige of those few who excel.[32]

Schneerson's charisma was grounded in his commanding knowledge of the rabbinic canon, including Talmud, Midrash, Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, as well as Zohar and the voluminous theoretical treatises of Habad Hasidism; all of this in on display in the thirty-nine collected volumes of *Sichos*, extended expositions on exoteric themes, as well as the more esoteric *Ma'amarim*, which take up and develop aspects of the abstract and enigmatically paradoxical Habad theology.[33]

Stampfer has pointed out that, "[i]n east European Jewish society it was possible, though not common, for a scholar to study in isolation until he was ready to make his mark on the scholarly world."[34] Stampfer cites the case of Naftali Tsevi Berlin (1817–93), who "transformed himself into a major scholar known particularly for the broad scope of his knowledge," as a result of a lengthy period of sequestration in private study. Another example, not mentioned by Stampfer, is Avraham Yesha'ayahu Karelitz, known as the "Hazon Ish" (1878–1953). The excellent biography of Karelitz by Benjamin Brown points out that the young Karelitz studied essentially by himself and was almost completely unknown before his immigration to the Land of Israel at the age of fifty five.[35] Heilman and Friedman entirely miss the context, the much broader phenomenon of young prodigies from prominent rabbinic families in Eastern Europe going to Berlin and

working to integrate Western learning with their own heritage. Hillel Goldberg's *Between Berlin and Slobodka*[36] follows the transitions made by Isaac Hutner, Joseph B. Soloveitchik, and Abraham Joshua Heschel, among others. Soloveitchik had studied Rabbinics privately with his father for twelve years, learning the characteristic conceptual approach to Talmud study of his grandfather, Rabbi Hayyim Soloveitchik. Goldberg points out that "[p]rior to university, then, Joseph Baer Soloveitchik never went to school."

More recently, we have the biography of Heschel by Edward Kaplan and Samuel Dresner,[37] which amply demonstrates that a young scion from a great Hasidic family can be profoundly attracted to Western learning and culture while maintaining an intense and abiding commitment to Hasidism. As Kaplan writes in a summary statement of powerful concision, Heschel was a "university-educated East European Jew inspired by God."[38] For all the differences between Heschel and Schneerson, precisely the same statement should be made about Schneerson; and one wishes that Heilman and Friedman had done so.

During the Berlin and Paris years Schneerson indeed kept himself in seclusion, but this isolation permitted intense inner work. To be sure, there are dangers when religious formation takes place without much peer contact, but the examples of Soloveitchik, Karelitz, and Heschel, among others, demonstrate that some extraordinary religious personalities are able to flourish and reach full stature outside the conformity and regimentation of the yeshiva world. As Brown makes clear in his study of Karelitz, the long period of self-sequestration and focused study was fueled not only by prodigious intellect, depth of spirit, and infinite capacity for conceptual labor but also by a clarity of purpose and sharply defined sense of self that sustained and refreshed a horizon of aspiration for decades. In the secular world, one can think of the analogy of famous technology visionaries who quit college to work in a garage, eventually emerging with creative concepts and products that transformed the world. Rather than seeing Schneerson's relative isolation as indifference to Hasidic culture, it was more likely a decision to develop away from the distractions and conformity of the Hasidic community itself. The Schneersons saw themselves as nobility, indeed, the spiritual aristocracy of the Jewish world. As with most aristocracies, there is not only noblesse oblige and communal concern but also patrician reserve and a carefully calibrated distance. At a point in their lives when they were not ready to take on a more public role, the young couple may have chosen to live away from the main Jewish area precisely to ensure that they would not be pestered by overly enthusiastic, curious Hasidim.

The rules are indeed different for royalty, and most commoners have no problem with that fact. The average Hasid living in poverty did not resent the holidays in Marienbad their rebbes took with their families and entourage; on the contrary, they found self-esteem in the royal treatment their master received and took vicarious pleasure in the trips. As David Assaf notes in his study of Rabbi Israel of Ruzhin, Ruzhin Hasidim took pride in their rebbe's regal lifestyle, which, it was said, he adopted for reasons of state and in which he took no personal pleasure; as Assaf puts it, "his conventions of nobility and kingliness were accepted by his hasidim and viewed with affection."[39]

Heilman and Friedman occasionally mention reports of Schneerson's grasp of Habad teachings but these remain vague and muffled, and the authors never adequately address Schneerson's rabbinic mastery. The silence on the key matter of scholarship skews their entire effort. In the fall of 1964, Schneerson began a multiyear series of discourses, known as *sichos*, explicating Rashi's commentary on Torah, developing and applying a consistent set of rules and interpretive practices. The Rashi *sichos*, which number in the hundreds, constitute an impressive analytical corpus on the great medieval commentator. The *sichos* trace Rashi's sources in Talmud and Midrash, noting how Rashi shapes and molds his materials for his purposes. They draw upon the rich library of Rashi supercommentaries and arrive at original conclusions regarding Rashi's meaning and intent. Each Rashi *sichah* is a tour de force of learned exposition. To be sure, Schneerson's exegetical principles would be unlikely to find acceptance in the academy. For example, he posited that Rashi's words always convey meaning accessible to a five-year-old child and at the same time encode a deep esoteric layer.[40] Yet in their richness, scope, sustained creativity, and vigor, they are a remarkable body of work. And—unusual for these circles—Rabbi Schneerson consulted and deployed variant readings based on manuscripts available to him.[41]

The rabbi's sustained focus on Rashi would have provided fertile grounds for analysis had Heilman and Friedman taken note of it. For, as Avraham Grossman observed in his seminal study of Rashi, key elements of Rashi's worldview included the uniqueness of the Jewish people, a special loving regard for the sanctity of the Land of Israel, and poignant messianic longing.[42] Precisely these elements figure prominently in Schneerson's own thinking. Had they been attentive to Schneerson's scholarly output, they might have traced the antecedents of his characteristic ideas in illuminating ways.

The authors would have done well to spend time with Kaplan's excellent study of Heschel, which evokes the atmosphere of spiritual nobility in Hasidic aristocratic families, with homes centered on religious aspiration and spiritual quest. In such homes, every religious act

was to be performed with mindfulness and a sublime aesthetic, making a personal statement of sacredness and reverence that reflected the family's religious signature.

In Schneerson's case, a strong indication of this culture is to be found in the *Reshimos*, notebooks from the 1920s and 1930s. Heilman and Friedman do mention the notebooks but do not fully grasp their significance. Not diaries, the *Reshimos* actually reflect the inner practices of the Chabad elite and young Schneerson's faithful recording of everything he saw and heard of these practices, largely from his father-in-law, signaling his induction into the Chabad leadership circle. As a Schneerson, part of the extended cousinage comprising the descendents of the founders, he was already eligible to join, but now he received transmission of practices that were not well known or deliberately kept from public view, making him a true member of Chabad's spiritual elite. And his faithful and lovingly meticulous recording of the practices, vignettes, and stories, reflects his desire to internalize that elite status, to inhabit it from within. The possibility that the young scion of the Schneerson lineage may have had a rich interior spiritual life even while pursuing his engineering degree, and that his leadership abilities may have grown from the seedbed of that life, is not considered by our authors.

Rabbi Schneerson's detractors have taken to calling him a ''failed messiah.'' This recalls something Alex Ross wrote about Leonard Bernstein. In his acclaimed survey of twentieth-century music *The Rest is Noise*, Ross notes that some critics claim that Bernstein ''frittered away his gift amid glitzy conducting dates, media appearances, and 'radical chic' parties at his apartment in Manhattan.'' To this Ross responds, ''Yet Bernstein's failures outweighed many others' successes.''[43] Mutatis mutandis, Schneerson's failure, if such it is, outshines the paltry success of so many other erstwhile Jewish leaders.

This book is helpful as an account of the transformation of Chabad from inner-directed to outer-facing, from a lineage that prized lengthy contemplative prayer to one that celebrates bold feats of outreach. But the biography of Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, when it is written, must not omit his command of the entire textual corpus of Rabbinic Judaism; his mastery and creative deployment of the paradoxical, intricate, and labyrinthine Chabad theological system; administrative proficiency that apparently included near-total recall of names, faces, and relevant facts; manifest spiritual intensity and boundless energy, displayed in the orchestration of collective rites of numinous transmission; the ability to listen deeply, counsel wisely, bring out the best in interlocutors, outsiders as well as devotees; and passionate concern for the destiny of the Jewish people as he understood it.

Some might take this as a retrograde lapse into hagiography. Quite the opposite: as Orwell suggested, one's analytical tools must be adequate to the subject at hand. With an individual like Menachem Mendel Schneerson, a pinched and blinkered approach simply will not work, not even as social history. What is most important must not be left off the table. The biographer must not confuse inspirational leadership with careerism. A hermeneutic of suspicion is called for, but one must know of what to be suspicious. For Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, crass ambition and intellectual shallowness are not on the list. Only a robust portrait that takes seriously the imaginative reach of a great thinker can capture both the possibilities and perils of religious leadership. It is not blind piety but the discipline of sociology that requires a serious engagement with religious intensity and its numinous origins.

BOSTON HEBREW COLLEGE

doi:10.1093/mj/kjt019
Advance Access publication December 23, 2013

NOTES

1. George Orwell, ''Reflections on Gandhi,'' in *A Collection of Essays by George Orwell* (Garden City, NY, 1954), p. 177.
2. Samuel Heilman and Menachem Friedman, *The Rebbe: The Life and Afterlife of Menachem Mendel Schneerson* (Princeton, 2010), p. 71
3. Ibid., p. 109.
4. Ibid., p. 120.
5. Ibid., p. 114.
6. Ibid., p. 149.
7. Ibid., p. 149.
8. Ibid., p. 147.
9. Ibid., p. 137
10. Ibid., p. 95.
11. Ibid., p. 128.
12. Ibid., p. 148.
13. Elie Wiesel, *All Rivers Run to the Sea: Memoirs* (New York, 1995), pp. 402–4.
14. Elie Wiesel, *Against Silence: The Voice and Vision of Elie Wiesel,* vol. 3, selected and edited by Irving Abrahamson (New York, 1985), p. 63.
15. Israel Meir Lau, *Out of the Depths*: *The Story of a Child of Buchenwald Who Returned Home at Last,* translated from the Hebrew by Jessica Setbon and Shira Liebowitz Schmidt (New York, 2011), pp. 193–204.
16. Ibid., p. 194.
17. Ibid, p. 201.
18. Ibid, pp. 201–2.
19. Ibid, p. 202.

20. Jonathan Sacks, *The Great Partnership: Science, Religion, and the Search for Meaning* (New York, 2011), pp. 90–91.

21. Moshe Idel, *Old Worlds, New Mirrors: On Jewish Mysticism and Twentieth-Century Thought* (Philadelphia, 2010), p. 217. Idel, using a variant spelling, speaks of "R. Menahem Mendel Shneorsohn, the last rabbi of Lubavitch." Idel's study gives special prominence to Heschel.

22. Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Judaism: A History* (New Haven, 2005), p. 299.

23. Heilman and Friedman, pp. 102, 109. The index entry under "beards" is divided into subcategories, and boasts a total of nine mentions. This actually understates the tally, as some pages refer to beards more than once. In addition, the index entry should be augmented by a further occurrence on p. 87.

24. Heilman and Friedman, p. 64.

25. Ibid., p. 274.

26. Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (Basic Books, 1983), p. 122.

27. Max Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*, (ed.) Shmuel N. Eisenstadt (Chicago, 1968), p. xix.

28. Edward A. Shils, "Charisma, Order and Status," *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 30 (1965), pp. 199–213; cited from S. N. Eisenstadt, "Introduction," pp. xxv–xxvi.

29. Aryei Fishman, *Judaism and Modernization on the Religious Kibbutz* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 13.

30. Ibid., p. 14.

31. Shaul Stampfer, *Families, Rabbis and Education: Traditional Jewish Society in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 163–64.

32. Ibid.

33. The English reader may gain some idea of the profundity of the *Ma'amarim* from Elliot R. Wolfson's *Open Secret: Postmessianic Messianism and the Mystical Revision of Menahem Mendel Schneerson* (New York, 2009). This important work deserves its own treatment, and here it must suffice to say that it displays the reach and depth of two great intellects.

34. Stampfer, *Families, Rabbis and Education,* p. 240.

35. Benjamin Brown, *The Hazon Ish: Halakhist, Believer and Leader of the* Haredi *Revolution* (Jerusalem, 2011), p. iii. For an extended discussion, see pp. 19–61.

36. Hillel Goldberg, *Between Berlin and Slobodka: Jewish Transition Figures from Eastern Europe* (Hoboken, NJ, 1989).

37. Edward K. Kaplan and Samuel H. Dresner, *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Prophetic Witness* (New Haven, 1998).

38. Ibid., p. viii.

39. David Assaf, *The Regal Way: The Life and Times of Rabbi Israel of Ruzhin*, trans. David Louvish (Stanford, 2002), p. 241.

40. See Tuvia Blau, *Kelalei Rashi* (Brooklyn and Kfar Habad, 5740 [1980]), esp. pp. 88–91.

41. See Shmuel J. Weinfeld, *Commentary Shai la-Mora on Rashi* (Jerusalem, 5763 [2003]), pp. 869–70. Weinfeld states that Rabbi Schneerson showed him photocopies of ten old Rashi manuscripts and encouraged him to obtain and use them.

42. Avraham Grossman, *Rashi* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 165–207.

43. Alex Ross, *The Rest Is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York, 2007), p. 407.