

Rabbi Dr. Norman Lamm

TORAH
תורה ומדע
UMADDA

THE ENCOUNTER OF RELIGIOUS
LEARNING AND WORLDLY KNOWLEDGE
IN THE JEWISH TRADITION

Maggid Books

Contents

<i>Preface to the Third Edition</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Chapter one: An Introduction to the Encounter</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Chapter two: Historical Precursors</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Chapter three: Opposition to Torah Umadda in Recent History</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Chapter four: The Rationalist Model: Moses Maimonides and Paradise</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Chapter five: The Cultural Model: Samson Raphael Hirsch and "Torah Im Derekh Eretz"</i>	<i>95</i>
<i>Chapter six: The Mystical Model: Abraham Isaac Hakohen Kook on the Sacred and the Profane</i>	<i>109</i>
<i>Chapter seven: Sources for New Versions of Torah Umadda</i>	<i>119</i>
<i>Chapter eight: The Instrumentalist Model: Perfumers, Cooks, and Bakers</i>	<i>131</i>
<i>Chapter nine: The Inclusionary Model: Madda as Textless Torah</i>	<i>137</i>

Chapter ten: The Hasidic Model: Madda as Worship 143
Chapter eleven: The Hasidic Model Compared 155
Chapter twelve: Educational Implications 169
Chapter thirteen: Torah Umadda and Religious Growth 179
Chapter fourteen: A Pluralistic Torah Community 191
Afterword: Torah Umadda: The Unwritten Chapter 203

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Is Torah Umadda Meant for Everyone? 223
Appendix II: Communal Reactions to Torah Umadda 225
Appendix III: Academic Talmud and Torah Umadda 227
Appendix IV: Letter to an Anonymous Scientist 233
Index 235
About the Author 247

Chapter one

An Introduction to the Encounter

The secularized reader, heir to the agnosticism that characterizes most of the intellectual life of the West and skeptical of all certitudes, especially theological ones, may well be amused at this effort to formulate (or reformulate) one aspect of the encounter between an ancient faith and the basic assumptions of contemporary Western culture. An accommodation between Faith and Reason (or Religion and Science) in the last decade of the twentieth century? Hasn't that problem been solved a hundred, two hundred years ago? And is not the attempt to resurrect the issue at this late date indicative of a rather soft-headed atavism?

Such a not-unexpected reaction reveals quite another set of unspoken certitudes buttressed by its own brand of triumphalism. It ignores the persistence of man's metaphysical yearning which, though dormant for generations, wakes up at irregular intervals to stake its claim on man's intellectual curiosity as well as arousing in him a spiritual thirst and a quest for transcendent meaning. To neglect this dimension is to

risk a warped vision of man's inner life and a cramped understanding of culture.

Religion exists, it persists, and the questions it asks and the answers it offers will not go away. To dismiss it as a fear reaction to the uncertainties of this complex and scary age, or to brand all religion as "fundamentalism" and hence unworthy of serious consideration save in self-defense, or to view it as legitimate only as long as it identifies with one's own social or political agenda – all of this is the kind of simplistic reductionism that one properly ought not to expect of a sophisticated, educated, and fair-minded person; and that, were such sentiments in mirror image uttered by religious folk, would rightly be condemned as parochial, narrow, and Neanderthal.

Religiously committed individuals who participate in our contemporary society and culture are beset by a conflict of values and perceptions that is of the greatest personal consequence. The encounter of the two worlds within religious individuals and communities often leaves deep scars on the psyche of the individuals and the ethos of the community. But it also holds the promise of fascinating creativity, of new syntheses, of renewed efforts to grasp elusive insights.

The tension between the sacred and the secular is a perennial one. As long as men and women keep open minds (admittedly not a universal condition) and recognize that both these realms embody truths that may be ignored only at the peril of injuring one's intellectual integrity, this subject will be of deep concern – to some as an anxious existential question, to others as a challenging theoretical problem. It is not a contest from which one side will emerge victorious and the other turn heel and flee in ignominious defeat. This most vexing, complicated, and axiologically significant issue cannot be reduced to such a simple, partisan, adversarial confrontation on the level of a children's game. The history of the last two or three thousand years should reinforce our conviction that we are dealing with an issue so perplexing, so central to human destiny and to our understanding of our place in the world, that we must shun simplistic solutions. The two worlds – of faith and inquiry, of religion and science, of trust and reason are destined (not doomed!) to live together, now close and now far, now attracting and now repelling, like twin stars revolving about each other in some distant corner of the galaxy.

Judaism, the world's oldest monotheistic religion, began as an act of revolt against its contemporary civilization. Abraham was the great iconoclast as well as the first Jew. He was called "Hebrew," the Sages of the Talmud declared, not only because of his ethnic origin as a descendant of Eber, but also because the term implies "side" or "over-against": Abraham was on one side and all the world on the other. Yet his opposition to the pagan Chaldean culture was one of engagement, not of indifference or seclusion. He did not ignore the heathen world, nor was he unconcerned with the idol-worshippers of his time. He was involved with them, taught them, was reprimanded by them, fought them, formed alliances with them, helped them.

This confrontation by the "knight of faith," as Kierkegaard called him, with his pagan environment, was but the first such encounter between Judaism and worldly culture. In different forms, this contest – or dialogue, depending upon the nature of the relationship and upon one's point of view – arose in Islam and Christianity as well.

In Christianity, the encounter was most often expressed as that between "Athens and Jerusalem." This term was coined by Tertullian (ca. 160–220) in referring to the struggle between Hellenism, representing classical civilization, and Hebraism, referring to Christianity, which considered itself the rightful heir of Judaism. The words "Athens" and "Jerusalem" eventually became paradigms for the development of culture in the Western world. Thus, closer to our own time, this pair of concepts became crucially important for Matthew Arnold in his analysis of contemporary humanism and Christianity in the nineteenth century; Arnold considered them to have an inverse relationship with each other, and he attempted but failed to produce a synthesis between them.¹

Heinrich Heine too universalized this antithesis, declaring that all men are either Jews or Greeks. The broad use of this neat pair of categories proved attractive to many a writer.² Indeed, this bifurcation into "Hebrew and Hellene" was fairly common, especially among Jewish writers upon their entrance into European life at the close of the eighteenth century. This was true of people like the early Zionist Moses Hess and the Hebrew poet Tchernichowsky as well as Heine. Hebrews or Jews were considered to be ascetics who questioned life, whereas Greeks were those who loved life realistically. Jewish covenantal assurances are

opposed to Greek speculations. The Jews represent unity, the Greeks multiplicity. The Greeks think of life as eternal *being*, the Hebrews as eternal *becoming*. The Greeks relate to space, the Jews to time. In the words of Moses Hess, “The task of all cultural history is to effect a reconciliation between these opposing principles.”³ Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of Western civilization is this dialectical tension between biblical religion and autonomous reason.

However, great caution must be exercised not to overstate the value of such dichotomy and not to oversimplify the collision between Judaism and Hellenism by elucidating from it two universal principles. The tendency to do this is a weakness of intellectuals, a delightful methodological toy of academicians. Toys can be played with, and often have educational value, but should never be substituted for reality. Tertullian himself denied the possibility of any meaningful dialogue between Athens and Jerusalem (“Jerusalem” was for him, of course, a symbol of Christian faith): “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What agreement is there between the Academy and the Church?” For this Latin Church Father, the gulf between them was unbridgeable. This assertion is of one piece with his famous statement *credo quia absurdum est*, that he believed *because* it is absurd. Such antirationalism never found a warm and hospitable reception among classical Jewish thinkers. They may have been, as most were, antirationalist, but not antirational. Skepticism of the value of reason is not the same as raising the denial of reason to the status of a virtue. Thus, the rigid separation between the two cannot be used, in Judaism, to justify a chasm between religion and the rest of the world, or, indeed, between religious knowledge and all worldly knowledge.

Judaism has, throughout its millennial history, confronted a variety of civilizations, each with its own values and perspectives. It has fought and rejected some completely, and learned from and taught others as a result of a fruitful and usually unselfconscious dialogue with them.

Often, numbers of Jews, overwhelmed by the majority culture and unwilling or unable to remain confidently independent as a cognitive and religious minority, have assimilated into the host culture; they and their descendants have been lost forever to Jewish posterity. This painful phenomenon has occurred from biblical times onward. Never, however, has that confrontation been as long, as intense, as complicated,

and as fateful as the present one – Judaism as it faces Western civilization and the entire complex of modernity.

This volume addresses one aspect of that encounter, insofar as it can be isolated from the whole matrix of relationships, and that is the intellectual-educational aspect. While there are various formulations of this encounter – the contemporary Jewish equivalent of “Athens and Jerusalem” might be “Yeshiva and University” – the one we shall use is that of Torah and *Madda*: Jewish learning and the worldly wisdom of our culture. Hence, *Torah Umadda* denotes the synergistic interrelation of religious study and secular or profane knowledge. The belief implied in this locution is that the interaction between the two yields constructive results. Definitions of some key terms now follow.

TORAH

“Torah,” which etymologically means “teaching” or “doctrine,” usually embraces a number of related things. Often it refers to the canonical text of the Pentateuch, the Five Books of Moses. Sometimes it includes the rest of Scripture as well; that is, the books of the Prophets and the Writings. We shall be using the term primarily in its most inclusive sense, namely, the entire corpus of the Jewish religious tradition, consisting of both the Written Law (Scripture) and the Oral Law (i.e., the oral tradition) coextensive with Scripture, which was subsequently reduced to writing as the *Talmud* and its vast literature.

There are two Talmuds (or *Talmudim*), the Jerusalem (or Palestinian) and the much more voluminous and authoritative Babylonian Talmud. Each Talmud consists of the same core, the *Mishnah* – the interpretations and legislations of the teachers known as the *Tannaim*, redacted toward the end of the second century of the Common Era. The two Talmudim differ in the *Gemara*, the vast commentary and supplement to the Mishnah, as developed in the academies (or *yeshivot*) of the Amoraim, successors to the Tannaim. The Gemara was redacted some 300 years later. These three terms – *Talmud*, *Mishnah*, *Gemara* – are synonymous; each means “study” or “learning.”

Talmud Torah, the study of Torah, has always held a place of the highest prominence in Judaism. A teaching of the Mishnah that has become part of the daily morning service, recited by praying Jews for

centuries, informs us of the high esteem in which the study of Torah by all Jews is held. After enumerating those virtuous deeds “of which man enjoys the fruits in this world while the stock remains for him in the world-to-come,” a list that includes honoring parents, acts of charity, prayer, hospitality, tending to the sick, and the like, the Mishnah concludes: “but the study of Torah is equal to them all [combined].”⁴ The Jew who studies Torah is considered to be engaging in *imitatio Dei*, for “the Holy One, blessed be He, the King of kings...studies Torah one quarter of the day.”⁵

So deeply ingrained is the study of Torah in Jewish religious consciousness that, in happy disregard of chronological order, the tradition has Abraham observing all the *mitzvot* (commandments, plural of *mitzvah*), even those legislated by the postbiblical Sages.

Effects of Torah study are vast. The Sages – the authors of the Talmud – held that the study of Torah raises the ordinary Israelite to the level of the priesthood. It elevates him to the order of freedom. It enhances brotherliness and is a source of consolation. The reward for the assiduous student of Torah will be the opportunity to continue “learning” Torah for all eternity!⁶

Torah may be studied individually or in small groups of two or three. The Jewish tradition encourages study in such small groups. The teacher-student relationship is most highly prized; the title for Moses is *Rabbenu*, “our teacher.” (*Rabbi* means “my master” or “my teacher.”)

The *yeshiva* (plural: *yeshivot*) is the oldest institution of higher learning in Judaism. As such, it may well be the oldest form of higher education in the world; universities began to coalesce into formal schools only in the late Middle Ages. The word *yeshiva* means “seat,” perhaps the chair from which the master, the head of the school (the *Rosh Yeshiva*), holds his lectures and directs the discussions. Another opinion derives the name from the fact that the disciples sat at the feet of their master.

The earliest *yeshivot* we know of flourished in both Palestine and Babylonia in the century before the Common Era. So inseparable is the idea of higher formal education from the fabric of Judaism that Jewish legend maintained that, in earliest biblical days, Abraham sent Isaac to study in the *Yeshiva* of Shem and Eber – thus locating the origin of the *yeshiva* within eleven generations of the creation of man!

It was the task of the master not only to give the lecture, which consisted of the *perush*, or explanation of the text “on the page”; but also to give *hiddushim* (“new comments”) – that is, to formulate new insights and offer original explanations. Those who attended the yeshiva were called *talmidei hakhamim*, “disciples of the Sages.”

The yeshiva is thus an educational institution that is well over 2,000 years old. It has shown phenomenal resilience, especially in its astounding renaissance after the Holocaust both in Israel and in the Diaspora, especially in the United States.

“Torah” consists of various canons, volumes, legal collections, or literary works, and comes in a variety of genres, often intertwined in the same text. The two main genres or branches of Torah are *Halakhah*, Jewish law, and *Agadah*, all the nonlegal material in the sacred literature, from legends to ethics to didactic parables to biblical exegesis to theology and mysticism. Halakhah is normative and, because of its broad influence on all forms of practical behavior, has always been accorded the position of preeminence. Agadah is the poetry to Halakhah’s prose; it captures the heart and fires the imagination of the student, and holds up for him the highest and most sacred ideals, often unattainable by average mortals. But it is the Halakhah that governs his daily activities in all areas of life, from the most critical to the most minute, and indirectly encapsulates the sublime insights and principles of the Agadah.⁷

HALAKHAH

The Hebrew root *H-L-KH*, “go” or “walk,” is both etymologically and substantively the source of *Halakhah*, the Jewish “way” or, as it is usually translated, “Jewish law.” The discipline of Halakhah is rooted in the effort to “walk before” the Almighty, as in the divine command to Abraham, “Go [or: walk] before Me and be whole” (Genesis 17:1), to live a life sanctified by carrying out the divine will. By its commitment to Halakhah, Israel achieves its mission of becoming a “holy people” (Exodus 19:6), and individual Jews thus live in consonance with the divinely revealed Law. And the highest activity in the halakhic life is learning – *Talmud Torah*, the study of Torah (especially Halakhah) itself. The primacy of Talmud Torah, as mentioned, is a most salient characteristic of the

Halakhah. Its emphasis, especially on the study of Halakhah, is evident throughout the Talmud and its literature.

However, an exclusive emphasis on Halakhah risks ignoring an important principle: that *Halakhah is minimal Judaism*, and not its totality; it does not exhaust the content of Torah. Halakhah is the necessary but not sufficient condition of Torah existence. It points beyond itself to higher achievements and greater challenges: to extending one's self beyond the Law; to supererogatory piety (*lifnim mi-shurat ha-din*), which implies social-communal and ethical as well as ritual punctiliousness;⁸ to the refinement of one's character both socially and spiritually; to the universal transformation of mankind at the Messianic End of Days; to the flight of the soul in the ethereal realms of Agadah and the stringent demands the latter makes upon us spiritually, morally, and psychologically, demands no less heroic than the practical and intellectual demands made upon us by the Halakhah. (The great poet of the nineteenth-century East European Jewish Enlightenment, Hayyim Nachman Bialik, missed this point in a famous introduction to his work on the Agadah. He considered Halakhah harsh and demanding in its discipline, and Agadah compassionate and forgiving; Halakhah had an angry visage, Agadah a smiling mien. But this is an error. As Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik pointed out in a lecture many years ago, it is Halakhah that, in setting the minimal criteria for conduct, avoids superhuman demands on Jews, whereas Agadah often ignores the all-too-human limitations of the majority and challenges the Jew to transcend his conventional social and psychological constraints and moral limitedness.)

Thus, Halakhah retains, as it must, its axiological primacy. Halakhah must take the lead, and its judgments must always be sought and respected and obeyed. But primacy is not exclusivity. Beyond the Halakhah lies all the rest of God's creation, and that too must be considered in the religious perspective of the believing Jew. Judaism is capacious enough to include all the world in its comprehensive purview, including religiously neutral knowledge and learning.

MADDA

We refer in these pages to such worldly wisdom as *Madda*, which in its plain sense means knowledge, and the effort to integrate it with Torah

as *Torah Umadda*. In the last century, in Germany, the preferred term was *Derekh Eretz* (literally, the way of the world). There is justification for use of the term *Madda* in the sources; Maimonides, the illustrious twelfth-century Talmudist, philosopher, and physician, named the first of the fourteen volumes that constitute the immortal *Mishneh Torah*, his halakhic code, the *Sefer ha-Madda*, the “Book of *Madda*.” Perhaps most accurate would be *hokhmah*, Wisdom, the term often employed in the sources. For instance, in the introduction to the Midrash on Lamentations we are told that whereas the non-Jews do not possess Torah, they do possess *hokhmah*, Wisdom – indicating the universality of such learning. The Talmud legislated a special blessing upon encountering a gentile scholar: “Blessed art Thou O Lord ... who has given of His wisdom to flesh and blood.” And Maimonides is fairly consistent, in his *Mishneh Torah*, in referring to such learning as *hokhmah*. The expression “Torah and Wisdom” may therefore be used as an alternative to “Torah Umadda.”⁹

Nevertheless, the term *Madda* does have warrant in Maimonides, as mentioned, and it has gained wide currency. It is engraved as the motto of Yeshiva University, “Torah Umadda,” and was introduced at Yeshiva by its first president, Dr. Bernard Revel. The term “Torah Umadda” was used by the eminent Rabbi David Zvi Hoffmann, successor to Rabbi Azriel Hildesheimer as head of the Rabbinical Seminary in Berlin, as the title of an article he published in *Jeschurun* in 1920. In Lithuania, the Yavneh group, which is discussed in Chapter 2, founded a school in 1928 that it named “The Universal School of Torah Umadda.” Dr. Revel preceded them both, however. In a collection called *The Alperstein Letters*, recently acquired by the Yeshiva University Archives, we find a letter by Dr. Revel to Rabbi A. Alperstein. His salutation refers to his correspondent as a man “rich in both Torah and *Madda*” and describes some of his hopes and plans and anxieties as he takes on the responsibility of heading the yeshiva. He sees his role as *mashgiah al limmudei ha-Torah ve’ha-Madda*, “supervisor of Torah and *Madda* studies.” The letter was written in the summer of 1915. *Madda*, therefore, understood as “wisdom” in the sense noted above, is the name we shall be using, both by itself and in conjunction with the study of sacred literature, as Torah Umadda.

Torah Umadda is thus an effort, not at all unprecedented in the

history of normative Judaism, to expand the area of religious interest to include all of creation, and to bring all of humanity's cultural creativity and cognitive achievements within the perimeters of Torah. The intersections of Torah and Madda are not always clear; indeed, they are more often than not elusive and indeterminate.

The culture or specific Madda that the overwhelming majority of Jews in the contemporary world face today – indeed, in which so many of them participate not only as consumers but also as producers – is that of modernity.

The salient elements of modernity, which has so profoundly shaped the scientific-technological megalopolis in which most Jews of the world live today, include the following things: the substitution of experience for tradition as the touchstone of its world view; a rejection of authority – at the very least a skepticism toward it, at worst a revolution against it; a radical individualism that draws upon the sources of both the Protestant faith and, in its more extreme manifestations, the French Revolution (specifically, the notion that people can and ought to recreate their society by destroying it first), and thus a preoccupation with the self; a repudiation of the past and an orientation to the future, and thus a fascination with the new (what Jacques Maritain has felicitously called “chronolatry”); and secularism, not as a denial of religion as much as an insistence upon its privatization, drawing largely upon the Kantian distinction between private and public morality, with moral issues relegated to the private realm and unenforceable in the public arena; and a rejection of particularisms of all sorts and an affirmation of universalism, the dream of the Enlightenment.

Of course this does not exhaust the list, and – equally self-evident – not all of the elements have to be present to qualify a point of view as modern. Indeed, some of these elements can be extrapolated to lead fairly rapidly to mutual inconsistency. Besides, there are currents and countercurrents, some of which we are experiencing at the time of this writing.

Thus, for instance, the decade of the '70s was highly hedonistic, with its much touted sexual revolution, experimentalism with dress and morality (especially its legitimization of homosexuality as an acceptable “alternative life-style”), general permissiveness, easygoing attitude toward

drugs and pornography, open life-style, apotheosis of the self (evidenced by the emphasis on self-gratification, self-expression, and self-realization), youth culture, feminism (in its more extreme manifestations), and so on.

Yet the '80s have seen a reaction set in against some of the excesses of the modernism of the '70s, leading a prominent sociologist to dub it "the revolt against modernity."¹⁰ Hence there has developed a new social conservatism, with its attack on permissiveness and cultural modernism, its attempt to restore traditional values (however one defines them), Pope John Paul II's conservatism within the Catholic Church, the Moral Majority and the "New Right," the social-political agenda of the Reagan and Bush administrations, the counterattack by political philosophers against the assertion that rights are anterior to the good, and so on.

Yet, despite these forays on the fringes of modernity, the basic characteristics of modernity have survived, all premature reports as to its demise and succession by "postmodernity" notwithstanding.

This, then, is the culture of modernity, in its broadest outlines, with which believing Jews must contend. That it presents a problem of overwhelming proportions cannot be denied. But the social, communal, and general cultural challenge of modernity is not our central concern here. Rather, we shall focus on the intellectual and educational dimensions of the encounter. This is the *Madda* aspect with which Torah Umadda must deal. Hence, the question of the *study* of the literature and sources of the modern experience, rather than the experience itself, is what occupies us; and, in this sense, the Torah Umadda problem of our period in history is a continuation of the problem first formulated in Alexandria (see, on this, the beginning of the next chapter) and perhaps even earlier.

However, before leaving the topic of modernism, the reader deserves to know the general approach of the writer to the fundamental cultural questions which, as stated, we do not entertain here in any great detail. This point of view is informed by a number of premises, among them the following two, which are most relevant to the more restricted question of Torah Umadda.

First, religion is not just one of a large number of social phenomena or interpretations of existence and, particularly, human experience. It addresses the most fundamental issues in a most fundamental way

and demands the most fundamental and unconditional response or responses. In this sense, it denies the secularist thesis that religion is simply one more phenomenon that has no special claim on modern man's attention. Religion deals with truth – “the Lord your God is Truth”; “the Torah of truth was in his mouth”; “Moses is true and his Torah is true” – even if, in this post-Kantian period, one insists that this truth of religion has no cognitive value in the realm of the natural order.

Second, this response, and the comprehensive commitment that flows from it, does not imply that all the rest of existence is of no or only peripheral interest to the faithful Jew. His belief in the binding nature of Halakhah and the priority given to the study of Torah in his intellectual life does not exclude concern with all else. It is a failure of intelligence to confuse priority with exclusivity. To ignore all the rest of existence because of the commitment to Torah as the channel to the Holy One is to insult the Holy One and deny His infinity – as if He too has no interest in the rest of His creation. (Theologically, this can result in an eccentric dualism – a God who is theistic in relation to Israel and deistic in relation to all else!) Even in the most radical interpretation of the mystical origin of Torah, to which we attend in a later chapter, it is Torah that is an aspect of God, not the other way around. Ignoring the world is an insult to Torah as well: the Midrash (the literature of both agadic and halakhic interpretation of biblical verses) maintains, using agadic language, that God employed the Torah as a blueprint in creating the world, and that hence it is sacrilegious to remove the world from the purview of the interest of the Jew committed to Torah.

PURPOSE AND PLAN OF THE BOOK

This book is primarily, but not exclusively, intended for readers who are as troubled as is the writer by the vexing problems thrown up by the confrontation of Judaism and the Jewish tradition on one side, and, on the other, modernity and the secular civilization in which we live; specifically, by the teachings of Torah, the eternal resource of divine wisdom and guidance, as it collides with the ever-changing wisdom of the secular culture of our scientific, technological, cosmopolitan society. This dilemma is the contemporary version of the predicament experienced by the Judean exiles who, by the shores of Babylon, hung

up their harps and lamented, “How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a foreign land?” (Psalm 137:4).

I hope that those who are fully committed to Torah and yet unabashedly participate in contemporary culture on its highest levels, and who gladly accept the tensions engendered by the encounter between Torah and Wisdom, will find here – if not solutions – at least challenges for further thought, and maybe even a hint or two as to directions in “singing the Lord’s song” in a cultural landscape that appears foreign to the faith of Israel.

Those who stand outside the Jewish tradition, either because of the accident of birth or because they do not accept the theistic basis of Torah or the binding authority of Judaism as expressed in the Halakhah, may at least benefit from observing the difficult but happy struggles of those committed to both Torah and Mada; observing these struggles can be, for them, an exercise in cultural and religious anthropology. Such readers are welcome as interested spectators of this internal debate – or, better, search. An attempt has been made to clarify and define terms for the uninitiated reader so as to facilitate following the argument.

Those who locate themselves within the Jewish tradition but experience no dilemma because they ascribe no value to secular wisdom as such, who affirm “Torah Only” – it is with them whom, in a special chapter, the writer conducts this dialogue, as brothers in the halakhic fraternity who differ on their orientation to Mada. If he fails in this attempt at convincing them, or even in drawing them into genuine dialogue, perhaps at the very least they will learn to appreciate the religious authenticity and spiritual earnestness of those who are seized by this metaphysical tension and who seek, in one way or another, to integrate Mada into their vision of Torah.

We begin with a brief recapitulation of past efforts at developing an open attitude toward the encounter of Torah and the enviroing culture. This short impressionistic historical survey is then interrupted in order to present the views of those opposed to Torah Umada, emphasizing especially the ideas of the “Torah Only” school of thought, and to respond to their criticisms. We then turn to the Torah Umada concepts of Moses Maimonides, Samson Raphael Hirsch, and Abraham Isaac Hakohen Kook, and essay a critical evaluation of their contributions –

which we term the rationalist, cultural, and mystical models of Torah Umadda, respectively. Following that, we posit some basic premises and sketch in the ideational background of Jewish religious thought in the Eastern Europe of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with some assistance from more contemporary figures, in order to extrapolate to three newly formulated varieties of Torah Umadda. These yield for us the instrumentalist, inclusionary, and Hasidic models. We then adumbrate the consequences of these new formulations, follow this with some observations on the Torah Umadda impact on the personal aspiration for religious growth and spiritual wholeness, and conclude by addressing the ideological-political question of the coexistence of divergent conceptions of the role of Madda in the framework of Torah Judaism – the view of Judaism that continues undiminished the centrality of the commitment to Halakhah.

A final note: Although we offer historical material as background, presenting a number of illustrations drawn from Jewish history, we have made no attempt to be comprehensive. This is not a book on cultural or intellectual history. Our approach is more phenomenological than historical; indeed, this work is primarily one of advocacy of a definite point of view, and the analytic, historic, and philosophic materials are used mainly to support the thesis so advocated.

NOTES

1. See, for instance, David J. DeLaura, *Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian England: Newman, Arnold, and Pater* (Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1969).
2. Lionel Trilling, *Matthew Arnold* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 256.
3. Hans Kohn, "The Teachings of Moses Hess," in the *Menorah Journal*, 18:5, May 1930, p. 403.
4. *Pe'ah* 1:1, and see note 6.
5. *Avodah Zarah* 3b.
6. For references and further elaboration, see my *Torah Lishmah: Torah for Torah's Sake in the Works of Rabbi Hayyim of Volozhin and His Contemporaries* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1989), Chapter 3. Hereinafter, *Torah Lishmah* refers to this work and not to its Hebrew precursor of the same name, published in 1972 by Mosad Harav Kook in Jerusalem.
7. The relation of Halakhah and Agadah to each other is as complicated as it is significant. For further treatment of the theme here alluded to – the underlying identity of

- Halakhah and Agadah – see the Introduction to my *Halakhot ve'Halikhot* (Jerusalem: Yeshiva University Press and Mosad Harav Kook, 1990).
8. Compare Nahmanides' famous dictum about *naval bi'reshut ha-Torah*, “a scoundrel within the boundaries of Torah,” in his commentary to the Torah, Leviticus 19:2.
 9. The logo of Yeshiva University prior to the present one, which bears the words *Torah Umadda*, cited the verse from Isaiah 33:6 – “And the stability of thy times shall be a hoard of salvation – wisdom (*hokhmah*) and knowledge, and the fear of the Lord which is His treasure.”
 10. This is the title of an article by Daniel Bell in *The Public Interest*, 54:81 (Fall 1985), pp. 42–63.