

A later phase of hasidic legend, represented by the appointment of the Seer of Lublin, seems to be much less restrictive in that mystical inspiration can be presented in almost the same way as prophetic spirit; that is, it is mediated by a religious authority just as the holy spirit derives from divine selection. Finally, esoteric knowledge can be acquired through dynastic lineage. Especially in this last case, there is no need for hidden revelation.

The tale of Nahum of Chernobyl shows a clearly hasidic peculiarity: it reflects on his task of providing his followers with 'children, food, and wealth', and demonstrates the great power of the *tsadik* to establish contact with the divine.

Although provisional and brief, these observations may have shown the possible ways in which hagiographic legends express hasidic thought. The legends centre, of course, on the *tsadik*, who embodies mystical charisma and helps his followers out of their misery.

---

## One Event, Two Interpretations: The Fall of the Seer of Lublin in Hasidic Memory and Maskilic Satire

DAVID ASSAF

AT the turn of the nineteenth century one of the most revered figures among Polish and non-Polish hasidic leaders and their flock was the *tsadik* Rabbi Jacob Isaac Horowitz, better known as the Seer of Lublin (1745–1815). As his appellation implies, his renown lay largely in his unique spirituality, here documented by his disciple the *tsadik* and mystic Rabbi Isaac Judah Jehiel of Komarno (1806–74), in his description of his initial encounter with the Seer: 'I was privileged to visit Lublin with my late father when I was a boy of nine, and I saw his [the Seer's] face illumined like torches. And when he opened the door to recite *Kegavnah*,<sup>1</sup> I saw a flame playing round his head. I was there for the Passover holiday and I witnessed several matters of the highest spirituality . . . and his intensely wonderful prayer, a leaping flame.'<sup>2</sup>

Among the Seer's followers there were those who even went so far as to draw a sweeping analogy between Jerusalem and the Seer's court in Lublin, envisaged as a miniature Jerusalem and the Holy Temple of the Diaspora. For such a description we turn to the words of another disciple, the *tsadik* Uri of Strelisk (1757–1826): 'When one comes to Lublin one should imagine to oneself that Lublin is the land of Israel, that the courtyard of the *beit midrash* [house of study] is Jerusalem, that the *beit midrash* is the Temple Mount, that his apartment is the Porch, that the gallery is the Sanctuary, that his room is the Holy of Holies, and that the Shekhinah speaks from his throat. Then one will understand what our rabbi is.'<sup>3</sup>

Even in cases where hasidic leaders and their followers broke away from the Seer—as did Rabbi Jacob Isaac, the 'Holy Jew' of Przysucha (1766–1813)—the esteem of these leaders for the Seer as their teacher remained undiminished.

An extended version of this chapter appeared in Hebrew in D. Assaf, I. Bartal, I. Etkes, and E. Reiner (eds.), *Bema'agalei hasidim: kovets mehkarim lezikhro shel mordekhai vilenski* (Jerusalem, 1999), 161–208. I would like to thank Dena Ordan, the translator of this shorter version.

<sup>1</sup> This is an Aramaic text from the Zohar recited in the hasidic prayer rite on Friday nights.

<sup>2</sup> Y. Berger, *Eser kedushot* (Piotrków, 1906), 89, no. 22.

<sup>3</sup> M. M. Walden, *Niflaot harabi* (Warsaw, 1911), 87, no. 290.

Indeed, as most of the *tsadikim* of the following generation were either direct or indirect disciples of his, it is by no means an overstatement to name the Seer the 'father of Polish hasidism'.<sup>4</sup>

On Simhat Torah (October) 1814 the Seer fell out of a window in his house, suffering critical injuries that led to his death nine months later on the fast of Tisha Be'av (August) 1815. Although these bare facts are not disputed, their interpretation, as rendered by hasidic and maskilic writers as well as others, differs substantially. Of these varying interpretations, the maskilic version was the earliest. Written in the style of a journalistic exposé, this satiric account followed upon the heels of the fall itself, making its initial appearance even prior to the Seer's death. The hasidic counter-version, on the other hand, with its clearly apologetic and polemical overtones—evidently intended to furnish an alternative to the maskilic version by endowing the fall with mysterious mystical nuances—is late, dating only from the early twentieth century. My intention here is not to uncover the reality behind the Seer's fall, but rather to trace the transmission of these opposing traditions, showing how their divergent treatments of the Seer's fall illustrate patterns of imagery, memory, and dispute.

#### THE SEER AND HIS FALL IN HASIDIC EYES

In later hasidic sources the series of events that led to the Seer's death is referred to by the semantically charged term the 'great fall'. Signifying more than just a tragic accident, this term is suggestive of a spiritual fall. Indeed, some hasidic sources link the Seer's fall to his emotional breakdown following his failed attempts to hasten redemption, and the shattering of the messianic hopes he had vested in Napoleon. According to hasidic legend, the Seer reportedly voiced extreme reservations regarding Napoleon—in contrast to several of his fellow *tsadikim*. However, as neither the Seer's messianic doctrine nor his efforts to hasten redemption are under discussion here, it is enough to recall one historian's observation that 'notwithstanding the delectable beauty of hasidic legend, it lacks historical truth. Not only do we find no hint of such an attitude in the Seer's writings, indeed, the very opposite is explicitly proven.'<sup>5</sup> Put briefly, in hasidic legend the Seer's fall has a threefold aspect: it is a physical fall; a personal and spiritual fall; and a military and political fall (Napoleon's failed attempt to invade Russia in 1812 and the dissolution of the duchy of Warsaw in early 1813).

As noted, the two main hasidic sources for the Seer's fall date only from the early twentieth century, which is to say long after the event in question. They appear to be independent of each other; the first is a brief description by the hasidic writer

<sup>4</sup> Although much has been written about the Seer, a definitive biographical study is still a desideratum. See D. Assaf, 'Hasidut polin beme'ah ha-19: matsav hamehkar usekirah bibliografit', in I. Bartal, R. Elijor, and C. Shmeruk (eds.), *Tsadikim ve'anshei ma'aseh: mehkarim behasidut polin* (Jerusalem, 1994), 357–79.

<sup>5</sup> I. Alfasi, *Bisedeh haahasidut* (Jerusalem, 1987), 411.

Aaron Marcus (1843–1916), published in 1901,<sup>6</sup> and the second is an undated letter sent by Rabbi Joseph Lowenstein of Serock (1840–1924), an expert on hasidic history, to Rabbi Tsevi Ezekiel Michelsohn of Płońsk (1863–1943?). This letter was published in Yisrael Berger's hasidic anthology *Eser orot* ('Ten Lights'), first published in 1907. Some excerpts follow:

After the year 5574 [1814], in which divine providence brought the fall of the emperor Napoleon . . . many predicted that God's great name would be magnified and sanctified. As for the rabbi of Lublin, he lived in the constant expectation of divine salvation. . . . He found a propitious time, the night of Simhat Torah, on which all Israel is acquitted after the days of judgement. On Shemini Atseret they drank mead in his house and piled all the empty glasses on the windowsill. He said to his followers: 'If we have a good Simhat Torah, then we will have a good Tisha Be'av.' After the *hakafot* ('circlings'), he commanded his followers to remain in the large hall and to guard him carefully in his room. And they became as deaf and heard not. Then the rabbi commanded his wife Rebbetsin Beyle to watch over him. . . . The rabbi sobbed loudly and the *rebbetsin* imagined she heard a loudly sobbing child knocking at the door, and she forgot his command and went to open the door. When she returned, the rabbi was not in the house. She only saw him snatched from the house through the window. His followers understood that this was no simple matter: it was impossible for anyone to throw himself from this window for the window was above shoulder height. Moreover, in all the time that he had sat in this room, some fifteen years, he had never approached the window to look at the marketplace. And all the glasses were still standing on the windowsill. [The holy rabbi, our teacher Judah of Zaklików, said that he who does not believe that this was a great thing is an opponent of the *tsadikim*. This is what Rabbi Jacob Leib of that place told me, who heard it from his mouth. And the mitnagedim joked that he was drunk and fell, and they refused to see that their interpretation contradicts the facts.<sup>7</sup>]

They searched for him until the hasid Rabbi Leizer of Chmielnik . . . made a circuit of the house several hours later. At a distance of some fifty cubits or more he heard someone moaning. He asked, 'Who are you?' and received the answer, 'Jacob Isaac, son of Meital'. And he emitted a noise. The greatest of his disciples gathered and drew lots for who would carry home his feet, his body, and his head. . . . The rabbi was very ill and his opponents imagined that he would expire that very day. The mitnagedim rejoiced at this and drank wine. When this came to the rabbi's attention, he said, 'When I leave this world they will not even be able to drink water.' And so it came to pass, for the Seer of Lublin, light of the world, died on the following Tisha Be'av.

And the rabbi said that they took him to heaven to receive judgement for trying to force the end of days and sentenced him to be cast down to earth. And the Maggid of Koziencice spread the corner of his robe to lower him to earth gently, and if not for him not a bone in his body would have remained whole, heaven forbid. It was thus that the rabbi found out that the Maggid had died, and if he had known he would not have initiated his attempt at all.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Verus [A. Marcus], *Der Chassidismus* (Pleschen, 1901), 163–5; cf. Alfasi, *Bisedeh haahasidut*, 412.

<sup>7</sup> The square brackets appear in the original. Evidently these bracketed sentences, found only in the first edition of *Eser orot* (Piotrków, 1907), are the addition either of Rabbi Michelsohn or of Berger (see below). Rabbi Judah of Zaklików was a disciple of Elimelech of Lizhensk and of the Seer of Lublin.

<sup>8</sup> Berger, *Eser orot*, 91, no. 27.

Although the similarities to Marcus's earlier account outweigh the differences, Lowenstein's account does differ in some respects, of which just one is noted here. Not only does Marcus's account mute the polemical barb directed at the Seer's opponents ('When I leave this world they will not even be able to drink water'), but it also lacks the messianic atmosphere so prominently featured in Lowenstein's account ('And the rabbi said that they took him to heaven to receive judgement for trying to force the end of days').<sup>9</sup>

As presented in this hasidic account, the fall is a miraculous event distinguished by several irrational features: the height of the window; the undisturbed wine glasses; and the fact that the Seer reportedly never went near the window. In the absence of a rational explanation only the miraculous one remains, supported by the semantic overlap between the Seer's fall and Napoleon's fall, and by the folk etymology 'Napoleon = *nefilah* (fall)', which is based on the Seer's intertwining of his fate with that of the French leader.<sup>10</sup> In the hasidic account the Seer, guided by his presentiment of impending events and their consequences, pointedly requests that his wife and the members of his intimate circle guard him carefully. However, in the spirit of a story whose tragic ending is foreseen, they fail to fulfil this duty. Despite his miraculous survival, the Seer interpreted his fall as a divine punishment for his premature attempts to bring the messiah,<sup>11</sup> he himself evidently believed that he deserved a death sentence. It was only the intervention of the Maggid of Koziénice, recently dead, that 'cushioned' his fall and delayed his death for nine months.

The bracketed statement attributed to the Seer's disciple Rabbi Judah of Zaklików that 'he who does not believe that this was a great thing is an opponent of the *tsadikim*' requires further clarification. Its apologetic and polemical tone can only be attributed to the fact that it is a reaction to an alternative interpretation that stripped the fall of its supernatural aspects, as substantiated by the continuation, which explicitly mentions the mitnagedim and their attitude to the fall: 'And the

<sup>9</sup> We cannot overlook the explicit messianic overtones connected with the conversion of Tisha Be'av into a joyful day, which was also a central facet of Shabbateanism. See G. Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626-1676* (Princeton, 1973), 615-20, 629-32. The ironic aspect of the hasidic interpretation of the Seer's fall (traditionally the messiah was to be born on Tisha Be'av, and in this case he meets his death on that date) was noted by A. Z. Aescoly, *Haḥasidut be'polin*, ed. D. Assaf (Jerusalem, 1998), 62.

<sup>10</sup> It is possible that the folk etymology 'Napoleon = *nefilah* (fall)' played some role in shaping the myth. Compare the hagiographic story regarding Napoleon, who dressed as a simple man and came thus to the Maggid of Koziénice. Upon Napoleon's departure the Maggid called out after him, 'You shall surely fall, Napoleon will fall' (Y. Berger, *Eser tsahsahot* (Piotrków, 1910), 87, no. 17; A. H. Michelsohn, *Ateret menahem* (Biłgoraj, 1910), 38, no. 125. The language used refers to Esther 6: 13. A different version used an etymology based on Exod. 18: 18: 'You will surely wear away, Napoleon, wear away' (Berger, *Eser orot*, 75, no. 32).

<sup>11</sup> Although psychology and psychoanalysis are not my focus here, it is difficult to avoid conjecturing that the Seer attempted to commit suicide while in a state of depression, as indicated by his explicit requests that his followers 'guard him carefully', and that his wife 'watch over him'.

mitnagedim joked that he was drunk and fell, and they refused to see that their interpretation contradicts the facts.' It should be noted, however, that although this brief passage appeared in the first edition of *Eser orot* (1907), from 1913 on it was expunged from all editions of the work, evidently because it could be understood ostensibly as legitimizing the alternative version. As we shall see below, a significantly different explanation was indeed in circulation.

In both the maskilic and the hasidic versions of the fall, wine plays a key role. The maskilic version—as reported in the hasidic source cited above and in sources to be examined below—attributes the Seer's fall to his emotional and physical imbalance and to his inebriated state. For its part, the hasidic source depicts the hasidim merrily indulging in drink prior to the Seer's fall, placing the empty bottles on the windowsill, where they miraculously remained untouched. Moreover—and here the polemical slant emerges with clarity—as portrayed in hasidic legend it is not the hasidim, but rather the Seer's opponents, who are drunkards. By rejoicing too soon at his impending death the latter receive a parodic 'punishment': the Seer's death on a fast day made it impossible for them to celebrate his death in drunken revelry.<sup>12</sup>

In sum, the hasidic source presents a dual stance: on the one hand, it provides an internal 'positive' explanation linking the fall to higher spiritual and messianic matters; on the other it puts forth an 'external', polemically oriented explanation that satirizes the mitnagedim while simultaneously offering a counter-version of events. But can the identity of these opponents who rejoiced in the Seer's expected demise be pinpointed more precisely, shedding further light on the use of this satiric barb in the process?

#### THE SEER IN HIS OPPONENTS' EYES

Hasidic legend did not overlook the chilly reception afforded the Seer when he moved from Łañcut to Czechów, a suburb of Lublin, after 1798:

In those days the city of Lublin was filled with scribes and great God-fearing scholars, but they were all mitnagedim who did not follow the ways of hasidism, and anyone following

<sup>12</sup> This tradition's polemical character is firmly established by the very existence of another hasidic tradition which sees it as a 'joke' and connects these remarks to an entirely different set of circumstances. In 1911, when Moses Menahem Walden of Warsaw expressed an interest in printing an anthology of stories about the Seer and his teachings, Rabbi Tsevi Ezekiel Michelsohn of Plońsk sent him a letter containing an anecdote that he had found in the Lithuanian preacher Benjamin Lewin's *Hamesh yadot* (Vilna, 1904), pt. 2, p. 354). This anecdote related how the Seer chastised the members of the burial society for drinking vodka at funerals. 'When one of them replied that "it is the time-honoured custom among scattered Jewry that the burial society members drink copious amounts of vodka while arranging the funeral and, in a hundred years hence, when [the Seer's] time to leave the world comes, then too will we take a glass of vodka without diverging from established custom", the holy rabbi immediately countered: "Be certain that when my time comes I will not even allow you a

that path they viewed as alien . . . and when they heard in Lublin that such a breach had been made near their city, that nearby one person who followed the paths of hasidism had settled and had begun to attract others . . . then they were greatly incensed and began to despise and to persecute him.<sup>13</sup>

Given what we know of the Seer's charisma and mystical personality, it was in effect all but impossible for his mitnagdic and maskilic critics to ignore the inroads he had made among their followers. Their struggle against the Seer focused primarily on undermining his authority and credibility. Ironically, the local mitnagdic rabbi Azriel Horowitz (known as 'the Iron-headed'), who made strong attempts to defame the Seer during his lifetime, unwittingly allowed him to be buried in a choice cemetery plot.<sup>14</sup> Other prominent figures involved in this campaign included the Lithuanian rabbi Dov Berish Heilpern, who preached in Lublin, and two militant mitnagedim, the preachers David of Maków and Israel Loebel of Slutsk. The latter two mocked and ridiculed the Seer in their writings, calling him an ignoramus and comparing him to Balaam as a way of discrediting his putative prophetic powers.<sup>15</sup>

Both the Seer's renown and the news of his embarrassing fall quickly reached mitnagedim and maskilim in Poland and Galicia. A sardonic account of the fall, apparently based on eyewitness and hearsay testimony, appeared in 1815, prior to

spoonful of cold water." And so it came to pass.' In response to this story Walden wrote that he had heard it 'from trustworthy informants regarding a different matter', surmising that it was the author of *Hamesh yaadot* who was mistaken (*Niflaot harabi*, 9).

Furthermore, the hasidic tradition reflecting mitnagdic joy on the day of the Seer's fall echoes the mitnagdic tradition about hasidic rejoicing at the Gaon of Vilna's death (9 Oct. 1797): 'Immediately after his death the above-mentioned hasidim gathered and made a joyful feast . . . they drank to inebriation . . . and danced the night long' (M. Wilensky, *Hasidim umitnagedim*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1970), ii, 95; see also S. Dubnow, *Toledot ha'hasidut* (Tel Aviv, 1930-1), 254-5; Y. Mondshine, *Kerem habad*, 4/1 (1992), 212-13).

Ironically, Joseph Perl, the avowed enemy of hasidism, also died on Simhat Torah, in 1839. Rumour had it that the hasidim 'danced wildly on his grave'—a rumour naturally firmly denied by the friends of the deceased. An obituary on Perl argued that claims that the 'hasidim joyfully danced like goats and evil spirits on his grave, God forbid' were false (*Kerem hemed*, v (Prague, 1841), 163, 167). Polemically speaking, spreading such claims was equivalent to desecrating the grave itself; see R. Mahler, *Hasidim and the Jewish Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 1985), 148. Another little-noticed source also reports hasidic joy at Perl's death. This was a report written by two Scottish missionaries who happened to be in Ternopil on the day of Perl's funeral. They visited the school Perl had founded and headed, and observed: 'There is great mutual contempt between the Jews of the Old and those of the New School. They told us that the rabbi who founded the New School in Ternopil had died there that very day, and all the Chasidim were rejoicing at the news' (Andrew A. Bonar and Robert M'Cheyne, *Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland in 1839*, 3rd edn. (Edinburgh, 1844), 444; see also 448-9).

<sup>13</sup> Solomon Gabriel Rosenthal, *Hugalut hatsadikim* (Warsaw, 1905), 21; Berger, *Eser orot*, 90, no. 26.

<sup>14</sup> D. Erman, *Devarim arevim*, 2 vols. (Munkács, 1903), i, 37b, no. 10; Walden, *Niflaot harabi*, 29-30, no. 46; 84, no. 261.

<sup>15</sup> See Walden, *Niflaot harabi*, 44, no. 79; 86, no. 283; *Tana devei eliyahu im . . . ramatayim tsofim* (Warsaw, 1881), 110, ch. 24, no. 22; Erman, *Devarim arevim*, i, 36b, no. 3; Berger, *Eser orot*, 92, no. 38; A. H. Michelsohn, *Ohel naftali* (Lviv, 1911), 117-20; *Da'at lenevonim* (Munkács, 1899), 3; Wilensky, *Hasidim umitnagedim*, ii, 195, 208, 313.

the Seer's death in August that year. Although it remained in manuscript and was never published in full, this satire evidently circulated widely. It was this initial version that effectively determined the attributes of the maskilic interpretation of the Seer's fall.

*SEFER NEKIYUT UFERISHUT OR MA'ASEI HARAV:*  
THE SATIRE'S TRANSMISSION AND AUTHOR

In 1904 the author and traveller Ephraim Deinard published a new edition of the polemical anti-hasidic work *Zemir aritsim* ('A Wicked Graft'), to which he appended an anonymous work copied by Mendel Landsberg of Kremenets (1786-1866). Landsberg was a friend and contemporary of the maskilim Joseph Perl (1773-1839) and Isaac Baer Levinsohn (1788-1860). In his introduction to this anonymous text Landsberg noted that it referred to the Seer, 'who experienced an impure event' viewed by 'his hasidic sect as signs of purity. . . . This pamphlet, called *Ma'asei harav* ['The Rabbi's Deeds'], was written in 1815, the year that this event concerning the *tsadik* took place.'<sup>16</sup>

The 'impure event' referred to by Landsberg was obviously the Seer's fall from the window of his house. Landsberg's determination of 1815 as the date of composition is substantiated by examination of the text, which further narrows it down to some time after Passover 1815 and before the Seer's death on Tisha Be'av of that year (of which the text's narrator seems unaware). Two significant points emerge from this dating. First, examination of the introduction—written, it would seem, by Joseph Perl<sup>17</sup>—reveals that the text in question was an initial satiric response to *Shivhei habesht* ('In Praise of the Ba'al Shem Tov'), which was first published in late 1814. This work eventually became the polemical focus of Perl's multifaceted creativity, as exemplified in his *Megaleh temirin* ('Revealer of Secrets') and in particular his German *Uiber [sic] das Wesen der Sekte Chassidim* (completed in 1816). Secondly, by its very presence in Perl's literary estate, this satire, which preceded the composition of *Megaleh temirin*, necessitates exploration of possible reciprocity between the two works.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> A short version of this satire was first published by Ephraim Deinard, *Zemir aritsim harishon* (Karny, NJ, 1904), 5-11. The original full version of the text is housed in the manuscript division of the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem, 4° 1153, file 110a. See S. Katz, 'Igerot maskilim bigenutam shel hasidim', *Moznayim*, 10 (1950), 266-76; Joseph Perl, *Uiber das Wesen der Sekte Chassidim*, ed. A. Rubinstein (Jerusalem, 1977), 18-19, 53-4. The transmission of this satire and the identification of its author are treated in full in Assaf, "'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal": nefilato shel ha'hozeh milublin bire'i hazikaron ha'hasidi vehasatirah hamaskilit', in Assaf et al. (eds.), *Bema'agalei hasidim* (Jerusalem, 1999), 173-81. For a critical annotated edition of the text of the satire see ibid. 193-207.

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of this matter, see my 'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal', 180-1, 183.

<sup>18</sup> Although not printed until 1819 in Vienna, *Megaleh temirin* was submitted to the Austrian censors in 1816. See I. Vaynlez, 'Yosef Perl—Zayn lebn un shafn', *Yosef perls yidishe ksovim* (Vilna,

The satire in question has, however, received scant scholarly attention. Before I proceed to a closer examination, it should be noted that the manuscript found in Perl's literary archive contains a longer and more complete version than that published by Deinard. It not only sheds light on the work itself and on its author, but it also enables us to examine the way in which maskilim perceived hasidism in general and the Seer of Lublin in particular.

Simhah Katz was the first to examine the satire, and it was he who identified both its original name, *Sefer nekiyut uferishut* ('The Book of Cleanliness and Abstinence'), and its author, Samson Halevi Bloch (1784–1845). Bloch was a Galician maskil known primarily for his three-volume geographical and historical textbook *Shevilei olam* ('Paths of the World'). The most telling proof of Bloch's authorship of *Sefer nekiyut* lies in its link to a lost satire entitled *Shivhei aleksei* ('In Praise of Aleksey'), a transparently parodic echo of *Shivhei habesht*. In the manuscript version of *Sefer nekiyut* we find the following statement regarding the non-Jewish drayman of the title: 'All his powerful and mighty acts are [recorded in the book?] *Shivhei aleksei*, which, God willing, I shall soon publish.'<sup>19</sup> A letter sent by Bloch to Perl in 1817 contains a declaration of the former's intention to write a satire by that name.<sup>20</sup> Either this satire has been lost or perhaps it was never written.

The matter of Aleksey (Alexei) requires further elaboration. Surprisingly, this noted figure receives no mention in early hasidic sources. Although *Shivhei habesht* contains numerous references to the Ba'al Shem Tov's 'Canaanite [Christian] servant' who accompanies him on his travels (and even tries to kill him on one occasion), he remains anonymous.<sup>21</sup> Once again, we find maskilic literature preceding hasidic legend. It was the maskil Joseph Perl who first mentioned 'seinen christlichen Kutscher Alexi' by name, poking fun at him in his *Uiber das Wesen der Sekte Chassidim*.<sup>22</sup> Discovery of the reference to Aleksey in *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*, written in 1815, makes this the earliest source in which this non-Jewish coachman-servant is explicitly identified by name. It is only later, in the 1860s, that we find Aleksey appearing by name in hasidic sources, often in imaginative expansions subsequently adopted by non-hasidic writers and scholars.<sup>23</sup> This state of affairs leaves us with one of two possibilities: either the name Aleksey was originally a sardonic maskilic invention, a mocking name for a prototypical non-Jew that later found its way into hasidic literature, where it was quite naturally and naively absorbed; or it was an authentic hasidic tradition transmitted orally, first documented in writing by maskilim and only subsequently in hasidic works.

1937), p. xxvii.

<sup>19</sup> My italics.

<sup>20</sup> Katz, 'Igerot maskilim', 273. Cf. Assaf, 'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal', 178, 200, 206.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Shivhei habesht*, ed. A. Rubinstein (Jerusalem, 1992), 153–4, 177, 192, 215, 230, 270–1; *Keter shem tov* (1795; repr. Brooklyn, 1987), pt. 2, pp. 124–5, no. 464.

<sup>22</sup> Perl, *Uiber das Wesen der Sekte Chassidim*, 71, 151.

Close textual and philological examination of *Sefer nekiyut uferishut* suggests that its original author, evidently Samson Bloch, sent it to Perl for consideration and perhaps for editing as well. As was his habit, Perl seems to have replaced the original introduction with one of his own devising, with the addition of sardonic explanatory comments. The different and later authorship of the notes is definitively established by their author's awareness of the Seer's death—of which the author of the satiric text displays no knowledge—and his comment 'I even walked on his grave.'

A brief look at the satire reveals that it was written in the form of a first-person narrative. The narrator, a maskilic merchant from Bialystok, arrives in Lublin on business just after Passover in 1815. Upon hearing from two local hasidim that the Seer<sup>24</sup> has been shut up in his house for some time and refuses to see anyone, the merchant sets out to uncover the truth. He introduces himself as a Jew from the hasidic area of Volhynia who is seeking a blessing from the rabbi as his wife has failed to conceive for the past five years. He obtains the details of the Seer's fall from his window on Simhat Torah by plying the hasidim with drink. The narrator's true identity is revealed after he berates the hasidim for their stupidity, for their naive belief in a *tsadik* who is nothing but a deceiving drunkard. The hasidim, for their part, are unable to accept the fact that what for them epitomized the *tsadik's* purity and gift of prophecy was nothing more than a sham. They accuse the merchant of coming to 'make the Seer stink', to which the merchant's ironic response is 'Why do you scream at me? He sank and fell and lay outstretched in human excrement, and I make him stink?' The printed version of the satire contains a different ending in which the merchant is joined by a mitnaged, originally from Vilna, who now lives in the Lithuanian town of Yorburg (Jurbarkas, west of Kaunas). These two ideal anti-hasidic prototypes, the maskil and the mitnaged, join forces in unmasking the *tsadik*.

Several of the classic themes of the maskilic critique of hasidism are well represented in this satiric work. Of these, a major motif is intoxication and the love of wine among *tsadikim* and their flocks. Not only does this unrestrained drinking cause the Seer's embarrassing fall, but it also ultimately induces the hasidim to let the secret slip. In addition, implanted in the text we find coarse hints comparing hasidism and Christianity, together with criticism of the Seer's supposed prophetic powers and continuous access to divine inspiration. Also embedded in the associative fabric of the text is an inverse parodic comparison of the Seer of Lublin to the biblical Samuel, similarly known as the Seer, whose rise to eminence came against the background of the corruption of Eli's sons, on the one hand, and of Eli's multiple blindness, on the other. The literate reader was certainly aware that Eli the priest met his death in a fall from his chair (1 Samuel 4: 18).

<sup>23</sup> For many examples, see Assaf, 'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal', 179 nn. 62–3.

<sup>24</sup> Here referred to as *haro'eh* and not *hahozeh*. The appellation *hozeh* for the Seer of Lublin is late and does not appear in print before the 1860s. Although both words are similar in meaning and can be trans-

The Dionysian and erotic aspects of the hasidic experience, along with the excessive hasidic emphasis on bodily excretion, are strikingly enunciated in this maskilic version. As depicted here, the crude, licentious hasidic ethos is in stark contrast to the professed hasidic ideal of purity and abstinence. Even the satire's title alludes to its crass nature via its parodic inversion of the terms *cleanliness* and *abstinence*—key terms in Hebrew ethical literature and synonyms for physical purity and sexual abstinence—to refer to the excrement in which the Seer landed while drunk. The satire's ironic treatment of the life of hasidic purity, patterned on 'cleanliness leads to abstinence, abstinence leads to purity, purity leads to hasidism',<sup>25</sup> highlights hasidic utilization of the outer walls of the study house as a public urinal and outhouse, lined 'with mire and mud and human excrement'. The Seer, who wanted either to urinate or to vomit, finds himself in this pile of excrement, and cleanliness in this context appears in its secondary, borrowed meaning of excretion. In searching for reasons why this satire remained in manuscript, we can perhaps point to its unusual crassness.

In addition to its crudity (and in some instances feeding it), the satire's first-person narrative is replete with sophisticated biblical associations and allusions. An excerpt from its account of the Seer's fall follows (although it can only be fully appreciated in the Hebrew original):

It came to pass when I begged them to tell me the story of the Seer . . . that after they had got drunk, one gave in to me. The ass opened his mouth and said: 'On the twenty-third day of the seventh month, which is the holiday of Shemini Atseret,<sup>26</sup> a day of drinking and rejoicing, when all had come to the Seer's residence, to rejoice with him on Simhat Torah . . . and the Seer drank and became drunk and his gorge rose and he vomited until the people were unable to sit with him, and the Seer could no longer control himself, and he commanded the lad who attended him, saying: "Place me in my bedroom, for the spirit of prophecy has begun to move in me, and let no man enter. For God will speak with me there." For his house was in the town wall and his bedroom was a small chamber with recessed and latticed windows all around and the one open window in his chamber was opposite the dung gate, where people go to do their business, which is lined with mire and mud and human excrement. . . .

He fell on his bed . . . until the urine rose to his head. He then mounted his bed to the windowsill, and holding his genitals, let his waters hit the ground. He had not yet finished urinating, his flesh was still in his hands, and he reeled and moved like a drunk, and fell full length on his face from the window onto the piles of human waste. He lay there without utterance or words, making only a soft murmuring sound, and no one knew his burial place. Towards evening, when the hasidim departed, two men who served him came there to relieve themselves. They lifted their eyes and they saw the rabbi lying prostrate like a prophet and the open window. They looked at each other in astonishment and were hesitant to approach him, for they said, he is in the grip of the spirit of prophecy; let us hear what

labeled as 'the seer', the use of *hozeh* enhances the allusion to the biblical Samuel, to be discussed below.

<sup>25</sup> See BT *Avodah zarah*, 20b; cf. Moses Hayim Luzzatto, *Mesilat yesharim: The Path of the Upright* (Philadelphia, 1936), chs. 10–12.

<sup>26</sup> The 23rd day of the Hebrew month of Tishrei is a holiday called both Shemini Atseret and

God says to him. They waited a long time but he did not move at all. . . . They approached him and turned him over and saw that his "circumcision" stood erect, for it was in his hand. And they shouted: "It has been given as a prodigious marvel to the house of Israel."<sup>27</sup>

As we would expect, the satire ends with a denunciation of hasidic stupidity and of hasidic failure to comprehend that the Seer was nothing more than a charlatan.

#### IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE MASKILIC VERSION OF THE FALL

Before examining the additional literary artefacts of the maskilic tradition of the fall, it is imperative to note that most maskilic literature dating from the first half of the nineteenth century was published at a later date; for example, the short version of *Sefer nekiyut uferishut* was first published in 1904. Nonetheless, as this literature did circulate widely as a sort of 'underground' literature, we can assume that the maskilic interpretation of the Seer's fall—so stingingly portrayed in *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*—was well known. At least another three literary artefacts of this tradition are extant: one from the 1840s penned by the satirist Isaac Erter (1791–1851); a second from the 1860s penned by the editor of *Hamelits* Alexander Tsederbaum (1816–93); and a third from the 1870s written by the famed rabbinic scholar Solomon (Shneur Zalman) Schechter (1847–1915).

The next known maskilic version of the Seer's fall appeared thirty years after *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*, in Isaac Erter's biting satire *Gilgul nefesh* ('Transmigration of a Soul'), which was first published in 1845. As its title indicates, this satire describes the strange transmigrations of a wandering soul, which in one of its incarnations inhabits the body of a hasidic leader. This rabbi—also the narrator and confessor—is none other than the Seer of Lublin. Erter reconstructs the circumstances of the fall via his confession:

At the conclusion of the harvest festival [Sukkot], on the eighth day of solemn assembly, Simhat Torah, it came to pass that, on that occasion at night, I made a circuit of the *bimah* uproariously celebrating according to regulation, skipping like a ram. . . . And I drank wine, becoming inebriated according to regulation. . . . When I left off drinking, a vision was revealed to me. In this vision I saw my house of prayer spinning, turning over in front of my eyes. I was frightened by this vision, lest I fall down drunk among the assembled congregation. I hurriedly called out: 'Come exalted holy guests, come to my upper chamber! There we will stay a while together, take sweet secret counsel together on hidden matters.' I went to my room, shutting the doors of the upper chamber and locking them.

Then my hasidim said one to the other: there is none like our master! There is none like our rabbi! . . . For our holy patriarchs have left their seats in divine paradise to come to his synagogue to rejoice with him on Simhat Torah. And he spoke to them in our presence as a man speaks to his fellow man. And he was leaping and whirling with them, calling their names . . . and we witnessed it. Now they meet together in his attic room, consulting together concerning our redemption and salvation, taking counsel to free us from our yoke and to Simhat Torah ('Rejoicing of the Torah').

bring a redeemer to Zion, our righteous messiah. . . . While they spoke of these matters . . . a young boy came shouting to his father, saying: 'Father, I went to relieve myself between the buildings and I found our rabbi lying there dead.' All my hasidim trembled and they all raced post-haste out of the doors and windows of the house, and found my body, my holy body, cast between the buildings in a place of vomit and filth, under the window of my upper chamber. . . . I was engaged in no battle with Satan or an evil angel, for I had a contest with a burning seraph, the burning liquor in my gut. After having closed the doors of my chamber behind me, in hopes of ridding myself of the effects of the wine and in an effort to restore myself to my usual state, I tried to vomit the wine out the window of my chamber in between the buildings and from drunkenness and heavy-headedness I fell through the lattice, breaking my neck.<sup>28</sup>

The figure of the *tsadik* presented here is one who deliberately misleads his foolish followers. They adhere to the absurd belief that their rabbi is closeted with the patriarchs and the angels in a joint attempt to bring the messiah, and interpret his fall as the result of a struggle with satanic forces. But as the *tsadik* well knew but did not reveal, it was not with a heavenly seraph that he struggled but with earthly wine. In developing this *tsadik's* literary persona, Erter relied not only on satirical allusions to biblical personages who either shut themselves up in their rooms and/or died in a fall, but also on realistic elements culled from anecdotes about various *tsadikim*.<sup>29</sup> In Erter's description of the drunken *tsadik* rolling in the mire,<sup>30</sup> we discern the influence of the much earlier *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*. As distinct from Bloch's satire, Erter's version of the fall reflects an awareness of the messianic component in the myth of the Seer. He quotes the fear-stricken hasidim who are convinced their rabbi is consorting with angels in an attempt to hasten the end of days: 'Now they meet in his attic room, consulting together concerning our redemption and salvation, taking counsel to free us from our yoke and to bring a redeemer to Zion, our righteous messiah.' In *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*, on the other hand, this messianic aspect is absent; there the hasidim simply interpret the Seer's actions as an attempt to effect a personal ascent of the soul. In any event, Erter's employment of the messianic myth allows us to date its origins more precisely—certainly no later than that generation.<sup>31</sup> It is also noteworthy that in Erter's version

<sup>27</sup> Assaf, 'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal', 200–3.

<sup>28</sup> Isaac Erter, *Hatsofeh levest yisra'el*, ed. Y. Friedlander (Jerusalem, 1996), 156–8. The first to identify this *rebbe* with the Seer was Dov Sadan, *Betsetkha uve'ohalekha* (Tel Aviv, 1966), 73.

<sup>29</sup> See Assaf, 'Vehamitnagedim hitlotsetsu shehishtaker venafal', 186 nn. 79–80.

<sup>30</sup> The tendency to demean the hasidic world and to place emphasis on the hasidic concern with excretion is characteristic of anti-hasidic satire. It is not by chance that the plot of *Megaleh temirin* opens with the *tsadik* on his way to the outhouse (Letter 1) and concludes with his death there (Letter 147). This satiric portrayal of the *tsadik* in the outhouse is drawn from the description of the Ba'al Shem Tov's death (D. Ben-Amos and J. R. Mintz (eds.), *In Praise of the Ba'al Shem Tov: The Earliest Legends about the Founder of Hasidism* (Bloomington, Ind., 1972), 255–7), where it says that the Ba'al Shem Tov was 'sick with diarrhea' and relates that he 'went to the toilet' before his death.

<sup>31</sup> Mendel Piekarcz takes an opposing view, claiming that as no evidence for messianic pretensions is found in the Seer's writings, the messianic myth connected with him is the invention of historians. See M. Piekarcz, 'Haḥasidut be'aspaklariyat Tiferet shelomoh lerabi shelomo miradomsk', *Gal-ed*, 14 (1995),

the *tsadik* (i.e. the Seer) dies immediately as a result of the fall, making Simhat Torah the day of his death. This shift can be seen as the maskilic answer to the orally transmitted hasidic saying—recorded only in late versions—that the Seer's opponents would not even be able to drink water on the day of his death (which was a fast day). Since Erter's fictional *tsadik* died on Simhat Torah, his opponents were able to celebrate his death in drink.

We find the next echo of the maskilic version of the Seer's fall in the 1860s in Alexander Tsederbaum's *Keter kehunah* ('Crown of Priesthood'). In this work Tsederbaum (known by his pseudonym Erez), editor of the daily newspaper *Hamelits*, painted a hostile, critical picture of the history of hasidism. A native of Zamość, Tsederbaum moved to Lublin following his marriage and stayed there from 1835 to 1840. Consequently, his remarks on the Seer and his fall may well preserve local traditions:

On the night of Simhat Torah 5575 [1814] the Seer closeted himself in his room on the second storey of his home. The one window overlooking the broad Jewish street was open; it was very near to the ground. When the spirit of ecstasy settled upon him, he ran to and fro in the room. Moving in haste to look skyward, he lost his balance and fell full-length on the ground. The perpetual uncleanness of that street saved him from sudden death, for if he had fallen on the paving stones he would have smashed his skull and broken his neck, but to his delight there was a mound of refuse there on which he fell. In a flash, the hasidim who were rejoicing on a full glass of wine made a commotion, hurriedly bringing expert physicians to restore him for he had fainted. The fall and the fright set his bones atremble, so that he tossed and turned in pain for nine months, until he died and was gathered unto his fathers on Tisha Be'av 5575 [1815]. The hasidim said that the *tsadik* had put his head out the window in order to grab hovering angels by their robes as a means of hastening the end of days, but that Satan had succeeded in confusing him and pushing him until he fell through the lattice. Miraculously, they recount, there was a row of empty glass bottles on that windowsill but when he fell he neither broke nor overturned a single bottle.<sup>32</sup>

Comparison of Tsederbaum's version to earlier maskilic versions elicits a more moderate, balanced, and 'rational' presentation of the events leading to the fall. The Seer is portrayed here not as a drunkard who lost his balance when trying to urinate or vomit, but rather as an excitable eccentric in an ecstatic state who fell while trying to hasten the end of days by grabbing angels by their robes. Tsederbaum's version also plays down the miraculous aspects of the fall by noting that the window was not much above street level and that a pile of refuse cushioned the Seer's fall. To this rational explanation he juxtaposed the hasidic version of the Seer's heroic struggle with Satan, who pushed him, and the miracle of the undisturbed wine bottles.

Shortly thereafter, in 1877, another brief version of the fall appeared in the margins of a short anti-hasidic satire, *Sihot hanei tsanterah dedahavah*, penned by Solomon Schechter, who later achieved fame as the scholar of the Cairo Genizah.

37–8 (Heb. sect.). See also Alfasi, *Bisedeh haḥasidut*, 411.

Writing under the pseudonym Yahats ben Rahtsa, Schechter published bogus hasidic letters mocking the *tsadikim* of Sadegóra against the background of the temporary defection of Dov of Leova (1821?–1875), the son of Rabbi Israel of Ruzhin, to the maskilic camp. Describing Dov of Leova's depression, seclusion, and refusal to receive his followers, he recalls the Seer's fall:

Although we were aware that his [Dov of Leova's] intentions were good, that he wanted to bring the messiah, why did he have to be so stubborn? The time was certainly not yet ripe. Why did he have to tempt Samael, who had already removed several *tsadikim* from the world in this fashion, like the holy *tsadik* of Lublin, who wanted to bring the messiah? What did Samael do? He tempted the aforementioned *tsadik* to imbibe large quantities of wine on Simhat Torah. When the *tsadik* went to his bedroom, he took him and thrust him out the window, killing him—a veritable act of murder. This gave the *apikorsim* [heretics] an opportunity to say that he was drunk.<sup>33</sup>

Here Schechter drafted the original polemical tradition of the Seer's fall in pursuit of a new purpose: a satiric blasting of the tragi-pathetic figure of Dov of Leova, a figure portrayed and used by each of the contesting factions—hasidim, rabbis, and maskilim—for its own ends.<sup>34</sup>

The final transmigration of the maskilic version of the Seer's fall belongs to the early scholarly historiography of hasidism. In 1891 the historian Simon Dubnow issued his well-known call 'Naḥpesah venaḥkorah' ('Let us Search and Examine'), inviting the Jewish public to send him material for preparation of a history of the Jews in Poland and Russia. One of Dubnow's many correspondents was Jacob Shapiro, an anti-hasidic scholar and amateur historian from Międzyrzec Podlaski, who provided Dubnow with much important data on Polish hasidism. In one of his letters to Dubnow, he wrote:

Regarding your surprise at the story of the death of the rabbi of Lublin found in *Keter kehunah*, I have already clarified to you that this is an ancient rumour. I have now seen it among Erter's seventeen transmigrations, [the one] when the soul entered a rabbi. You can find there in *Sefer hatsofeh*,<sup>35</sup> my friend, all the details concerning the rabbi of Lublin's death. And Erter's version preceded [the one in] *Hamelits* by about forty years.<sup>36</sup>

From Shapiro's remark that 'this is an ancient rumour', we can infer that the maskilic tradition that Dubnow found so surprising had certainly circulated among Polish mitnagedim for a long time. In any event, we have seen that its sources were not dependent on either Tseederbaum's *Keter kehunah* or Erter's *Gilgul nefesh*. In his

<sup>32</sup> A. Tseederbaum, *Keter kehunah* (Odessa, 1867), 125.

<sup>33</sup> Yahats ben Rahtsa, 'Sihot hanei tsanterah dedahavah', *Hashahar*, 8 (1877), 418. See I. Davidson, *Parody in Jewish Literature* (New York, 1907), 74–6. On the identification of the writer with Schechter, see J. Nacht, 'Smolenskin beromaniyah', *Do'ar hayom*, 177 (1925), 3; id., 'Shneur Zalman Schechter' (Heb.), *Hado'ar*, 29/21 (1950), 544.

<sup>34</sup> On the Dov of Leova affair, see the bibliography in D. Assaf, *Derekh hamalkhut: r. yisra'el miruzhin umekomo betoledot haḥasidut* (Jerusalem, 1997), 26–8, 457–9.

<sup>35</sup> This refers to Erter's famous book *Hatsofeh leveit yisra'el*, of which 'Transmigration of a Soul' is a

own book Dubnow took care to adopt neither the maskilic nor the hasidic version of events. He presents both, though it is not difficult to guess to which he lent greater credence: 'The hasidim believe that some element of the "demonic forces" grabbed him and threw him out of the window, whereas the mitnagedim have a rational explanation: the *tsadik* drank too much wine during the holiday and became drunk. Upon putting his head out of the window he fell out.'<sup>37</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The Seer of Lublin's tragic fall, and his death some nine months later, marked a turning point in Polish hasidic history. With the death of this foremost of the four 'first-generation' leaders of Polish hasidism,<sup>38</sup> hasidic leadership passed into the hands of the Seer's disciples—who then split into many rival dynasties. At their vortex was the court of Przysucha–Kock (later to become the large Gur (Góra Kalwaria) and Alexander (Aleksandrów) dynasties) and their many opponents.

The Seer's enigmatic personality and the messianic myth linked to him during his lifetime, on the one hand, and the mysterious fashion in which he met his death, on the other, fired the imagination of his contemporaries and of following generations. The maskilic 'exposé' of the embarrassing circumstances surrounding his fall found expression in a series of satires and maskilic works, beginning with *Sefer nekiyut uferishut*, written in 1815 while the Seer lay dying, continuing in Erter's *Gilgul nefesh*, published in 1845, and concluding with Tseederbaum's publication of *Keter kehunah* in 1867 and Schechter's *Sihot hanei tsanterah dedahavah* ten years later. It also appears likely that the continued circulation of similar oral rumours and gossip formed the background for the subsequent creation of hasidic legend with its apologetic, polemical explanation of the 'true' circumstances surrounding the Seer's fall.

The maskilic interpretation, which failed to strike roots, did not survive in historical memory, whereas the romantic hasidic myth with its 'messianic' tinge gained in strength. In this respect the autobiographical remarks of the hasidic author Yehiel Grantstein are instructive:

The author, a native of Lublin, recalled that when he was young, still attending *heder* and at a slightly more advanced age, he would go from time to time—like many other lads attracted to stories of *tsadikim* heard and absorbed at home or from hasidic elders in the *shiblakh*—to the rabbi's study house. . . . There, in the open courtyard that provided access to Szeroka Street,<sup>39</sup> he would look at the small window, the window of the dramatically

chapter.

<sup>36</sup> M. Eidelbom, 'Lekorot haḥasidut', *Tagim*, 2 (1971), 55.

<sup>37</sup> Dubnow, *Toledot haḥasidut*, 330.

<sup>38</sup> The four were the Seer of Lublin, Rabbi Israel, the Maggid of Koziennice (d. 1814), Rabbi Menahem Mendel of Rymanów (d. 1815), and the Seer's disciple Rabbi Jacob Isaac 'the Holy Jew' of Przysucha (d. 1813).

<sup>39</sup> The Seer's study house was located at 28 Szeroka Street. See M. Balaban, *Die Judenstadt von*



exciting 'Fall'. . . . From there he would continue on to the aforementioned street and find the spot that the books knew to tell of, the veritable spot where they found the rabbi of Lublin lying, mumbling, sighing.<sup>40</sup>

The hasidic version was also incorporated into the works of writers who reshaped it to their needs, and it was even adopted, albeit with some reservations, by historians and students of hasidism. In his seminal article 'Haḥasidut bepolin' Aaron Ze'ev Aescoly stressed the messianic aspect of the Seer's teachings, unquestioningly accepting the hasidic interpretation of the fall.<sup>41</sup> Martin Buber took matters one step further in his novel *For the Sake of Heaven*, endowing the Seer with that same messianic stamp and even devoting an entire chapter to the circumstances surrounding the fall—again only according to the hasidic interpretation.<sup>42</sup>

Obviously, it is not within our power either to re-create the Seer's fall or to determine which version is correct. Another possibility hinted at in the sources is that the Seer, who was in a deep depression, purposely threw himself from the window in a suicide attempt. His explicitly reported request that his wife and disciples guard him very carefully may support this possibility.<sup>43</sup> It is highly unlikely, though, that the actual circumstances will ever come to light, nor is it important that they do. Close examination of the different versions of the fall highlights the satirical and polemical stamp in each and reveals the convoluted paths of memory-building. We may compare the hasidic and maskilic traditions to two rivals who seemingly ignore each other. And behold, not only do we possess evidence that they are clearly aware of each other, maintaining an indirect dialogue, but we also see how their imagery and their historical patterns have been shaped by that reflected dialogue.<sup>44</sup>

*Translated from Hebrew by Dena Ordan*

*Lublin* (Berlin, 1919), 81.

<sup>40</sup> Y. Grantstein, *Hashevil vehaderekh* (Tel Aviv, 1986), 200.

<sup>41</sup> Aescoly, 'Haḥasidut bepolin', 62.

<sup>42</sup> M. Buber, *For the Sake of Heaven*, trans. L. Lewisohn (Philadelphia, 1953), 298–302.

<sup>43</sup> See n. 11 above.

<sup>44</sup> For additional examples of such concealed polemical dialogues between maskilic and hasidic hagiography, see C. Shmeruk, *Sifrut yidish: perakim letoledoteiha* (Tel Aviv, 1978), 234–60.

THE LITTMAN LIBRARY OF  
JEWISH CIVILIZATION

MANAGING EDITOR  
*Connie Webber*

*Dedicated to the memory of*  
LOUIS THOMAS SIDNEY LITTMAN  
*who founded the Littman Library for the love of God*  
*and as an act of charity in memory of his father*

JOSEPH AARON LITTMAN

יהא זכרם ברוך

*'Get wisdom, get understanding:*  
*Forsake her not and she shall preserve thee'*

PROV. 4: 5

*The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization is a registered UK charity*

**POLIN**  
STUDIES IN POLISH JEWRY

---

VOLUME FIFTEEN  
*Focusing on Jewish Religious Life, 1500–1900*

Edited by  
ANTONY POLONSKY

---

*Published for*  
The Institute for Polish–Jewish Studies  
*and*  
The American Association for Polish–Jewish Studies

Oxford · Portland, Oregon  
The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization

2002