# **OU JERUSALEM CENTRE.**

#### RABBI DR ALAN ABRAHAM KIMCHE

"Great Jewish Thinkers"

## Rabbi Joseph Ber Soloveitchik (1903-1993)

- 1. A most influential and significant Jewish Leader of 20th century.
- 2. a 200 years rabbinical dynasty of both paternal and maternal.
- 3. Named after his great-grandfather the "Beis Halevy" RY Volozhin
- 4. Talmudic training in Russia and academic training in Berlin
- 5. 1932 moved to USA Boston representative of Agudat Yisrael
- 6. 1935 only visit to Israel to submit candidacy for ChR of Tel Aviv
- 7. 1944 Chairman of Mizrachi Religious Zionists of America.
- 8. Rosh Yeshiva University RIETS Rabbical College 1941-1986
- 9. Non-messianic Religious Zionism "Kol Dodi Dofek" 1956
- 10. "Lonely Man of Faith" 1965. Religious Existentialism.

"The Lonely Man of Faith"

Creation of Man in Bereishit Ch.1

כו) וַיִּאמֶר אֶלֹהִים נַעֲשָׁה אָדֶם בְּצַלְמֻנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וִיִרְדּוּ בִדְגַּת הַיָּם וּבְעָוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהַמָּה וּבְכָל־הָאֶֶרֶץ וּבְכָל־הָרֶמֶשׁ הָרֹמֵשׁ עַל־הָאֶרֶץ כז) וַיִּבְרָא אֶלֹהִים! אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמׁוֹ בְּצֵלָם אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם כח) וַיִּבְרָא הֶעֹהִים אֶלֹהִים! אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמׁוֹ בְּצֵלָם אֶלֹהִים בְּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם כח) וַיִּבְרָא הֶעֹהִים אֶלֹהִים! אֶת־הַאָדָם בְּצַלְמׁוֹ בְּצֵלָם אֶלֹהִים בְּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם כח) וַיִּבְרָר אֹתִם אֶלֹהִים! אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמׁוֹ בְּצָלָם אֶלֹהִים פְּרָוּ וּרְבָוּ וּמִלְאַוּ אֶת־הָאָרָץ וְכִבְשֵׁהָ וּרְדּוּ כח) וַיְבָּרָר אֹתָם אֶלֹהִים הָשָׁמִים וּבְכָל־חַיָּה הָרֹמֶשָׁת עַל־הָאָרָץ וִדְרָבוּ וּמִלְאָוּ אֶת־הָאָרָץ וְכִבְשָׁהָ וּרְדָוּ בִּדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשְׁמִים וּבְכָל־חַיָּה הָרֹמֶשָׁת עַל־הָאָרֶץ

### Creation of Man in Bereishit Ch.2

ז) וַיִּיצֶר°יְקָןָּק אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר´מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפָּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיֵּים וַיְהָי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיֵּה

ח) וַיִּטַּע יְקֹוֶק אֶלֹהְים גַּן־בְּעָדֶן מִקֶדֶם וַיָּשָׂם שָׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יֵצְר

כא) וַיַּפֵּל°יְקָןָּק אֱלֹהִיםו תַּרְדֵּמֶה עַל־הָאָדָם וַיִּישָׁן וַיִּלָּח אַחַת מִצַּלְעֹתָיו וַיִּסְגָּר בָּשָׂר תַּחְתֶּנָה

כב) וַיִּבֶן ۠יְקֹוֶק אֶלֹהִיםוּ אֶת־הַצֵּלֶע אֲשֶׁר־לָקַח מִן־הָאָדָם לְאִשֶׁה וַיְבָאֶהָ אֶל־הָאָדָם כג) וַיֹּאמֶר הָאָדָם זַאת הַפַּעַם עֶצֶם מֵעֲצָמֵׁי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרֵי לְזֹאת יִקָּרֵא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ ַלְקָחָה־זְּאַת

כד) עַל־כֵּן יִעֲזָב־אִישׁ אֶת־אָבָיו וְאֶת־אִמָּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתֹּוֹ וְהָיָוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד

\_\_\_\_\_

Rav Soloveitchik proposes that the two accounts of the creation of man (in chapters 1 and 2 of Bereishit) portray two types of man, two human ideals. In their approaches to God, the world and the self.

The first, he calls Adam I, - is guided by the quest for dignity, which is a surface social quality attained by control over one's environment. He is a creative and majestic personality who espouses a practical-utilitarian approach to the world.

Adam II, on the other hand, is guided by the quest for redemption, which is a quality of the depth personality attained by control over oneself. He is humble and submissive, and yearns for an intimate relationship with God and with his fellow man in order to overcome his sense of incompleteness and inadequacy. These differences carry over to the type of community each one creates: the "natural work community" (Adam I) and the "covenantal faith community" (Adam II).

God not only desires the existence of each of these personality types and each of these communities, but actually bids each and every one of us to attempt to embody both of these seemingly irreconcilable types within ourselves. We must attempt to pursue both dignity and redemption. The demand to be both Adam I and Adam II leads to a built-in tension in the life of each person responsive to this call; and because one lives with a constant dialectic, a continual oscillation between two modes of existence, one can never fully realize the goals of either Adam I or Adam II. Unable to feel totally at home in either community, man is burdened by loneliness. Some Important Ideas derived from Adam1 and Adam2 analysis:

- 1. Validating the creative, natural, material, ambitions of Man as part of his Divine legacy as Adam1 create partnerships and groups to build and shape and dominate the world.
- 2. Defining the spiritually sensetive Adam2, who marvels and meditates at on the wonders of Nature seeking the presence of God in every moment and place.
- 3. Adam2 is essentially a Lonely Man of Faith, meeting God alone.
- The contrasting types of communities and friendships made by Adam1 in contrast to Adam2. קנה לך חבר.
- Re-define yetzer hara; that engagement in material benefits and pleasures is an integral part of the Divine intention. בכל דרכך דעהו.
- 6. Contrast sharply with the Christian view that only after The Original Sin was Man driven by material interests, and that to attain a true spiritual life one must abandon materialism, live as a monk or nun in denial of one's physical nature.
- 7. The resolution of the these two dimensions of human nature is not the ability of one to obscure the other, rather it is a dialectic process moving back and forth between these two modes of existence. רצוא ושוב.
- 8. The quality of 'GEVURA' he translates as a form of heroism, contrasted to classic heroes who are making a public display of courage, Adam1 has the inner courage to engage fully in the material world but drawing on his spirituality of Adam2 he is able to resist its seductions and excesses.
- 9. The key to this dialectic is in a different essay by RYBS called 'Halakhic Man'. In which the Man uses the concepts of halakha to reconstruct his world and sees everything in the framework of its halakhic meaning.
- 10. <u>RYBS taught non-messianic religious zionism.</u> In this he followed the views of R.Yitzchak Yaakov Reines (1839 - 1915) who was a founder of the Mizrachi movement but avoided all forms of messianic redemption in his promotion of the Zionist ideal. The contrasting Messianic form of religious zionism goes back to R.Zvi Hirsch Kalischer (1795 - 1874) who wrote extensively of actively bringing the messianic redemption and building the Beit Hamikdash.

#### IN WHAT WAY IS THE MODERN MAN OF FAITH LONELY?

Rav Soloveitchik proposes that the two accounts of the creation of man (in chapters 1 and 2 of Bereishit) portray two types of man, two human ideals. This is a dual call in life.. To BE two incompatible people... This dillema is insoluble.. Its built-in to the soul of man... RYBS proposes no solution. In fact the individual can never resolve this, as he is always either in one state or the other, there is no synthesis or resolution.

The demand to be both Adam I and Adam II leads to a built-in tension in the life of each person responsive to this call; and because one lives with a constant dialectic, a continual oscillation between two modes of existence, one can never fully realize the goals of either Adam I or Adam II. Unable to feel totally at home in either community, man is lonely.

Since this type of loneliness is inherent to one's very being as a religious individual, RYBS terms it "ontological loneliness" (ontological = relating to existence). In a sense, this kind of loneliness is tragic; but since it is willed by God, it helps guide man to realize his destiny and is ultimately a positive and constructive experience.

Contemporary society speaks the language of Adam I, of cultural and material achievement, and is unable or unwilling to understand the language of Adam II, of the uniqueness and autonomy of faith. Worse, contemporary Adam I has infiltrated and appropriated the realm of Adam II; he presents himself as Adam II, while actually distorting covenantal man's entire message.

For instance, whenever Torah, Mitzvot or Judaism in general is prtrayed as being 'good for you', providing tranquility, inner comfort and harmony, solution to discord and hardship, RYBS considered this to be a false ideology, using the language of Adam1, of utilitarian goals, in order to motivate Adam2 who is engaged in spiritual issues. (Lishma and shelo lishma.) A dangerous error to use utilitarian and pragmatic terms to justify a religious life. On the contrary, Religious life is intrinsically valuable without any need to use pragmatic reasons. This becomes a religion of convenience which is self-serving.