

Counterpoint

A dialogue between authors and reviewers

Books reviewed in *Jewish Action*, Summer 5760/2000

The Heroic Struggle

This letter is a response to Schneur Zalman Alpert's review of my book, *The Heroic Struggle*. Alpert is a highly gifted librarian and member of the talented Yeshiva University Library staff. His articles are usually informative and enriched oft times by knowledge not normally accessible to others. His article on Rabbi Shimon Rom, a *rosh hayeshivah* printed in the weekly *Algemeiner Journal* was a three-dimensional depiction worthy of inclusion in any history of RIETS, the yeshivah of Yeshiva University. And his observations have probably disconcerted many complacent authors. However, his recent article was not up to his usual standard.

The opening paragraph asserting a "be-all, end-all" status to the Russian Jewish community would probably provoke vociferous protest from Torah heirs of the Polish, Hungarian, Galician, and German-Jewish communities. His simple citation of Rabbi Chaim of Volozhin would have been enhanced by stressing his conciliatory uniqueness in desisting from the ban against Chassidism, his acceptance of Chassidism in the yeshivah of Volozhin, and his possession of many Chassidic works in his library. This matter has been frequently stressed in written and oral form by Rabbi Dr. Norman Lamm, president of Yeshiva University.

The task of scholarship requires rigorous self-discipline, entailing both inclusion and exclusion. Over-inundation of information can be proverbially like the overabundance of oil "extinguishing the flame of the wick." The late Dr. Brickman, an eminent academician, in his detailed introduction, clearly and effectively depicted the virulent and intensive antagonism of the *Yevsektzia* the Jewish section of

the Communist party, to observant Judaism. Alpert is cavalier and fragmentary, merely stating that there should have been more information. Indeed, the interested scholar can peruse various sources, among them Dr. Zvi Gittelman's highly documented work *Jewish Nationality and Soviet Politics* (Princeton, 1972), who provides an abundance of information regarding the ideological convolutions of this anti-religious organization. However, the primary task of this work was to project to the foreground of the reader's consciousness the rare heroism of a spiritual personality moving through the dark valley of adversity and emerging triumphant. Any extraneous information would have detracted from this purpose.

The book is pervaded by the Lubavitcher Rebbe's multifaceted spiritual and educational leadership. Indeed, his tormentors during interrogation, in enumerating his many activities, commenced by saying, "We are well aware you have used your influence to create a network of *chadarim*, *yeshivos* and other religious institutions throughout the USSR." His involvement with the Joint agency was to obtain funding for many religious institutions in Russia. Included among the photographs there is a document listing many *chadarim* and their budgets under his auspices. Alpert's statement that the reason for the arrest is not apparent is difficult to understand.

Alpert mentions the Leningrad Jewish Communal Council's attempted conference and the Rebbe's opposition to this attempt. He expresses his skepticism to this having linkage with the Rebbe's arrest. Rabbi Sholom Ber Levin, in his work *Toldos Chabad BeRussia HaSovietis 1918-1940* provides us with much important information on this era in general.

In Chapter 19, entitled "Leningrad Conference," he relates that the Leningrad Council consisted of 13 non-observant Jews and 10 observant Jews. It was discovered that the intent of the conference was to introduce an educational program to undermine traditional Judaism for children, to create a revisionist seminary "in harmony with the spirit of the times," and to found houses of prayer with revised prayer books. The traditional members, upon discovering this, immediately broke off from the council and generated large public outcry in defiance of this intention. From a person of dual loyalty, it was learned that a meeting was convened by the non-observant chairman of the Leningrad council, and plans were made to covertly use every means available in this struggle against the Lubavitcher Rebbe. This is seen as one significant factor in the Rebbe's arrest. This work also relates that rabbis from many cities were interrogated by the G.P.U., whether they favored or opposed the convening of this conference. The Lubavitcher Rebbe finally wrote an outspoken letter opposing this gathering and disclaiming any connection with this effort. The text was on his desk when he was arrested by the G.P.U. Hundreds of copies were made of this letter and distributed throughout Russia to create public clamor against this plan, and in this way the conference was pushed off. Indeed, during the prisoner interrogation he was explicitly asked the reason for his opposing the conference, and he replied that only rabbinic authorities can deal with such matters. A paradigm of altruism and *mesiras nefesh* (self-sacrifice), he demanded the same of his followers. A *Chassid* asked if his son should have a *bris*, since the father would be consequently exiled to

Siberia. The Rebbe replied, “*Fur gesundeheit*—travel in good health.”

Alpert mentions a painful American court trial related to the Chabad library. The Chofetz Chaim ethic would have precluded citing this occurrence. He then, with euphemistic innuendo, uses the word “blacklisting” regarding 3 people. In actuality, Chana Schneerson is mentioned twice, and Chaim Lieberman is mentioned 6 times. *The Heroic Struggle* was originally published in the *Uforazto Journal* in 1980, five years before the book trial, and included the arrest incident. The approach to the crib of Barry Gurary was not mentioned in the original version, and obviously is thus unrelated to the book trial. In this context, a public statement to the Chabad community made by the famed Supreme Court lawyer Nat Lewin after the trial’s conclusion is noteworthy. He stated that a highly critical juncture in the book trial was a statement of the Lubavitcher Rebbe’s wife, Chaya Mushka Schneerson. When asked about ownership of the books, she answered, “The books belong to the *Chassidim*. My father belonged to the *Chassidim*.” Indeed, at a later time, Chaim Lieberman made a conciliatory gesture through an intermediary to the Lubavitcher Rebbe, and it was accepted. The first Chabad leader, Rabbi Schneur Zalman, in his classic work *Likkutei Amarim Tanya*, chapter 25, states that every *mitzvah* (action) endures eternally; the 3 individuals obviously have an undeniable place in the history of Chabad.

In the winter of 1985, I went with Rabbi Menachem M. Sasonkin, now the Chabad rabbi of Akron Ohio, as an emissary of *Ezras Achim* to Russia. This pioneering Russian aid organization was in essence a derivative of the work of the Lubavitcher Rebbe more than half a century before. We gave Torah classes in Moscow, Mintz and Leningrad, and also brought *mitzvah* supplies: *tefillin*, *mezuzos*, religious books, etc. One Shabbos morning, I walked in sub-zero weather with a mercifully mild wind chill factor, to the Archipova *shulin* in Moscow. During

the course of the prayers and the removal of the *Sefer Torah*, the cantor’s recitation of the Aramaic *Berich Shmai* stirred my curiosity. Whenever he would recite the word “*Keshot*—truth,” in the phrase “God is *keshot* His Torah is *keshot*, His Prophets are *keshot*” etc. he recited with a throttled gag, barely forcing the words from his mouth. Ever conscious of surveillance, I exchanged very brief Sabbath greetings after the prayers with this individual. Unable to control the impulse, I uttered the word *keshot*. He very briefly murmured, “One person understood.” Unable to express the anguish and rage against harsh religious repression, he cried out to God, with the emphasis on the word *keshot* from the innermost essence of his personality. This to my mind is the essence of *The Heroic Struggle*

Repeatedly, many individuals have spoken of the profound, evocative effect that this work has had upon them, awakening within them the spark of Jewish identity, which Jewish mysticism and Chassidism assert cannot be dimmed or extinguished under any circumstances. It is to be hoped that with the broader distribution of this work, many other lives will be inspired and illuminated by the *keshot* heroism of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, culminating in the collective Messianic redemption of the entire Jewish people.

Rabbi Dr. Alter B. Metzger
Brooklyn, NY

Zalman Alpert responds:

I thank Rabbi Metzger for his kind and generous words concerning my work, and for his interesting response. Permit me to reply to several of his points. In challenging the historical basis of my review, Dr. Metzger refers to two works, namely Dr. William Brickman’s *Jewish Nationality And Soviet Politics* (Princeton:1972) and Rabbi Sholom Ber Levin’s Hebrew monograph *Toldos Chabad BeRusia HaSovietis 1918-1940*. Brickman’s book draws on the author’s personal visits to Russia, and his extensive research in periodical literature relating to the Communist war against Judaism.

Rabbi Levin’s work collects many letters and memoirs from *Lubavitcher Chassidim* in Communist Russia from 1918-1940, yet offers no analysis of these primary sources. Levin’s book is clearly tendentious (as it presents only Chabad sources) and in a phone conversation with me several years ago, Levin stated that his work was to collect and preserve the sources for the future historian to draw upon and write the historical account. Most importantly, Rabbi Metzger fails to realize that since the fall of Communism, the Russian archives have been opened to Western scholars. Thus numerous archival collections relating to the Communist struggle against Judaism and the Lubavitcher Rebbe have been made available to Israeli, Russian and American scholars. Young scholars such as Efim Melamed, Leonid Smilovitsky, Avraham Greenbaum and Michael Beizer, amongst others, have published important articles using Soviet archival material concerning the fate of Judaism in Stalin’s Russia. The material in my review was drawn from Beizer’s important article, *The Leningrad Jewish Religious Community —rFm NEP Through its Liquidation* that appeared in *Jews In Eastern Europe* (No. 28, Winter 1995). Even a casual glance at the notes accompanying the article will show the reader the wealth of archival material used in its preparation. Amongst these collections is a small, but important, police file on the arrest of Reb Chaim Lieberman, the Lubavitcher Rebbe’s personal secretary. Clearly, neither Levin nor Brickman had access to this material. I find it somewhat surprising that a scholar of Dr. Metzger’s caliber is not aware of current scholarship in this field. Other Chabad scholars such as Yehoshua Mundshine, Baruch Oberlander and Saul Shimon Deutsch have availed themselves of these new primary sources for their Chabad historical work.

Rabbi Metzger states, “The Chofetz Chaim ethic would have precluded citing this occurrence” referring to the court battle over ownership of the library of Rabbi Joseph Isaac Schneerson. It was none other than the 7th Lubavitcher

Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson who proclaimed the 5th day of Teves (the day Federal Judge Charles Sifton ruled that the books belonged to Agudath Chasedei Chabad) as an official Chabad holiday (known as “*Didan Notzach!*”) to be celebrated annually with dance, *farbrengens* and joy. This day was to mark the victory of Chabad over Barry Gourary in the Federal courts concerning Rabbi Joseph Schneerson’s library. So it is hardly I who raised the library issue; rather, every year this issue and the subsequent Chabad court victory is celebrated by Chabad communities the world over with special commemorations.

Furthermore I am happy to hear that Rabbi Metzger recognizes the status of people like Rebbetzin Chanah Gourary, Barry Gourary and Reb Chaim Lieberman in Chabad history, yet that is not the attitude of the official Chabad establishment. In *Yemei Chabad* (historic *Days in Chabad*), published by the official Chabad publishing house (Kehot: 1993), we read of the birthdays and *yahrzeits* of Rebbetzin Chaya Mushka Schneerson and Mrs. Shayna Horenstein, but the 270 page book has no mention of their older sister, Rebbetzin Channa Gourary. We learn much about various Schneerson family members who were not *rebbe*s but there is no mention of the sole surviving male descendent of the mainline Schneerson family, Barry Gourary. Needless to say, Reb Chaim Lieberman is not mentioned; so much for “their undeniable place in the history of Chabad.”

Finally, on a personal note, Rabbi Metzger seems to be implying in his letter that I fail to appreciate the significance of the work of Rabbi Joseph Isaac Schneerson in Communist Russia. Nothing could be further from the truth. My own uncle, Rabbi Schneur Zalman Alperowitz (affectionately known as Zalman Kurnitzer) was the *rosh yeshivah* of the central Lubavitcher yeshivah in Nevel, Russia. After the closing of that yeshivah he continued his underground work in spreading Torah in Russia and was a close associate of the Rebbe, until his

death. As much as Rabbi Metzger, I too appreciate the Lubavitcher Rebbe’s work in Soviet Russia.

The Kuzari

I was delighted to read a review of my translation of *The Kuzari* in *Jewish Action*, and even more delighted that it was written by such an expert as Rabbi Chaim Eisen, who has been lecturing on *The Kuzari* for the past 18 years. Admittedly I am a neophyte to *The Kuzari* by comparison, and I therefore humbly submit to his authority on this text.

I read the review mostly with my head nodding in agreement. In my appendix on Greek philosophy at the end of the book, I concur with many of Rabbi Eisen’s conclusions about HaLevi’s attitude toward rational Judaism and his embrace of a more experiential Judaism. I hope to quote from his interpretations in future lectures.

Rabbi Eisen touches on a fundamental issue which divides the academic community and the general public. Academic purists are loathe to accept anything short of the “genuine article,” replete with multiple versions and extensive footnotes referencing the original language. They will go to great lengths to preserve the most literal translation possible, even at the expense of readability. Unfortunately, such works tend to be somewhat tedious and of less appeal to the general public for that very reason. A good example of this is the recent JPS translation of Ralbag’s *Wars of the Lord*, which, while a brilliant technical translation, makes for very difficult reading. My personal feeling is that anyone who would dedicate himself to the laborious chore of working through such a technical translation should also be scholar enough to study the text in its original language.

Nevertheless, I would be delighted if my work prompts those in the academic community, who may be dismayed by my “insubordinate” translation, to render a truly technical translation from the original Arabic. I would certainly welcome such a work and proudly add it to my arsenal of teaching tools.

I would like to briefly respond to two excellent, specific points raised by Rabbi Eisen: 1) Regarding the term “*vehamaskilim yavinu*” — “And the intelligent will understand” at the very beginning of *The Kuzari*: Rabbi Eisen understands this to mean that HaLevi is alluding to the fact that the whole story of the Khazar King’s dream of being visited by an angel is a metaphor to HaLevi’s approach to Judaism — that it should be approached experientially instead of rationally — and that the intelligent reader will realize this metaphor. I enjoy this *pshat*, and would agree that it *may* altogether be what HaLevi had in mind when he wrote those words, speculative as that may be. But I would also point out that several other approaches have been suggested for these words, none of which seems in my mind to be less acceptable than Rabbi Eisen’s. Rabbi Yehuda Moscato, in his commentary *Kol Yehuda* (published in 1594), offers three possible explanations, each different from Rabbi Eisen’s. And Rabbi Yisrael HaLevi Zamushitz, in his commentary *Otzar Nechmad* (published in 1795), translates this phrase to mean that the arguments between the Rabbi and the King will be “beneficial to those of understanding to ensconce these concepts in their hearts.”

Rabbi Eisen suggests that my translation, “Perceptive readers will gain much understanding from them [these arguments],” is too non-literal because “one wonders to what extent Rabbi Korobkin’s more approachable adaptation preserves the author’s intent.” This is only true if the author’s intent is Rabbi Eisen’s understanding of the phrase. But other interpretations exist which are perfectly consistent with my translation. While I fully accept the fact that the translation is non-literal and based on commentary, I don’t think it should be criticized because it doesn’t conform to Rabbi Eisen’s personal interpretation of HaLevi’s words. And as Rabbi Eisen himself acknowledged, a translator must sometimes take liberties with literalness in order to provide a more fluid text. This, I believe, is especially true when I rely on the two

“*edim nèmanim*” – the widely accepted commentaries of *Kol Yehuda* and *Otzar Nechmad* for my translation.

2) Regarding HaLevi’s view of the *mitzvah* of living in *Eretz Israel*: I am very grateful to Rabbi Eisen for pointing out my mistranslation of the word *chova* (obligation), based upon my usage of the Warsaw edition of *The Kuzari* for that particular phrase. The word was read and explained as *chibat* (affection) by *Otzar Nechmad* (not *Kol Yehuda*, as Rabbi Eisen states based on another misprint from the old edition!) While I did regularly cross-reference other texts for accuracy, this phrase apparently got by without my notice. I welcome such corrections from other readers, so that all such errors in translation, as well as typographical errors, will be corrected in future editions. (Please send all such corrections to rabbidanny@enter.net)

However, I would disagree with Rabbi Eisen when he states that this mistranslation has “crucial halachic consequences.” Whether one translates the passage as “The obligation of your Torah” or “affection of your Torah” one cannot derive from that phrase *alone* what HaLevi’s stance is on the *mitzvah* to live in *Eretz Yisrael*. This paragraph is said by the Khazar King, and not the Rabbi; it can therefore not be considered an authoritative statement of Torah doctrine, as HaLevi portrays the King as a newcomer to Judaism and subject to error over basic concepts. (See, for example, 3:50, where the King erroneously states that the institution of *eruv* is a violation of a *mitzvah d’orayta*, not to carry on the Sabbath.)

Irrespective of this one phrase, however, HaLevi’s position on the *mitzvah* of living in *Eretz Yisrael* is indisputable, as Rabbi Eisen himself points out, from the response of the Rabbi in the following paragraph and from other places, especially at the end of the final essay. It becomes clear that HaLevi’s position is that it is most definitely a *mitzvah* to live in *Eretz Yisrael*, and that Diaspora Jews are hypocrites for bowing toward Israel while not making any effort toward

aliyah. In my appendix, “On Living in Israel,” I did not spell this out explicitly because it was clearly stated in the text. Based on Rabbi Eisen’s comments, however, I hope to emphasize this point more clearly in future editions.

Rabbi Eisen also called into question my inclusion in the appendix of Rav Moshe Feinstein’s novel responsum (*Even HaEzer* 1:102), which states that the *mitzvah* of living in Israel is a “*mitzvah kiyumi*” (a non-obligatory *mitzvah*) and not a “*mitzvah chiyuvi*” (an obligatory *mitzvah*). My intention in including this responsum was *not*, as Rabbi Eisen assumes, to align Rav Moshe with Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s position. It was rather to assuage the curiosity and genuine concern of the Diaspora reader (for whom this English edition was primarily meant) over the seeming hypocrisy of scores of Torah leaders who insist on living in *galut* instead of making *aliyah*. This seeming hypocrisy is only heightened after reading *The Kuzari*, and I therefore felt the responsibility to at least offer some level of reconciliation to the Diaspora Jew.

Readers may be interested to note that Rav Moshe’s *teshuvah* has fallen under heavy attack by many religious Zionist scholars, because Rav Moshe states that he is following the *psak* of Ramban, who, at face value, seems to clearly state (in his addenda to Rambam’s *Sefer HaMitzvo* 4) that it is a *mitzvah chiyuvi*. A very interesting and exhaustive discussion can be found in *MeAfar Kumiby* Tzvi Glatt (1981: *Keren Tzvi Menachem*), a young yeshivah student who was murdered *al kiddush Hashem* in Chevron several years ago. In chapter 5 of the halachic section of his book, Glatt vigorously argues that both Ramban and Rambam maintain the *mitzvah* of *aliyah* to be a *mitzvah chiyuvi*, and therefore contests Rav Moshe’s *psak*. When the book was being published posthumously, Rav Moshe was asked to give his approbation to this *sefer*. In his characteristic humility he agreed, but in the approbation he wrote: “Even though from a halachic standpoint I maintain

my original position [that living in Israel is only a *mitzvah kiyumi*], and even though I believe the author has overstated his case, it is nevertheless worthwhile to print and read this book, to increase Torah study and to beautify it through deliberations over these matters.”

Many of the questions that Glatt poses to Rav Moshe based on Ramban’s and Rambam’s language can be similarly leveled at him based on HaLevi’s language in *The Kuzari*. Accordingly, we can only speculate what Rav Moshe would have said about HaLevi’s position regarding the *kiyum*/*chiyuv* issue. Regardless, neither *The Kuzari* nor my translation of *The Kuzari* offers any definitive “practical halachic implications of this position for Diaspora Jewry” for the following reason: If, after noting the very strong and explicit language of Ramban (an analysis of which is beyond the scope of this letter), Rav Moshe could still conclude that the *mitzvah* is only a *mitzvah kiyumi*, he could certainly argue that *The Kuzari*’s definition of a *mitzvah* is also a *mitzvah kiyumi*— even with the correct translation of the word *chovat*. Rabbi Eisen will also note that in halachic discussions of the *mitzvah* of *aliyah*, such as in Glatt’s book, HaLevi is not prominently cited, simply because *The Kuzari*, while cited as a foundation for religious Zionist *hashkafah*, is not considered or used as a *halachic* treatise. The simple bottom line is that there is a plethora of *rishonim* who say the same thing as HaLevi in more precise halachic language, albeit not as passionately or poetically as HaLevi. This is why any “halachic” derivations which can or cannot be made from one word in *The Kuzari* are, in my opinion, overblown.

Once again, I thank Rabbi Eisen for lending his time and expertise to review my translation. I hope that Rabbi Eisen’s article will stimulate further discussion and study of *The Kuzari*, and I look forward to learning more about *The Kuzari* from him in person some time in the future.

Rabbi N. Daniel Korobkin
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Rabbi Eisen responds:

First, I thank Rabbi Korobkin for his constructive comments on my review. I am, of course, gratified that he concurs with many of my conclusions. I, too, look forward to our meeting one another in person to discuss *Sefer HaKuzari* at much greater length. Simultaneously, however, I feel obliged to clarify the two specific points regarding which Rabbi Korobkin commented.

Concerning the first point, as Rabbi Korobkin notes, I touched upon the issue of literalism in translations in general in my review. I certainly endeavored to present a balanced perspective on the considerations militating both for and against attempts at literal, scholarly precision, which inevitably, to some extent, compromise readability. As I noted, “The comparison between the styles of the *ibn Tibbon* and *al-Charizi* renditions [of *Moreh HaNevochim*] aptly illustrates the predicament of the translator who strives to be *both* readable *and* right.”

In particular, regarding the expression “*vehamaskilim yavinu*” (Daniel 12:10) in *Sefer HaKuzari*'s preface, I stated, “Rabbi Korobkin evidently grappled with these words, rendering them, ‘Hopefully, perceptive readers will gain much understanding from [the rabbi’s arguments]’ (p. 2). The dilemma of the translator as interpreter, outlined above, is clearly manifest. On the one hand, a literal rendition (‘but the intelligent will understand’) sounds relatively recondite. On the other hand, while it is surely a vast improvement over the 1905 edition’s glaring omission, one wonders to what extent Rabbi Korobkin’s more approachable adaptation preserves the author’s intent.” It was explicitly *not* my object to advocate a translation that supports my — or anyone else’s — interpretation. I merely noted that, by opting for an interpretive adaptation rather than a more faithful rendering, Rabbi Korobkin has guided the reader to only *one* particular interpretation that may or may not retain the author’s intentions and the profound, multifaceted complexity of his work.

Concerning the second point — Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s usage of the term “obligations of your Torah” in describing the mandate to live in *Eretz Yisrael* — Rabbi Korobkin rightly comments that “one cannot derive from that phrase *alone* what HaLevi’s stance is on the *mitzvah* to live in *Eretz Yisrael*. This paragraph is said by the Khazar King and not the Rabbi; it can therefore not be considered an authoritative statement of Torah doctrine.” However, whenever Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi uses the King to present an erroneous impression or conclusion regarding Judaism, the Jewish sage swiftly rebuts it. Here, as I noted, “The sage’s reply, unconditionally admitting his (and our) ‘sin’ and conceding the resultant hypocrisy of our liturgical references to ‘*Tzion*’ (2:24), certainly leaves no room for doubt regarding Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s position.... *Aliyah* is an ‘obligation of your Torah,’ not merely an option.”

As for Rabbi Moshe Feinstein’s responsum, I humbly join Rabbi Korobkin in referring the reader to both the original responsum in *Iggerot Moshe* and the comments of Tzvi Glatt in *MeAfar Kumi*. I must observe, however, that it is explicitly from Rambam’s ruling alone (in *Mishneh Torah, Hilchot Melachim* 5:9) that Rabbi Feinstein derives that the *mitzvah* of dwelling in *Eretz Yisrael* “is not mandatory; rather, when one dwells there, one fulfills a *mitzvah*.” (Of course, I should add that any truly religious Jew seeks opportunities to fulfill God’s manifestly expressed will — indisputably confirmed regarding the *mitzvah* of dwelling in *Eretz Yisrael* — even without a quantifiable mandate.) In any case, while Tzvi Glatt disputes even this interpretation of Rambam’s ruling, it is surely untenable to imagine any analogous interpretation of Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s emphatically unambiguous language. I must also note that, contrary to Rabbi Korobkin’s claim, I never “called into question” his inclusion of Rabbi Feinstein’s responsum, nor did I assume that its incorporation was intended “to align” it with Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s position. Rather, my point was that, in

an appendix dedicated to the subject, “it seems inappropriate, particularly in an edition of *Sefer HaKuzari*, to ignore Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s (earlier) ruling, which explicitly differs.”

Finally, I must take exception to Rabbi Korobkin’s implication that we should sever the bonds between Jewish law and Jewish thought and regard *Sefer HaKuzari* as relevant only to the latter. As Rabbi Shelomoh Yosef Zevin writes, in his essay “*HaKuzari BaHalachah*” (published in his “*LeOr HaHalachah*” [*Yerushalayim: Beit Hillel*, 1957], pp. 281-301), no such dichotomy exists in the Talmud (or the Bible). Besides listing myriad references to *halachot* in *Sefer HaKuzari*, Rabbi Zevin notes a number of major halachic issues that Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi analyzes with great precision, which are cited — with referral to *Sefer HaKuzari* — by major halachic authorities. (Apart from the *mitzvah* of dwelling in *Eretz Yisrael*, Rabbi Yehudah HaLevi’s detailed discussion of the halachic date line [2:20], cited by Rabbi Avraham Yeshayahu Karelitz [*Chazon Ish*], deserves special mention.) In light of these references and others, we should reaffirm that serious study of *Sefer HaKuzari* — like that of all the great classics of Jewish thought — demands diligent consideration of not only its conceptual ramifications but its practical implications as well.

Again, I thank Rabbi Korobkin for his constructive comments. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to “discuss” these issues with him in the pages of *Jewish Action* and I look forward to continuing the dialogue between us in the future. **JA**

Correction

The review of *The Rav: The World of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik* which appeared in the Fall issue erroneously stated that both the book and the tape (both by Rabbi Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff) referred to the Rav’s height as 6’2”. In fact, only the tape contains that information, which was correctly stated in the reviewer’s original text.