

F60.2 [301.7]

Z65.3 [V62.5]

Antisocial personality disorder  
Arrest for ATM fraud

### **F60.3 [301.83] Borderline Personality Disorder**

Throughout their adult lives, people with borderline PD (BPD) appear unstable. They're often at the crisis point as regards mood, behavior, or interpersonal relationships. Many feel empty and bored; they attach themselves strongly to others, then become intensely angry or hostile when they believe they are being ignored or mistreated by those they depend on. They may impulsively try to harm or mutilate themselves; these actions are expressions of anger, cries for help, or attempts to numb themselves to their emotional pain. Although patients with BPD may experience brief psychotic episodes, these resolve so quickly that they are seldom confused with psychoses like schizophrenia. Intense and rapid mood swings, impulsivity, and unstable interpersonal relationships make it difficult for these patients to achieve their full potential socially, at work, or in school.

BPD runs in families. These people are truly miserable—so much so that up to 10% complete suicide.

---

The concept of BPD was devised about the middle of the 20th century. These patients were originally (and sometimes still are) said to hover between neurosis and psychosis—a “borderline” whose existence is disputed by many clinicians. As the concept has evolved into a PD, it has achieved remarkable popularity, perhaps because so many patients can be shoehorned into its capacious definition.

Although 1–2% of the general population may legitimately qualify for a diagnosis of BPD, it is probably applied to a far greater proportion of the patients who seek mental health care. It may still be one of the most overdiagnosed conditions in the diagnostic manuals. Many of these patients have other disorders that are more readily treatable; these include major depressive disorder, somatic symptom disorder, and substance-related disorders.

---

### **Essential Features of Borderline Personality Disorder**

These patients exist in a perpetual crisis of mood or behavior. They often feel empty and bored. Disturbed identity (insecure self-image) can lead them to attach themselves strongly to others and then reject these same people with equal vigor. On the other hand, they may frantically try to avert desertion (it can be actual or fantasied). Pronounced impulsiveness can lead them to harm or mutilate themselves or to engage in other potentially harmful behaviors, such as sexual indiscretions, spending sprees, eating binges, or reckless driving. Although stress can cause brief episodes of

## PERSONALITY DISORDERS

dissociation or paranoia, these quickly resolve. Intense, rapid mood swings may yield to anger that is inappropriate and uncontrolled.

### The Fine Print

**The D's:** • Duration (begins in teens or early 20s and endures) • Diffuse contexts  
• Differential diagnosis (physical and substance use disorders, mood and psychotic disorders, other PDs)

### Josephine Armitage

"I'm cutting myself!" The voice on the telephone was high-pitched and quavering. "I'm cutting myself right now! Ow! There, I've started." The voice howled with pain and rage.

Twenty minutes later, the clinician had Josephine's address and her promise that she would come in to the emergency room right away. Two hours later, her left forearm swathed in bandages, Josephine Armitage was sitting in an office in the mental health department. Criss-crossing scars furrowed her right arm from wrist to elbow. She was 33, a bit overweight, and chewing gum.

"I feel a lot better," she said with a smile. "I really think you saved my life."

The clinician glanced at her nonswathed arm. "This isn't the first time, is it?"

"I should think that would be pretty obvious. Are you going to be terminally dense, just like my last shrink?" She scowled and turned 90 degrees to look at the wall. "Sheesh!"

Her previous therapist had seen Josephine for a reduced fee, but had been unable to give her more time when she requested it. She had responded by letting the air out of all four tires of that clinician's new BMW.

Her current trouble was with her boyfriend. One of her girlfriends had been "I'd seen James with another girl yesterday morn-

can see that life is just unbearable for you. You really can't take care of yourself any more. Perhaps therapy is too difficult at this point in your life. Do you think I should just take over for you for the time being? Perhaps I should send the police or an aid car to get you. Maybe this is the wrong program for you? Should we explore taking a break?" Or, more irreverently, "Perhaps staying in bed for 6 months is a good idea."

All DBT strategies are arranged to highlight their dialectical character. As shown in Figure 7.1, strategies can be categorized as primarily emphasizing change or acceptance. Many treatment impasses result from the therapist's failing to balance treatment strategies on one side (change or acceptance) with their polar counterparts. The categorization is artificial, since in many ways every strategy comprises both acceptance and change. Indeed, the best strategies are those that clearly combine the two, as I found in dealing with one patient who was referred to me. At the time of her referral, her options were to get into treatment with me or to be committed involuntarily to a state hospital (yet again). The patient repeatedly engaged in parasuicidal behavior and had burned out almost all mental health resources in the Seattle area. Her behavior seemed out of control. Her inpatient physicians were trying to get her involuntarily committed; the nurses were trying to get her into a program with me. At our first appointment, I told her that she was the perfect kind of person for our program and I would accept her into therapy (an acceptance strategy), but only if she agreed to work on changing her suicidal behavior (a change strategy). She was free to choose therapy with me or not (letting go), but I was also free to choose whether to work with her or not (control). The aspects of change and acceptance are discussed in more detail later.

## TEACHING DIALECTICAL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

Throughout therapy, an emphasis is put on dialectical reasoning, both on the part of the therapist and as a style of thinking taught to patients. Dialectical reasoning requires the individual to assume an active role, to let go of logical reasoning and intellectual analysis as the only route to truth, and to embrace experiential knowledge. Meanings are generated and new relationships are found by opposing any term or proposition with its opposite or an alternative. The primary message to be communicated to the patient is that concerning every subject, opposite statements are possible. The dialectical therapist helps the patient achieve syntheses of oppositions, rather than focusing on verifying either side of an oppositional argument. The therapist helps the patient move from "either-or" to "both-and." Thus, many statements should be closely followed by their inherent opposites with the therapist modeling for the patient the ambiguity and inconsistency that reside therein. The key here is not to invalidate the first idea or polarity by asserting the second. The position is "Yes, but also. . ." rather than "Yes, but no, I was mistaken."

A similar position is adopted with respect to action and emotional

responses. Two ideas are important here. The first is that the possibilities for personal and social change do not emerge from some point outside of or transcendent to the system, but lie within the existing contradictions of each specific social context (Sipe, 1986). The person and the environment both challenge and limit each other reciprocally. Change, both in the person and in her social context, involves refinements and transformations of current capacities in light of these challenges and limits (Mahoney, 1991).

The second idea is that extremes and rigid behavior patterns are signals that a dialectic has not been achieved. Thus, a middle path, similar to that advocated in Buddhism, is advocated and modeled: "The important thing in following the path to Enlightenment is to avoid being caught and entangled in any extreme, that is, always to follow the Middle Way" (Kyokai, 1966). This point holds for therapist and patient alike. Thus, the therapist should not hold to flexibility in a rigid fashion or avoid extremes at all costs. As Robert Aitken, a Zen master, has said, we must even "be detached from our non-attachment" (Aitken, 1987 p. 40).

Dialectics, from the point of view of behavior, can be most clearly seen in the treatment targets advocated in DBT. The DBT behavioral skills are good examples here. Emotion regulation is balanced with mindfulness, where the emphasis is on observing, describing, and participating, instead of regulating emotional or any other experience. Even in the teaching of emotional control, both distraction and control of attention on the one hand, and experiencing with attention and letting go of control on the other, are advocated. Interpersonal effectiveness focuses on changing problematic situations; by contrast, distress tolerance emphasizes accepting problematic situations.

## SPECIFIC DIALECTICAL STRATEGIES

Specific techniques that target the therapist–patient relationship and dialectical behavior patterns are described below and summarized in the bottom half of Table 7.1. Although I believe that each of these strategies can be described in strictly behavioral terms, I have not attempted to translate from dialectical discourse to behavioral terms in every instance. It would, it seems, violate the spirit of the dialectics I am trying to convey.

### I. ENTERING THE PARADOX

Allen Frances (1988) once said that one of the first and most important tasks in psychotherapy with borderline patients is to get their attention. "Entering the paradox" is a powerful way to do just that. It works, in part, because the paradox contains within itself surprise; like humor, it presents the unexpected. When confronted with a paradox, one has to sit up and take notice. Entering the paradox is a strategy much like *koan* practice for the Zen student. *Koans* are dilemmas or enigmatic stories that Zen students are given to solve, they force to students to

responses. Two ideas are important here. The first is that the possibilities for personal and social change do not emerge from some point outside of or transcendent to the system, but lie within the existing contradictions of each specific social context (Sipe, 1986). The person and the environment both challenge and limit each other reciprocally. Change, both in the person and in her social context, involves refinements and transformations of current capacities in light of these challenges and limits (Mahoney, 1991).

The second idea is that extremes and rigid behavior patterns are signals that a dialectic has not been achieved. Thus, a middle path, similar to that advocated in Buddhism, is advocated and modeled: "The important thing in following the path to Enlightenment is to avoid being caught and entangled in any extreme, that is, always to follow the Middle Way" (Kyokai, 1966). This point holds for therapist and patient alike. Thus, the therapist should not hold to flexibility in a rigid fashion or avoid extremes at all costs. As Robert Aitken, a Zen master, has said, we must even "be detached from our non-attachment" (Aitken, 1987 p. 40).

Dialectics, from the point of view of behavior, can be most clearly seen in the treatment targets advocated in DBT. The DBT behavioral skills are good examples here. Emotion regulation is balanced with mindfulness, where the emphasis is on observing, describing, and participating, instead of regulating emotional or any other experience. Even in the teaching of emotional control, both distraction and control of attention on the one hand, and experiencing with attention and letting go of control on the other, are advocated. Interpersonal effectiveness focuses on changing problematic situations; by contrast, distress tolerance emphasizes accepting problematic situations.

## SPECIFIC DIALECTICAL STRATEGIES

Specific techniques that target the therapist-patient relationship and dialectical behavior patterns are described below and summarized in the bottom half of Table 7.1. Although I believe that each of these strategies can be described in strictly behavioral terms, I have not attempted to translate from dialectical discourse to behavioral terms in every instance. It would, it seems, violate the spirit of the dialectics I am trying to convey.

### I. ENTERING THE PARADOX

Allen Frances (1988) once said that one of the first and most important tasks in psychotherapy with borderline patients is to get their attention. "Entering the paradox" is a powerful way to do just that. It works, in part, because paradox contains within itself surprise; like humor, it presents the unexpected. When confronted with a paradox, one has to sit up and take notice. Entering the paradox is a strategy much like *koan* practice for the Zen student. *Koans* are dilemmas or enigmatic stories that Zen students are given to solve, even though there seem to be no logical answers; they force to students to

- T BALANCES TREATMENT STRATEGIES**
- \_\_\_ T alternates between acceptance and change strategies in such a way that a collaborative working relationship is maintained in the session.
  - \_\_\_ T balances nurturing the patient with demanding that the patient help herself.
  - \_\_\_ T balances persistence and stability with flexibility.
  - \_\_\_ T balances focus on capabilities with focus on limitations and deficits.
  - \_\_\_ T moves with speed, keeping P slightly off balance.
  - \_\_\_ T is awake, responsive to P's movements.
  - \_\_\_ T takes positions whole-heartedly.
- T MODELS dialectical thinking and behaviors.**
- \_\_\_ T looks for what is not included in P's and own points of view.
  - \_\_\_ T gives developmental descriptions of change.
  - \_\_\_ T questions permanence and intransigence of boundary conditions of the problem.
  - \_\_\_ T makes synthesizing statements, including aspects of both ends of the continuum.
  - \_\_\_ T makes statements highlighting the importance of interrelationships in determining identity.
  - \_\_\_ T advocates a middle path,
- T highlights PARADOXICAL contradictions of the following:**
- \_\_\_ P's own behavior.
  - \_\_\_ The therapeutic process.
  - \_\_\_ Reality in general.
- \_\_\_ T speaks in METAPHORS and tells parables and stories.
  - \_\_\_ T plays the DEVIL'S ADVOCATE.
  - \_\_\_ T EXTENDS the seriousness or implications of P's communication.
  - \_\_\_ T helps P activate "WISE MIND."
  - \_\_\_ T makes LEMONADE out of lemons.
  - \_\_\_ T allows NATURAL CHANGES in therapy.
  - \_\_\_ T ASSESSES DIALECTICALLY, examining both the individual and the broader social context, for an understanding of P.

*Note.* In this checklist and those in the chapters to follow, T refers to the therapist and P to the patient.

go beyond intellectual understanding to direct experiential knowledge. Knowing how sugar tastes by reading about its taste qualities in a book is very different from knowing how sugar tastes by directly experiencing sugar on one's tongue. The solution to a *koan* is not logical or intellectual. It is an experience.

In this therapeutic strategy, the therapist highlights for the patient the paradoxical contradictions of the patient's own behavior, of the therapeutic process, and of reality in general. The patient's attempts at rational explanations of a paradox meet silence, another question from the therapist, or a story or slightly different paradox that may throw some (but not too much) light on the enigma to be solved. Suler (1989) suggests that a *koan* "becomes a desperate struggle around personal issues, including the personal conflicts

that led the student to Zen. It is a struggle for one's very life" (p. 223). So, too, a therapeutic paradox well constructed and highlighted becomes for the borderline patient a struggle for life. Innumerable paradoxical dilemmas that take on life-and-death qualities typically arise in therapy with a borderline patient. For example, the therapist may say, "If I didn't care for you, I would try to save you." The patient says, "How can you say you care for me if you won't save me when I am so desperate?" The ultimate synthesis here is "You are already saved." However, interim insights have to do with the fact that, in reality, the therapist can not save the patient. Trying to do so, therefore, would divert therapy into pseudo-help rather than the real help that the patient needs. Also, even if the therapist could save the patient in the current moment, it takes infinitely more care and patience for the therapist to help the patient save herself than for the therapist to rescue the patient.

Another example has to do with the typical borderline patient's perennial dilemma of deciding who is right and who is wrong whenever a disagreement or confrontation arises. The idea that the answer is both (or neither) is difficult for the patient to grasp. Often, the therapeutic relationship is the first one the patient has ever been in where, during a confrontation, the other person asserts that "I'm OK and you're OK." In particular—and this is a crucial point—the therapist in DBT often validates the patient's point, but simultaneously does not "give in" or change his or her behavior. For example, in the strategy of observing limits (see Chapter 10), the therapist validates the patient's need ("Yes, it would be better for you if I were not going out of town this weekend") while meanwhile continuing with plans to go out of town. The patient is portrayed as the "good guy" ("You really do need what you say you do"), but so is therapist ("And I'm still OK for not giving it to you and going out of town").

The essence of the strategy of entering the paradox, however, is the therapist's refusal to step in with logic or intellectual explanation to pull the patient out of the struggle. As Suler (1989) goes on to state, "The cracking open of the double-binding self-contradiction and the insightful reframing of one's crisis can only occur if, in the words of Zen, one 'lets go of the hold' . . . letting things happen of their own accord" (p. 223). Some paradoxes inherent in psychotherapy and in the life of a borderline patient may take years to resolve.

By entering the paradox, the therapist continually stresses to the patient that things can both be true and not true, that an answer can be both yes and no. The therapist is not drawn into the patient's wish to assert one side of an oppositional argument as absolutely true, to the exclusion of the truth of the oppositional point of view. Neither does the therapist unconditionally assert the other side of the argument. The therapist continues to maintain that both sides can be true and that an answer to any question can be both yes and no. As noted earlier, "both-and" is offered as an alternative to "either-or." The therapist need not be overly concerned about clearing up the patient's confusion about this; the confusion will clear up as the patient becomes more comfortable with the dialectical approach. To return to the teeter-

totter metaphor, when the patient sits on the very end of one side of the teeter-totter, the therapist both sits at the other end to provide balance and simultaneously focuses attention on the oneness of the teeter-totter.

A central paradox of DBT and all therapies is that all behavior is "good," yet the patient is in therapy to change "bad" behavior. DBT stresses validation of a patient's responses, but only to counter the invalidation she has been exposed to. Validation is a strategic necessity. As long as the patient (or the therapist) is mired in invalidation or in validation, she cannot see that the dichotomy itself is an artificial one. Behavior is neither valid nor invalid, neither good nor bad. Once the balance is achieved, both therapist and patient must move to a position of neither validation nor invalidation. Responses simply are. They arise as a consequence of causes and conditions that are both past and immediate, and that are both internal and external to the person. In turn, responses have consequences, which may either be desired or not.

The paradox of change versus acceptance runs throughout therapy. Entering the paradox, the therapist highlights and amplifies the seeming incongruity that even the inability to accept must be accepted. (As we say to patients, "Don't judge judging.") A patient is exhorted to accept herself just as she is in the moment. But, of course, if she does that, she will have changed substantially; indeed, the very admonition to learn to accept conveys a nonacceptance of the status quo. The patient is told that she is perfect just as she is, neither good nor bad, and completely understandable, yet she must change her behavior patterns. In this way, the therapist heightens the naturally arising dialectical tensions facing the patient, so that she has no way out other than to move away from the extremes. Patrick Hawk, a master of Zen and Christian contemplation, suggests that "*Koans* are themes to be clarified in engagement with one's teacher. . . . This act of making clear is called realization" (personal communication, 1992). In DBT, as in Zen, clarification and realization are arrived at via the engagement of the student/patient with the teacher/therapist. In particular, the therapist must enter the multiple paradoxes the patient encounters in trying to solve the dialectical dilemmas of extreme vulnerability versus invalidating the vulnerability; unrelenting crises versus blocking and inhibiting the experience of the emotional components of the crises; and a passive inability to resolve problems and painful emotional states versus apparent independence, invulnerability, and competence.

A number of dialectical tensions arise naturally in the course of the psychotherapy relationship. The patient is free to choose her own behavior, but she can not stay in therapy if she does not choose to reduce suicidal behaviors. The patient is taught to achieve greater self-efficacy by becoming better at asking for and receiving help from others. The patient has a right to kill herself, but if she ever convinces the therapist that suicide is imminent, she may be locked up. The therapist is paid to care for the patient, but the patient's doubts about the genuineness of the therapist's caring are usually interpreted as instances of the patient's problems showing up in the therapeutic relationship. And if the patient stops paying, the therapy stops. The therapist is both



detached and intimate, modeling autonomy and independence, yet encouraging attachment and dependence on the part of the patient. The patient is not responsible for being the way she is, but she is responsible for what she becomes.

The patient is urged to get in control of excessive attempts to control. The therapist uses highly controlling techniques to increase the patient's freedom. Struggling with, confronting, and breaking through these paradoxes forces the patient to let go of rigid patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior so that more spontaneous and flexible patterns may emerge. Likewise, genuine entering of the paradox, within both the therapeutic relationship and the consultation group, forces the therapist to let go of rigid theoretical positions and inflexible therapy rules, regulations, and patterns of action.

## 2. THE USE OF METAPHOR

The use of metaphor and storytelling has been stressed by many psychotherapists, most notably by Milton Erickson, who was famous for his teaching stories (Rosen, 1982). Likewise, the use of metaphor, in the form of simple analogies, anecdotes, parables, myths, or stories, is extremely important in DBT. Metaphors are alternative means of teaching dialectical thinking and opening up possibilities of new behaviors. They encourage both patient and therapist to look for and create alternate meanings and points of reference for events under scrutiny. Ones from which multiple meanings can be drawn are usually the most effective in encouraging different views of reality.

As many other writers have discussed (Barker, 1985; Deikman, 1982; Kopp, 1971), the use of metaphor is a valuable strategy in psychotherapy for a number of reasons. Stories are usually more interesting and easier to remember than straight lecturing or instruction. Thus, a person whose attention wanders when she is presented with behavioral information or instruction, may find it much easier to attend to a story. Stories also allow an individual to use them in her own way, for her own purposes. Thus, the sense of being controlled by the therapist or teacher is lessened, and the patient may be more relaxed and open to a new way of thinking or behaving; she is thus less likely to stop listening immediately or to feel overwhelmed. She can take from the story what she can use, either immediately or at a later point. Finally, metaphors, when constructed properly, can be less threatening to the individual. Points can be made indirectly, in a way that softens their impact.

The use of stories can be especially helpful when the therapist is trying to communicate the harmful effects of the patient's behavior on others in a way that normalizes the responses of others while not directly criticizing the patient. They can also be useful in talking about the therapist's own responses (especially when the therapist's own motivation to continue working is flagging), or in telling the patient what she can expect from the therapist. Metaphors can also redefine, reframe, and suggest solutions to problems; help the patient recognize aspects of her own behavior in or reactions to situa-

## Validation

How to do it???

Validation does NOT mean that you AGREE or APPROVE of behavior.  
In fact, **validation is non-judgmental.**

### Validation Strategies:

1. **Focus on the inherent worth of the person**, whether it is yourself or someone else.
2. **Observe**—Listen carefully to what is said with words, expression, and body. Intently listen, be one-mindful in the moment.

If you are self-validating, ***honor your experience by sitting quietly with it***, knowing it for at least a few moments.

If you are validating someone else, use good eye contact, nod, be one-mindful in your focus on them.

3. **Describe—Non-judgmentally state the facts of the situation.**
4. **State the unstated**—Note the presence of feelings, beliefs, etc. that have not been voiced: “You seem to feel angry, but also hurt by what that person said to you.”

If validating yourself, identify primary emotions. If anger is obvious, explore your feelings of any shame, hurt, or disappointment that may be hiding beneath.

5. **Find what is true/valid about the experience** and note this. Without feeling that you have to agree or approve of the experience, find a piece of it that makes perfect sense, and validate this.

If validating yourself, perhaps you realize that the thoughts you are having are “irrational”, however, validate that they exist and are powerful in the moment.

If validating someone else, even if you disagree with their behavior, find something that you can empathize with—“When you get that angry, you want to strike out at someone.”

# שער יהוד ז"ג ותו"הא כ

דייקא והתקשרותם זה בזה הכל הוא בכח' **פלא** אשר לא  
מושג זה בכח' השנה בכח' פנימיות יחודם המתגלה בתוכם  
דהיינו קישורים ויחודם הגלתי בכח' פנימיות התכמה והחסר  
אשר נגלה בתוכם יחודו ית' כ"א כח כליהם הוא בכח' **פלא**  
וכח נסתר והוא מצד רצונו ית' שאינו מושג בשום חכמה ושכל  
נמצא כח זה הוא מקיף עליהם ועל כח הפלא הזה שהוא רצונו  
ית' מקיף בחי' עתיק שהוא רדל"א דהיינו כי אמת שכל הכח'  
הג"ל הטה מצד רצונו ית' בכח' **פלא** אבל הרצון הזה שהוא  
הפלא אינו בכח' הש' כי אין לתאר אליו רצון הסודה על  
איוה התפעלות בכח' השתנות בכחו ית' גם בחי' פלא לא  
יתואר כ"א על ב' בחי' דהיינו למשל התקשרות הנפש עם  
הגוף הוא בכח' **פלא** כמאמ' ומפליא לעשות שמקשר הגשמיני  
ברוחניות אשר המה אינם בגודל' החוקים ונכדלים באין  
ערך זה לזה ואעפ"כ מתקשרים הוא **פלא** וכן המה כל הפלאים  
בקישור העולמות ובהתגלותם הוא בחי' **פלא** אין יתהוה  
הגבול מכלתי בע"ג וכמ"ש נפלאים מעשיך נמצא כל הפלא  
הוא מצד כ' בחי' מהופכים ואעפ"כ יתקשרו אבל מאחר שהוא  
לברו ית' ואין לתאר אליו ית' שום בחי' מצד כוחו ית' אשר  
הוא לברו ית' א"א לתאר אליו ית' אפי' בחי' **פלא** וגם איוה  
רצון נמצא כח הפלא הזה אינו מושג ולא ידיע מקוד מוצא  
כ"א מצד כח השמאיתו ית' אשר לא נודע ולא קיימא לאודעא  
נתגלה מאתו כח הפלא נמצא כוחו זה מקיף לכח הפלא וכח זה  
נק' עתיק יופין דהיינו שנעתק סבחי' יומין שהוא ההתגלות  
שחוא אינו בערך ידיע' כלל אפי' להארו בשם **פלא** וכמאמ' רב  
הממני יפלא כל רב' כי בחי' **פלא** סובל ב' פירושי' דהיינו כי  
**פלא** הוא לשון מבוסה כמו כי יפלא מסך דבר וכחרגומו ארי  
יהבסי וגם **פלא** הוא פלאות דהיינו שיהיו ב' הפכים בנושא א'  
הוא **פלא** וכאמת ב' הפירושים הן. אחד כי מצד הביסוי שאינו  
מושג הוא פלא דהיינו מצד הסתר כוחו ית' בכח' כריאת  
העולמות הנגלים ליש הוא **פלא** אין יהי' נגלה מא"ס ית' אשר  
אין זולתו ואין יהי' נגלה ממנו הוולת נמצא כל הפלא הוה הוא  
מצד תהסתרה של בחי' כלים הנגלים לגבי דידן אבל לגבי  
ית'

# פרשת ויראי

עלמותו סיינו כשאנו מוסיפים בחינת גילוי חלקותו  
 ומחינת עלמות אואים בקדר סמנויל באריכות אזי  
 נעשה בחינת חזן היל לראש פינם כד סלקא סלקא  
 לעילא עד אים וכד נחמה נחמה עלי מכל עבין  
 ואז נקי חזן ישראל סמוקנלה מבחינת ישראל דלעילא  
 שהוא בחינת ישראל עלו נמקי שהוא בחי' עלמותו  
 יית ממש למעלה מעלה מכל קדר ההשתלשלות ואז  
 נחגלה בחינת החילת הנחי בחינת סוף המעשה  
 דווקא כי זסו חכלית בריאה כל העולמות בכדי  
 שיחגלה בחינת עלמותו ממש בכל ספרין ובכל הדרגין  
 החאין דווקא וזהו או יחזיק נעמחי יעשה שלום  
 לי שלום יעשה לי וארזיל שלום נשמליא סיע ושלום  
 נשמליא של מנה שהוא בחינת יחודא תחאם וגם  
 בחינת שלום נקי כשיש מקודם בחינת מחלוקת ואחיי  
 נעשה שלום זכיהם וזכו בחינת יסויה נעשה  
 דווקא בחי' שלום עיי בחי' יוסף הלדיק עליון סלכן  
 נקי שלום עיש שהוא עקנלה ענחי' שלימותא דכלא  
 ובנחי' יסויה דווקא נחגלה חכלית פנימות כחנתו  
 כנני ואז דווקא נקי בחינת שלימותא דכלא כידוע  
 לייח ודיל :

סס פורס ייש רפנו

להבין ענין בחינתם כי נס הוא דבר שפיי דרך  
 המנע לא יחייב שישם כן נק הוא למעלה  
 מהעצב והשכל ולחזין מה שרשו למעלה הם  
 להבין זה ליל שפעם בחיב כולם בחכמה עשית היינו  
 בצריאות עולמות עיש חכמה היינו שאנו רואים  
 שאין דבר צולס שישם סוה לחזירו נק כלים  
 מכלים פונים וסינו פעיש חכי מוכרם סיחיה זה  
 הפרט כך וזה הפרט כך ומזם נעשים השמות  
 בצריאות שאין אי דומה לחזירו ודיל ופעם בחיב  
 נשלחים מעסיך סינו שהשתלשלות עולמות  
 הוא בחי' פלא למעלה מעויד וסכל ומגלה והוא  
 הישך בחי' החכמה וכן הקושיא נעם שאנו אומרים  
 אשר ילך את האדם בחי' וכו' פלא יסתם אחד מהם  
 או יסתם אחד מהם איח לאחקיים (ולעמוד לסניך)  
 אשילו פעם אחת היינו פעיש החכי איח לאחקיים  
 בהעדר אחד מדרכי הצריאה וסינו קדר הצריאה  
 ואחיי מקיים ועשליא לעשות היינו שפעשים הוא  
 בחינת פלא למעלה מבחי' חכי ומגלה אך הענין  
 הוא ששכיהם אחת כי בחי' צריאות עולמות יש  
 שני בחינת אחד הוא בחי' כולם בחכמה עשית  
 ובחי' הכי הוא בחי' נשלחים מעסיך וסינו כי לנו  
 רואים ריבוי לצבום מדכנות פונות זמיו דסינו  
 דלחיי ונכיה מהדלחיי יש כעה מיני דומם ונעם  
 מיני למה שאין אי דומה לחזירו וכן צבולם  
 וגם שאין דומים עעם הפירות ופעם סינו למעלה  
 קודם

כשיש לחדם חולי החמיות ריל חס חכל העצב  
 הלז או השרי הלז ירפא מחליו ומחמה פעצעו הוא  
 בחי' קרינות ונחם סיחכל פרי אחר לא ירפא  
 מחליו כידוע וגם שאנו רואים שנחם לא יחרישו  
 ולא יעדו הקרקע הגם שיזרעו לא ילמחו זיעים  
 פונים כמו כאשר יחרוש ויעדור הקרקע ודיל :  
 וסינו פעיש חכמה מוכרם להיות זה שיחרישו  
 ויעדו ונחם לאו לא יהיה זרעים פונים וכן  
 השקנות סמינים זמיו ודיל אך זהו כאשר נראה  
 לגבי דידן שהוא נראה ליש ודנ- נשיע חכל קמיי  
 יית כי בחינת כחורה סינו שאין עשית כלום  
 ואין הלימות מעלים לפניו כלום הוא סוה ומסוה  
 קטן וגדול בהשוואה אחת ואך יהיה פני השכים  
 בנושא אחד סיחיה בחינת הצריאה ליש ודנר נשיע  
 ולפעם לא יחיי עשית כולם ולא יהיו  
 חוצקים ממש ריבוי וסינו כלל זהו בחינת פלא  
 למעלה מעלה וסכל ומגלה כי עשיי חכמה לא  
 יסי צלעשר סיחיה פני השכים כאילו בנושא אחד  
 ודיל וזה היב בחינת סיש צצריאות עולמות כולם  
 בחיב עשית ובחינת נשלחים מעסיך בחינת  
 פלא למעלה מחויב וסכי הצחינת עולים נקנה  
 אחד כי הצחינת סינו שיש צכל מין משונה מחזירו  
 וחזירו מחזירו איח גיכ פלא למה יסי זה המין  
 נמראה זה וזה המין נמראה זה ולמה יסי ענע  
 של ענע זה בחינת הקרינות וענע של ענע זה  
 בחינת חמיות הלל פלא הוא למה יסי כך כי  
 עשיי חכמה לא יסג כיח הענע של העשצוהפרי  
 מה היא חש צענע החמיות או מענע הקרינות  
 חכל למה יסי צענע כך זה לא כודע ונלתיאשער  
 להשיג עשיי חכמה וסכל חנושי ודיל חוה הגם  
 סנצרה העולם בחי' חכמה היינו סינו מין אחד  
 מחזירו עכיו פלא הוא למה יסי זה המין כך וזה  
 המין כך ודיל והנה עשיי הצריאה הצחינת פלא  
 שיש צצריאה עולמות הוא גדול מבחינת חייכ שיש  
 צצריאות עולמות כי בחינת פלא היא למעלה מבחי'  
 סכל ומויב כידוע אך האונת הוא מבחינת החכי  
 שיש צצריאות עולמות הוא יחך נעלי מבחי' הפלא שיש  
 בחי' צריאות עולמות כי בחי' הפלי חכיל לא סייךכיה  
 אחסנהיע בחי' חכמה היינו ריבוי החזלקות פרעים  
 פונים שאין אחד דומה לחזירו אז יש בחי' פלא  
 מאחר שאין עוד מלכדו ואשק צלעדו שאין נחמו  
 ריבוי פרעים פונים לכן מיכרמים לנו לומר שבחמה  
 מלך עלמותו זה אין הים מקחיר כלום כי מאחר  
 שאין מלכדו כלל ואח סוה ומסוה קטן וגדול ואין  
 יסיה פני השכים כאילו סלל פלא סלל חכל

ענין הנם

רק לגבי דין הוא נראה ליש ודבר צביע ואיך  
 ועם הוא זה פלא למעלה מעויל ועייז יהיה אחר  
 כך עליי לנחית עלם היס עיי נחית מלות סכיל  
 ודיל אכל אס לא יחיס נחיתה הנחית נס הכיל  
 לא יכול להיות נחית חויג סכיל מאחר שהוא  
 נראה ליש ודבר צביע זה גיב הטעם שריך לקמוד  
 גאולה לחילה כי נחילה עיי שאומרים צרוך חתה  
 הויי היינו כי צרוך לשון המעשה כמו נריכות  
 חמים ותינו סומטיק עלמותו יית אף למטה היינו  
 פלא לראות סיס כלל רק כאשר הוא נחית  
 שאין מלכדו ואשם זולתו כלל וזו צרוך חתה סויי  
 היינו נחית סויי סיינו עלמותו ציה היה והיה  
 ויסים אף נחית חתה כי חתה הוא נחית נוכח היינו  
 גילוי ליש נחית חתה נראה לדבר צביע לכן לריך  
 לחיות נחית חתה נס על יליח מלרים סכיל ודיל  
 וזו נחית ליריך נס לסמוקס עשני קושע סלה  
 היינו סכל עיקר סנס סוא רך צכדי לקשע היס  
 סיינו סיאיר אף צנחית היס נחית עלמותו כאשר  
 סוא נחית חן עוד מלכדו ואשם נלעדו כלל וזתה  
 יס שני נחית נקיס נחית נקיס נגל ס ונחית  
 נקיס נקחרים סיינו כי נחית נקיס נגלים סוא  
 סזנס סוא היסוך הטבע מזה ונקיס נקחרים סיינו  
 סנסק סוא מ:ונס צעצע כמו נס של פורי ודומיו וזתה  
 לשי סנראה גדול נחית נקיס נגלים על נחית  
 נקיס נקחרים כי זזה ניכר סנס לעין וזתה סנס  
 נחילס אכל נחית גדלס מעלה סנסק סנסקחרים  
 על מעלה נקיס סנגלים כי זזו יתר עדיק סנסק  
 ווסקח ונלונס צעצע דווקא ותינו כי צנחית נקיס  
 נגליים מלור עלמותו יית סהוא כל יכול להשך  
 הטבע אכל נקיס נקחרים מלונס נחית סלה  
 הייל נחית טצע ועיקר חכלית סנריחה סוא  
 חרצתה סאף צנחית יס יאיר נחית פלא כאשר  
 סוא נחית חן עוד מלכדו ככיל ודיל ולכן  
 חנרזיל לעחיד לנח ינכסלו כל סמועדיי רך יסאך  
 נחית פורים נלכד סיינו כי כל סנוועדים סס  
 נחית נס על יל חת מלרים סהוא נחית נקיס  
 נגלים ככיל לכן ינכטו כי חכלית סנריחה סלדרצת  
 סאף סנראה לנחית יס יאיר נחית עלמיתו כאשר  
 סוא נחית חן עוד רך נחית נס של פורים יסאך  
 סהוא נחית נקיס נקחרים סיינו סנסק מלונס  
 צעצע כאשר סיא חכלית סנריחה סאף צנחית יס  
 יאיר עלמותו יית כאשר סוא נחית חן עוד מלכדו  
 ודיל ולכן כתיב לעחיד לנח ונסא נס לנרים  
 וכתיב ואל עמיס חרים נקי לגויס דווקא סעיקר סנס  
 יס דווקא נחית גויס סנס צנחית סיס סיינו

קודם גילוי צחית חכמה הייל סיינו ריכוי סרעיס  
 סוכיס חן גילוי לנחית סיל וכיו למעל להנדיל  
 נחית סואו רוחיס סאכנס סנונס על כרך  
 גדול סוא מנחנר ומנכרנ ומנחנר עם סחרון  
 סקנין מננו סנומיה על עיר קטנה נלכד סלה  
 פלא סוא ותינו לגבי דין אכל לגבי סוילך צעלמו  
 חינו נחשנ לפליחה כי מוס יכך כמו סוס ענדו  
 כן זה ענדו כתיב להנדיל נחית מוס סנכרס פלא  
 סוא רך אחר סנריחה סנראה ליש ונכול ואנשיי  
 סוא סוס נחן ולין סוסקחיר כלוס לסניו חן נקיר  
 נחית פלא אכל קעיי יית סלא נחית ססלסלות  
 לא סייך לומר נחית פלא מנחנר סאין מלכדו  
 ואשם זולתו כלל וכלל ודיל וזתה חומוס  
 סעולס קורין חותו חלה דאלסיה סיינו סמודיס סהוא  
 יית צרה חת סעולס כי חן דבר עוסה חת עלמו  
 וסאין עוד מלכדו אכל זזה סס חנים מודיס סהוא  
 יית מוסלא רועמות מדריגות נחית היס וסנגול  
 רך קעיי יית היס וסאין נחית גמורס רך סס  
 מודיס נחית חכמה סיינו נחית חכמה נחית נחית  
 סעולס סיינו נחית סנומו נחית סכל אכל צנחית  
 ססלא סיס צנחית סעולס זזה חנים מודיס  
 אכל חכלית סנריחה סוא נכניל יסרלל עם קרובו  
 אפר עיי יתייחד נחית חכי עם נחית ססלא  
 סיינו אף סנריחה סעולס ליש ודבר נסרר ריכוי  
 נצות מדריגות ללין קן וחכלית סכל סוא לעיני  
 נסר סלנו אכל קעיי יית חינו חוסף עקוס כלל  
 ולין סליוולוס מעלים לסניו כלוס העסיכ נס מוסך  
 לא יסטיך מוסך ואיך סוא זה סלא פלא סוא  
 למעלה מוסכל וזתה וזו יחוד נחית סחכי עם  
 נחית ססלא ודיל :

**ומעתה** יזן ענין סנס כי נס סוא מלסון  
 רועמות וס:אכמיס סרימו נס סהיינו  
 סהוא נח פלא סהוא למעלה מעויל סיינו חן  
 סקעיי יית חן היס וסססכרה וסליוולוס מעלים  
 כלוס ולכן קודס מית סיה לריך לחיות נחית נס  
 סל יליח מלרים כי סנה חכלית סנריחה סוא  
 סאף למטה יאיר עליומו יית כאשר סוא נחית  
 חן עוד מלכדו סיינו נחית פלא הייל ועיי מיה  
 יסיה זה סגילוי סיא עיי חורה ונלות סיא נעשע  
 סנס עלם היס נחילת למקירו ולינו נראה לדבר  
 צביע כאשר סיה חכלית סנריחה ותינו עיי קלף  
 סל חנילק וזמר סל לילית וסזרוב ודומיתן סעלס  
 היס נחילת ולכן לריך לחיות חחילס נחית נס  
 סכיל סיינו סנין חן סקעיי יית חן סיס חוסף כלוס

good to come from a great evil. Without sin, for instance, could be no joy over the repentant sinner. But these matters belong to the mysterious ways of God, who may bring it about for purposes of His own. So far as man is concerned, he must never consciously embrace evil, even if his intention is to produce a greater good.<sup>19</sup>

A further example of the use of the neutral in the service of God is the way in which the *Torah* precepts rely on the material world. For instance, the parchment upon which phylacteries are written, the wool from which the 'Fringes' are manufactured, the citron used in worship on Tabernacles, all of these belong to the material world. In themselves they belong to the 'somethingness' of things (*yesh*) and are therefore in separateness from the divine. But when man uses them for the purpose of carrying out God's precepts, he elevates them and causes their 'somethingness' to become annihilated in the divine 'Nothingness'.<sup>20</sup>

Just as the power and might of a human king is seen to greater effect when he succeeds in imposing his rules even on distant isles and by the most intensive warfare, so, too, the whole purpose of the existence of evil is for God's glory to be revealed, even in its direct opposite.<sup>21</sup> Not that the illustration is exact. There cannot be, in reality, anything opposed to God. The existence of evil, the opposite of God's goodness, belongs to the great marvel (*pele'*) and is part of the greater mystery of how there can be a finite world at all. The illustration is intended only to convey this thought that a full and complete revelation must proceed from the contrary of that which is revealed. It is for this reason that man's rejection of sin is so significant. It is in this way that the very contrary to God is pressed into His service. This, too, is the mystery of the emergence of the loftiest souls from evil. Abraham was Terah's son, David was descended through Ruth from Moab, Akiba was a descendant of Sisera, and so forth. God's purpose is thus fulfilled in two ways. First, through Israel's worship the unification of God takes place. Secondly, God's glory is revealed in even greater measure when the good vanquishes the powers of evil.

This explains the otherwise puzzling statement in the Lurianic *Kabbalah* that the spiritual 'root' of Pharaoh was nourished from the 'back of *Kether*'. Pharaoh is the symbol of

## SEEKER OF UNITY

evil. How, then, can he be said to receive nourishment from *Kether*, the divine Will? But it belongs to the divine Will that the glory of God be revealed by contrasting it with its contrary. Nevertheless, it is from the *back* of *Kether* that the 'root' of Pharaoh is nourished, for the revelation of God's glory through its contrary does not belong to the normal channels of divine self-revelation. These are rather those of 'coercion' and 'conversion'. The revelation through contrast is important and belongs to the divine Will, but not in its most direct manifestation. This indirect purpose is called in the language of the *Kabbalah* the 'back' of *Kether*.<sup>22</sup>

We have seen that Aaron differs from his rival Doh Baer on the question of ecstasy in worship. Both thinkers consider the attainment of ecstasy to be of the utmost importance, but Aaron is far more tolerant than Doh Baer of ecstasy not entirely free from the taint of self-interest and self-awareness. Aaron is careful to point out that there is an ebb and flow in the life of worship. Man cannot always attain to ecstatic prayer. For all that, the aim of contemplation should be the attainment of ecstasy. At the very least, man should reflect on the idea that he is firmly resolved to become annihilated in God's unity. He therefore takes it upon himself immediately to turn from evil and do good, increasing thereby the sense of God's unity. This is far removed from true ecstasy in which the soul is lost in God, but, at least, there is firm resolve in the heart for such total annihilation to take place. In other words, the heart is involved even if it is not truly affected. But for man to dwell in contemplation without even this resolve is no more than an intellectual, academic exercise and does not merit the term 'contemplation' at all.

Aaron's illustration is taken from the life of a businessman. Such a man may come to see that a certain business deal he has in mind will be of great advantage to him. But it does not by any means follow that thorough contemplation that it is so will result in his determined and enthusiastic participation or that his enthusiasm will be evident all the time as he seeks to realize his aim. There will be times when his enthusiasm for the vision of success he has seen will carry him triumphantly along, but there will also be other times when it will all seem weary, heavy, burdensome. Nevertheless, he will persevere, because his

## SEEKER OF UNITY

evil. How, then, can he be said to receive nourishment from *Kether*, the divine Will? But it belongs to the divine Will that the glory of God be revealed by contrasting it with its contrary. Nevertheless, it is from the *back* of *Kether* that the 'root' of Pharaoh is nourished, for the revelation of God's glory through its contrary does not belong to the normal channels of divine self-revelation. These are rather those of 'coercion' and 'conversion'. The revelation through contrast is important and belongs to the divine Will, but not in its most direct manifestation. This indirect purpose is called in the language of the *Kabbalah* the 'back' of *Kether*.<sup>22</sup>

We have seen that Aaron differs from his rival Doh Baer on the question of ecstasy in worship. Both thinkers consider the attainment of ecstasy to be of the utmost importance, but Aaron is far more tolerant than Doh Baer of ecstasy not entirely free from the taint of self-interest and self-awareness. Aaron is careful to point out that there is an ebb and flow in the life of worship. Man cannot always attain to ecstatic prayer. For all that, the aim of contemplation should be the attainment of ecstasy. At the very least, man should reflect on the idea that he is firmly resolved to become annihilated in God's unity. He therefore takes it upon himself immediately to turn from evil and do good, increasing thereby the sense of God's unity. This is far removed from true ecstasy in which the soul is lost in God, but, at least, there is firm resolve in the heart for such total annihilation to take place. In other words, the heart is involved even if it is not truly affected. But for man to dwell in contemplation without even this resolve is no more than an intellectual, academic exercise and does not merit the term 'contemplation' at all.

Aaron's illustration is taken from the life of a businessman. Such a man may come to see that a certain business deal he has in mind will be of great advantage to him. But it does not by any means follow that thorough contemplation that it is so will result in his determined and enthusiastic participation or that his enthusiasm will be evident all the time as he seeks to realize his aim. There will be times when his enthusiasm for the vision of success he has seen will carry him triumphantly along, but there will also be other times when it will all seem weary, heavy, burdensome. Nevertheless, he will persevere, because his