בס"ד

FULL ELUCIDATED EDITION · PARKLAND

בסוכות תשבו

ד"ה בסוכות תשבו שבעת ימים · יום ב' דחג הסוכות ה'תשכ"ג

In Sukkos Shall You Dwell

OCCASION

Second day of Sukkos, 5723

SOURCE

Kuntres Chag HaSukkos, 5751 — Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 5 (מוגה)

HEMSHECH

Third of four 5723 Tishrei maamarim released together in 5751 — follows יבחר לנו (Rosh Hashanah) and וכל אדם (Shabbos Shuvah)

EDITORIAL STATUS

מוגה — this specific scan is mafteiach.app's own labeled "מוגה" file for this maamar

> *A sukkah is built from encompassing light — the kind that, by definition, never settles into anything. The maamar asks how sitting in one for seven days could possibly change what encompassing light is.*

A bilingual study edition: the argument set out clause by clause with the elucidation woven in, deep-dive commentary at points of real difficulty, and the complete footnote apparatus with per-citation status.

OPENCHASSIDUS

The argument at a glance

Eight moves: two verses give two different reasons for sitting in a sukkah. The maamar reads the gap between them as the gap between the near encompassing light and the far one — and asks how a week of sitting could touch either.

TWO VERSES	א	"In sukkos shall you dwell" is a command to act; "I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos" is a report of what God already did. The Rebbe's father-in-law reads the second as the reason for the first — but if God already housed Israel in the Creator's own bosom, why does anything need to be commanded at all?
NEAR AND FAR	ב	Two encompassing lights, two verses: "dwell" reaches the near encompassing light; "I made dwell" names the far one — the level of the essence of the soul itself, rooted in the Essence, where there is nothing left to command.
THE REAL PUZZLE	ג	Encompassing light, by its own definition, cannot settle — that is what makes it encompassing rather than internalized. So how can a week of sitting in a sukkah change the near encompassing light into something settled at all?
THE ANSWER	ד	Only relative to itself is encompassing light unsettleable. Relative to the Essence, where near and far, encompassing and internal, are not even distinct categories, even encompassing light can be settled — and sitting in the sukkah draws exactly that level.
A NEW SELF	ה	Why can a week of sitting draw the Essence at all? Because teshuvah itself works this way: it does not repair the old self, it makes the person a new being entirely — and only from a root that never was implicated to begin with.
FROM THE DEPTHS	ו	Cross-referencing the shofar maamar's revealed/concealed/absolute will: the Ten Days' own "Mi'maamakim" — "out of the depths" — draws not from the accessible depth of the heart but from the depth before all depths, the root of the root.
DEEPER STILL	ז	Yom Kippur's own avodah reaches deeper than the Ten Days' own — because Yom Kippur's atonement is from the essence of the soul as it stands above any relation to the revealed faculties at all, not merely deeper within them.
CLOSING THE LOOP	ח	Sukkos is the revelation of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah made settled: the near encompassing light becomes a settled light because it is drawn by an arousal from Above no different in kind from what makes the absolute will itself responsive — and the far encompassing light was never subject to change to begin with, only revealed.

SECTION 1

Two verses, two reasons

BEFORE WE READ

The Torah gives the mitzvah of the sukkah twice in the same breath: a command ("in sukkos shall you dwell") and, in the next clause, a reason cast as a report ("for I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos when I took them out of Egypt"). The Frierdiker Rebbe's own maamar on this verse (the base text this discourse builds from) reads the two clauses as naming two different actors — God's own act of housing Israel, and Israel's own commanded act of dwelling — and the maamar opens by pressing on why the commanded act needs its own reason at all.

סעיף א

"In sukkos shall you dwell seven days; every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos, so that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos when I took them out of the land of Egypt."[1] **And my father-in-law the Rebbe, in his own maamar on this verse (in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703)**[2]**, notes precisely: that "I made [them] dwell in sukkos" is that the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell — to Israel; while "in sukkos shall you dwell" is a command to Israel that they themselves dwell in sukkos — that is, that they dwell by their own power, in their very being. And nevertheless the Rebbe states a reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell": that since the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos by His own power, they are therefore able, and required, to dwell in sukkos by their own power.** *The grammar carries the whole distinction: one clause is God's own deed done to Israel, the other is Israel's own commanded deed. The puzzle the Rebbe is about to press on is why an act that is Israel's own, commanded of them, needs God's prior deed as its stated reason at all.*

סעיף א · 1

בסוכות תשבו שבעת ימים כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות למען ידעו דורותיכם כי בסוכות הושבתי את בני ישראל בהוציאי אותם מארץ מצרים[1], ומדייק כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר במאמרו ד"ה זה (שבהמשך ר"ה תש"ג)[2], דבסוכות הושבתי הוא שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל לישראל, ובסוכות תשבו הוא ציווי לישראל שהם ישבו בסוכות, היינו שישבו בכח בסוכות בעצם, ואעפ"כ אומר כ"ק אדמו"ר טעם על זה דבסוכות תשבו, דכיון שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל בסוכות בכח עצם, לכן יכולים הם וצריכים לשבת בסוכות בכח עצם.

And it may be said that the Rebbe's precise reading carries two points: since "I made [them] dwell" is a matter that is [entirely] in the Creator's own bosom, they are therefore able, and required, to sit in sukkos by their own power. And also, from the very fact that a reason is given at all for "in sukkos shall you dwell" — namely, "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" — it is proven that Israel's ability to sit in sukkos is not by their own power, but through a power given from Above; and nevertheless, once the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell (when He took them out of Egypt), they are thereafter able to sit in the sukkah by their own power. *Both points cut the same way: the commanded act ("you shall dwell") turns out to depend entirely on the reported act ("I made dwell") for its very possibility — not just its justification. The rest of the maamar is the explanation of how a past divine act becomes a present human capacity.*

סעיף א · 2

ויש לומר, שבהדיוק שבהמאמר שני ענינים[3]. דכיון שבסוכות הושבתי הוא בחיק הבורא [ענין שהוא רק בחיק הבורא] לכן הם יכולים וצריכים לשבת בסוכות בכח עצם. וגם, מזה שאומר טעם על זה דבסוכות תשבו (כי בסוכות הושבתי) מוכח שבכדי שיוכלו ישראל לישב בסוכות הוא לא בכח עצמם אלא ע"י נתינת כח מלמעלה, ואעפ"כ, לאחרי שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל (כשהוציאם מארץ מצרים) יכולים הם לישב בסוכה בכח עצמם.

SUMMARY

The sukkah's two verses name two different actors: God's own housing of Israel "in His bosom," and Israel's own commanded dwelling. The command depends entirely on the deed — not merely as its justification, but as the source of the very power to fulfil it. The maamar's task is to explain how a divine act completed at the Exodus becomes something a person can do himself, every year, by his own power.

SECTION 2

Near and far

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now supplies the structural key for the whole discourse: two kinds of encompassing light (מקיף), near and far, keyed respectively to the two verses. This vocabulary — a light that surrounds a person rather than entering him, and which comes in nearer and farther grades — recurs throughout Chassidus; here it is mapped directly onto the sukkah's own two clauses.

סעיף ב

Now, even within Israel's own sitting in sukkos by their own power, there are two matters: "in sukkos shall you dwell," and "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos." And among the differences between these two matters: "in sukkos shall you dwell" is phrased as a command, while "shall dwell in sukkos" is phrased as narration and report. And a further difference: the command "in sukkos shall you dwell" is to all of Israel, while "shall dwell in sukkos" is specifically "every citizen" of Israel. *Two grammatically distinct clauses, sitting one verse apart, describing what looks like the same act. The maamar is about to argue they are not describing the same act at all.*

סעיף ב · 1

ב) **והנה** גם בהישיבה בסוכות דישראל בכח עצמם, שני עניגים. בסוכות תשבו גו', וכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות. ומהחילוקים דשני העניגים, שבסוכות תשבו הוא בלשון ציווי, וישבו בסוכות הוא בלשון דסיפור והודעה. ועוד חילוק, שהציווי בסוכות תשבו הוא לכל ישראל (מעצמם), ואלו שישבו בסוכות (רק) האזרח בישראל.

And it is explained in the maamar that within encompassing lights there are two grades: the near encompassing light, and the far encompassing light. And the two matters, "dwell" and "shall dwell in sukkos," correspond to these two grades: "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the near encompassing light, and "shall dwell in sukkos" is the far encompassing light. And this is why, regarding "shall dwell in sukkos," the verse says "every citizen of Israel" — for "citizen of Israel" is the essence of the soul, which is rooted in the Essence, and dwelling in the far encompassing light is at the level of the essence of the soul. *"Citizen" (אזרח) is not incidental phrasing — the maamar reads it as naming a level of the soul, not merely a legal category of person. The near/far distinction in the light tracks a corresponding near/far distinction in what part of the person receives it.*

סעיף ב · 2

ומבאר בהמאמר, דבמקיפים יש ב' מדריגות, מקיף הקרוב ומקיף הרחוק. ושני הענינים דבסוכות ישבו בסוכות הם בשתי מדריגות אלו. בסוכות תשבו הוא במקיף הקרוב וישבו בסוכות הוא במקיף הרחוק. וזהו שגבי ישבו בסוכות אומר כל האזרח בישראל, דאזרח בישראל הוא עצם הנשמה שמושרשת בהעצמות, והישיבה במקיף הרחוק היא בהדרגא דעצם הנשמה.

And it may be said that this is why "shall dwell in sukkos" is not phrased as a command, but as narration and report: because the matter of command applies only at the level of the soul as clothed in the body, whereas in the soul as it is above [the body], and especially in the essence of the soul, there is no such thing as command. And the matter of "shall dwell in sukkos" — that the essence of the soul dwells in the far encompassing light — is (not because of a command, but) of its own accord, because its root is in the Essence. *A command presupposes a commanded party distinct enough from its source to be told what to do. The essence of the soul, rooted directly in the Essence, has no such distance to cross — it simply is where it is, which is why the verse only reports it rather than commanding it.*

סעיף ב · 3

יש לומר, דזהו שישבו בסוכות הוא לא בלשון ציווי דצ"ל, אלא בלשון סיפור והודעה, כי ענין הציווי שייך רק בדרגת הנשמה המלובשת בגוף, משא"כ בהנשמה שלמעלה, ובפרט בעצם הנשמה, אין ציווי. והענין דישבו בסוכות הוא שעצם הנשמה יושבת במקיף הרחוק, הוא (לא מפני הציווי) אלא מצד עצמה, לפי ששרשה הוא בהעצמות.

סעיף ב · 4

ומבאר בהמאמר, דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות הוא טעם על בסוכות תשבו. היינו דהכח על בסוכות תשבו, להמשיך מקיף הקרוב, הוא מפני שעצם הנשמה (האזרח בישראל) מושרשת בהעצמות (מקיף הרחוק). וצריך להבין, דהטעם (והכח) על בסוכות תשבו הוא (כמפורש בכתוב) כי בסוכות הושבתי, ולמה צריך גם להטעם דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות.

And the maamar explains that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is [itself] the reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell." That is: the power for "in sukkos shall you dwell," to draw the near encompassing light, is because the essence of the soul (the "citizen of Israel") is rooted in the Essence (the far encompassing light). And it needs to be understood: the reason (and power) for "in sukkos shall you dwell" is, as the verse itself makes explicit, "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" — so why is a further reason, "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos," also needed? *The maamar has now stacked two candidate reasons for the same command, and the question is why both are needed — an inquiry it answers by showing that section א's original two-clause structure and section ב's near/far structure are really the same fact seen from different angles, and each explanation reaches a different depth.*

SUMMARY

The sukkah draws two grades of encompassing light: the near, corresponding to the commanded "in sukkos shall you dwell," and the far, corresponding to the reported "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — a level of the essence of the soul itself, rooted in the Essence, where command does not apply because there is no distance left to command across.

SECTION 3

The real difficulty

BEFORE WE READ

Having named the near encompassing light, the maamar now presses on what "encompassing" actually means — and finds a genuine problem: encompassing light is defined by the very fact that it cannot settle into anything. So how could a week of sitting in a sukkah change it into a "settled light" at all?

סעיף ג

ג) **ויובן** זה בהקדים, דכיון שאורות המקיפים (כמו שהם מצד עצמם) אינם באים בהתיישבות, הרי זה שע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה נמשכים הם בפנימיות ובהתיישבות, הוא כמו שינוי באורות המקיפים. ויתירה מזו, דמלשון המאמר שע"י הישיבה בסוכה נמשכים אורות המקיפים בפנימיות ונעשים אורות מתיישבים (ולא ממשיכים אורות המקיפים בפנימיות ובהתיישבות) משמע, שהשינוי שנעשה ע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה הוא גם באורות המקיפים עצמם. דנוסף לזה שע"י הישיבה בסוכה הם נמשכים בפנימיות ובהתיישבות, גם אורות המקיפים עצמם משתנים להיות אורות מתיישבים. וצריך להבין, איך שייך שע"י עבודת האדם (ישיבה בסוכה) יהי' שינוי בהאורות דלמעלה.

סעיף ג · 1

This is understood by prefacing that, since encompassing lights (as they are in themselves) do not come into settledness, the very fact that Israel's sitting in the sukkah draws them into internality and settledness is itself like a change in the encompassing lights. And more than that: the maamar's own wording — that through sitting in the sukkah the encompassing lights are drawn into internality and *become* settled lights (rather than: are drawn into internality and settledness) — implies that the change wrought by Israel's sitting in the sukkah is in the encompassing lights *themselves*. That is: in addition to their being drawn into internality and settledness, the encompassing lights themselves are transformed into settled lights. And it needs to be understood: how is it possible that through a person's own act of avodah (sitting in a sukkah) a change should occur in the lights Above? *This is the maamar's real difficulty, and it is sharper than it first appears. It would be one thing to say a person's act lets him receive an unchanged encompassing light differently. It is another thing entirely to say the light itself — something entirely outside and above the person — is altered by what he does.*

סעיף ג · 2

והנה הפירוש דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (בפשטות) הוא, שישראל למטה (נשמות בגופים) צריכים לישב בסוכה (בפשטות). וע"פ הידוע[6] שכל הפירושים שבאותו הפסוק שייכים זה לזה, מובן, שגם הענין דישבו בסוכות במקיף הרחוק הוא ע"י הישיבה בסוכה כפשוטה.

Now, the plain-sense meaning of "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is that Israel below (souls clothed in bodies) must sit in a sukkah, in the plain sense. And according to the known principle[6] that all the meanings within a single verse are connected to one another, it is understood that the matter of "dwelling in sukkos" at the level of the far encompassing light is likewise [drawn] through the plain, literal sitting in a sukkah. *The principle being invoked is a real interpretive rule, not a convenience: a verse's mystical sense and its plain sense are not two unrelated readings layered on the same words, but two depths of one single meaning — which is exactly what makes the difficulty in this section a real one, and not merely a play on words.*

And it needs to be understood: it is explained in several places[7], on the verse[8] "for He is not a man, that He should relent" — that the matter of relenting and reconsidering (change) applies only within the category of "man," but within the category of "not man," relenting does not apply. And the reason for this is that change belongs principally to intellect: for within intellect there is a consideration for this and a consideration for that, and since "man" [in this technical sense] consists of intellect and emotive attributes, meaning that even a person's emotive attributes follow his intellect, therefore, when a change occurs in the intellect, the emotive attributes change as well. Whereas in a will that is above intellect — that is, an essential will that has no reason, not even a hidden one — there is no change. *This is a real technical distinction, not a rhetorical aside: change requires something that weighs options, and only intellect (and what follows from it) weighs options. A will with no reason at all — not even a reason too subtle to state — has nothing in it for change to act on.*

סעיף ג · 3

וצריך להבין, דהמבואר בכ"מ[7] עה"פ[8] כי לא האדם הוא להנחם, דענין ניחומין וחרטה (שינוי) שייך רק בבחינת אדם, אבל בבחינת לא אדם, אין שייך ניחומין. והטעם על זה הוא, כי ענין השינוי (בעיקר) בשכל, כי בשכל יש סברא לכאן וסברא לכאן, וכיון שאדם הוא מוחין ומדות, היינו שגם המדות שבאדם הם ע"פ השכל, לכן, כשנעשה שינוי בשכל משתנים גם המדות. משא"כ ברצון שלמעלה מהשכל, היינו רצון עצמי שאין לו טעם, גם לא טעם כמוס, אינו משתנה.

And so too Above: within the sefiros of Atzilus, and even within the externality of Keser (for even the externality of Keser is included within the category of "man"), change applies — but within the internality of Keser ("not man"), change does not apply. And on this basis it needs to be understood: the maamar implies that through Israel's sitting in the sukkah, the far encompassing light too is drawn [in a way involving change] — but on the face of it, how could change apply to the far encompassing light at all? *The far encompassing light was identified in section ב with the essence of the soul rooted in the Essence — exactly the "not man," beyond-intellect register where, by this section's own principle, no change should be possible. The maamar has, in effect, sharpened its own difficulty rather than dissolved it.*

סעיף ג · 4

ועד"ז למעלה, שבספירות דאצילות וגם בחיצוניות הכתר (שגם חיצוניות הכתר נכלל בבחינת אדם), שייך שינוי, אבל בפנימיות הכתר (לא אדם) אין שייך שינוי. ועפ"ז צריך להבין דמשמע מהמאמר שע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה נמשך גם מקיף הרחוק, דלכאורה, איך שייך שינוי במקיף הרחוק.

SUMMARY

Encompassing light, by definition, cannot settle — that is what "encompassing" means, as against "internalized." And change itself, by the principle of "not a man that He should relent," applies only where intellect operates; the far encompassing light, rooted in the essence of the soul beyond intellect, should by rights be no more subject to change than anything else in that register. The maamar has built its own hardest question: how can a week of sitting in a sukkah touch either light at all?

SECTION 4

The answer: from the Essence, no light is unsettleable

BEFORE WE READ

The resolution turns on relativity: "encompassing" and "cannot settle" are true of a light only relative to itself. Relative to the Essence — where the very distinctions of near/far, encompassing/internal do not obtain — nothing is fixed in place, and sitting in the sukkah is precisely what draws that level.

סעיף ד

סעיף ד · 1

ד) **יש** לומר הביאור בזה, דזה שמקיף הוא מוגדר בזה שאינו בא בהתיישבות הוא כמו שהוא מצד עצמו, אבל מצד עצמות אוא"ס, שלגבי' אין חילוק בין מקיף לפנימי, גם המקיף יכול לבוא בהתיישבות. וע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה ממשיכים המקיפים מעצמות אוא"ס, ועי"ז גם אורות המקיפים נעשים מתיישבים.

The explanation may be said to be this: that an encompassing light is defined by not coming into settledness only as it is in itself — but from the side of the Essence of the Infinite Light, with respect to which there is no difference at all between encompassing and internal, even the encompassing can come into settledness. And through Israel's sitting in the sukkah, the encompassing lights are drawn from the Essence of the Infinite Light itself — and through this, the encompassing lights themselves become settled. *This is the same move the maamar's own sibling made about the will: a category (there, "against the will"; here, "cannot settle") holds only relative to a level that still has that category built into it. Relative to the Essence, which has no such category at all, the constraint simply does not apply — and what looked like a change in an unchangeable thing is really a drawing from a level where the thing was never fixed to begin with.*

סעיף ד · 2

ויובן זה ע"פ הידוע[9] בפירוש הכתוב ליום חגינו (דהעניגים שבר"ה ויוהכ"פ הם בכסה בכסה והעלם) מתגלים הם בסוכות. דמזה מובן, שהעבודה דבסוכות תשבו הוא גילוי התשובה דיוהכ"פ, שעל ידה היא ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס (כדלקמן[10]). וע"י העבודה דבסוכות תשבו, שההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס שע"י התשובה דיוהכ"פ היא בגילוי, גם אורות המקיפים נעשים אורות מתיישבים.

And this is understood on the basis of the known teaching[9] in the interpretation of the verse "for our festive day" — that the matters of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, which are in concealment (כסה) and hiddenness, become revealed on Sukkos. From which it is understood that the avodah of "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur — through which comes the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light (as below[10]). And through the avodah of "in sukkos shall you dwell," in that the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur is [now] in open revelation, the encompassing lights too become settled lights. *This is the hemshech's own hinge, stated plainly: Sukkos does not introduce a new theme after Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, it reveals, in the open, what those days already accomplished in concealment. Everything the maamar builds from here draws on that identification with the sibling maamar's own teshuvah-of-Yom-Kippur.*

DEEP DIVE · RELATIVE TO WHAT?

Why "cannot settle" was never an absolute fact

Section ג's difficulty rests on treating "encompassing light cannot settle" as a fixed property of the light itself — the way "water is wet" is a fixed property of water. Section ד's answer is that it was never that kind of fact. It is a fact about the light *relative to its own level*, and every level, without exception, has a further level relative to which its own defining constraints simply do not apply.

This is not a loophole invented to solve the difficulty; it is the same structural move this maamar's own two siblings make repeatedly. The sibling on Rosh Hashanah distinguishes an arousal that has "no place at all" in Atzmus from one that does, depending entirely on which level of Atzmus is meant. The sibling on Shabbos Shuvah distinguishes atonement for a breach of the will from a level where breach was never a coherent category, again purely by which level is in view. Here, "encompassing" and "cannot settle" turn out to be exactly this kind of relative fact: true of the light as it is in itself, false — because the categories do not even apply — as it is drawn from the Essence.

What earns the change, then, is not that a person's act somehow overpowers an immovable light. It is that sitting in the sukkah reaches past the light's own self-relative definition to the level where the distinction (encompassing versus settled) was never drawn in the first place — and draws the light *from there*.

SUMMARY

Encompassing light cannot settle only relative to itself; relative to the Essence, where encompassing and internal are not even distinct categories, it can. Sitting in the sukkah — the revealed form of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — draws the encompassing lights from that unconditioned level, which is why they can become settled without anything in the light itself being violated.

SECTION 5

A new self, root and all

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now asks why an act of avodah can draw the Essence at all — and answers by way of teshuvah's own nature: teshuvah does not repair the person who sinned, it makes a genuinely new person, and only a root untouched by the sin could be the source of that newness.

סעיף ה

And it may be said that the revelation of the essence of the soul, rooted in the Essence of the Infinite Light (above the root of the souls in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel"), is in teshuvah — through teshuvah itself. And the matter is this: that a person's doing teshuvah after he has sinned is from the side of the soul's root in the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel." For from the side of the soul's root in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," through sinning and flawing (the opposite of the intent of "with whom did He take counsel"), he becomes severed from his root — and that after sinning he does teshuvah and changes his very being is from the side of the revelation of the soul's root in the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel." *"With whom did He take counsel" (established in the sibling maamar, section ז) named a real root — the souls of the righteous, prior to creation. That root can be severed by sin. What teshuvah reaches is deeper than even that root: a level the sin never touched, because it was never inside the relation the sin broke.*

סעיף ה · 1

ה) **ויש** לומר, שהגילוי דעצם הנשמה שמושרשת בעצמות אוא"ס (שלמעלה משורש הנשמות בהענין דבמי נמלך) הוא בהתשובה, שע"י תשובה עצמה. והענין הוא, דזה שהאדם עושה תשובה לאחרי שחטא הוא מצד שרש הנשמה בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מהענין דבמי נמלך. שמצד שורש הנשמה בהענין דבמי נמלך, ע"י שחטא ופגם (היפך הכוונה דבמי נמלך), הוא נפרד משרשו, וזה שלאחרי שחטא הוא עושה תשובה ומשנה את מציאותו, הוא מצד גילוי שורש הנשמה בעצמות אוא"ס, שלמעלה מהענין דבמי נמלך.

And there is a further matter in this: that the cause which brings a person back to teshuvah is that the point of Jewishness within him is always intact (and when the point of Jewishness within him is aroused, he wants, in no way whatsoever, to remain severed, and so does teshuvah) — and that the point of Jewishness within him is always intact, that even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful to Him[25], is because the soul's bond with G-dliness is an essential bond, above the bond that comes through Torah and mitzvos (the matter of "with whom did He take counsel"). *The bond that produces teshuvah cannot itself be a casualty of the sin, on pain of nothing ever driving anyone back — which is exactly why the maamar needs a bond deeper than the one sin can sever. "Even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful" is not sentiment; it is the load-bearing premise.*

סעיף ה · 2

ועוד ענין בזה, דהסיבה שמביאה אותו לחזור בתשובה היא לפי שנקודת היהדות שבו היא תמיד בשלימות (וכאשר מתעוררת נקודת היהדות שבו, אינו רוצה בשום אופן להיות נפרד ועושה תשובה), וזה שנקודת היהדות שבו היא תמיד בשלימות, דגם בשעת החטא היא באמנה אתו ית'[25], הוא לפי שההתקשרות דהנשמה באלקות היא התקשרות עצמית, שלמעלה מההתקשרות שע"י תומ"צ (הענין דבמי נמלך).

סעיף ה · 3

והחילוק דשני העניגים הוא, שהגילוי דעצם הנשמה בזה שגם לאחרי החטאים הוא שב להוי', הוא, שע"י שהחטאים נעשה נפרד מאלקות (שלכן צריך לעשות תשובה עליהם), אלא שכיון ששורש הנשמה הוא בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מהעגין דבמי נמלך, הפירוד שע"י החטאים הוא רק בחיצוניות, ולכן ביכלתו לעשות תשובה (ע"י גילוי הפנימיות). והגילוי דעצם הנשמה בהסיבה שמביאה אותו לחזור בתשובה, הוא, שע"י החטאים לא נעשה מלכתחילה גרעון ח"ו בההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה באלקות, וגם בשעת החטא היא באמנה אתו ית' (והוא ע"ד שנתבאר לעיל בד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' שע"י[26]), דהכפרה שע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס בעל הרצון היא באופן שע"י החטאים נעשה פגם, וע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס בעל הרצון שאינו מוכרח בהרצון, מתכפרים הפגמים. והכפרה שמצד עיצומו של יום הכפורים היא (לא באופן של פעולה, אלא) שביום זה מתגלה ההתקשרות של עצם הנשמה עם העצמות (שלמעלה מבעל הרצון), שבדרגא זו אין פגם מלכתחילה.

And the difference between the two matters [just given] is this: the revelation of the essence of the soul in the fact that even after sinning it returns to Havayah is that, through the sins, a severance from G-dliness occurs (which is why teshuvah is needed for them) — except that since the soul's root is in the Essence of the Infinite Light, above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," the severance through the sins is only in externality, and so he is able to do teshuvah (through the revelation of his internality). Whereas the revelation of the essence of the soul in the very cause that brings a person to return in teshuvah is that, through the sins, no deficiency, Heaven forfend, was ever created to begin with in the essential bond of the essence of the soul with G-dliness — that even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful to Him (and this follows the pattern explained above in ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי'[26]): that the atonement drawn through the Essence of the Infinite Light as "Owner of the will" works by way of the sins having created a flaw, and the drawing from the Essence as Owner of the will — who is not compelled by the will — atoning for that flaw. Whereas the atonement from the side of "the essence of the day" of Yom Kippur is (not in the manner of an action at all, but) that on that day is revealed the bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence (which is above the "Owner of the will"), a level with respect to which there was never any flaw to begin with. *Two distinct roles for the same essence-level bond, mapped directly onto the sibling maamar's own two-tier atonement (the Owner of the will, versus the Essence above even Him): one register in which the bond is severed only externally and teshuvah repairs it; a deeper register in which the bond was never breached at all, and the day itself simply reveals that this was always so.*

סעיף ה · 4

ועפ"ז יש להוסיף ביאור בזה שעיצומו[27] של יום הכפורים מכפר (דוקא) לשבים[28], כי בכדי שתהי' המשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום, גילוי ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, צריכה להיות איזו עשי' דהאדם [וע"ד גילוי עצם הנשמה בר"ה, שהיא ע"י העבודה דתמליכוני עליכם[29]], וכיון שהסיבה המביאה לעשות תשובה היא התקשרות העצמית, לכן, ע"י התשובה היא המשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום.

And on this basis a further point may be added, explaining why the essence of the day[27] of Yom Kippur atones specifically for those who return[28]: because in order for the drawing of "the essence of the day" — the revelation of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — to occur, some action of the person is required [in the same way that the revelation of the essence of the soul on Rosh Hashanah is through the avodah of "that you make Me King over you"[29]]. And since the very cause that brings a person to do teshuvah is [already] the essential bond, therefore, through teshuvah comes the drawing of "the essence of the day." *A closing of the circle: the essence-bond is what makes teshuvah possible in the first place, and teshuvah is in turn the vessel that draws the revelation of that very bond into the open — cause and consequence folding back into each other, exactly as tov required chesed as its vessel in the sibling maamar's section ז.*

SUMMARY

Teshuvah does not merely repair a severed bond; in one register it does exactly that (the externally severed bond with the Owner of the will), but in its deeper register it reveals a bond that a sin could never touch to begin with — the essence of the soul's own root in the Essence. And it is precisely because this untouched bond is what drives a person back to teshuvah that teshuvah becomes the vessel for revealing it in the open.

SECTION 6

Out of the depths

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now reaches back to the sibling maamar's own vocabulary (revealed will, concealed will, absolute will) to explain a liturgical detail of the Ten Days: why the psalm said each day is *"Mi'maamakim"* — "out of the depths" — plural, and why King David, who has already said "with all my heart I have sought You," needs to add anything at all.

סעיף ו · 1

ו) **וביאור** הענין בפרטיות יותר יובן בהקדים מה שנתבאר לעיל (בהמאמר ד"ה יבחר לנו[30]), שבתקש"ז שע"י שעז"ה נעשה תמליכוני עליכם, ג' עניגים. קיום המצוה דתקש"ז, שהיא האתערותא דלתתא המעוררת את הרצון הגלוי, והתשובה דתקש"ז, שעל ידה נמשך ההחלט ורצון המוחלט ולמעלה יותר ברצון המוחלט בעצמותו שע"י אתעדל"ת יתעורר הרצון גלוי, והביטול הפנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה, שיע"ז נמשך רצון המוחלט עצמו.

The matter is understood in more detail by prefacing what was explained above (in the maamar ד"ה יבחר לנו[30]): that in the sounding of the shofar, through which "that you make Me King over you" is effected, there are three matters — the fulfilment of the mitzvah of the shofar, which is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will; the teshuvah of the shofar, through which is drawn the [absolute will's own] determination that an arousal from below should arouse the revealed will, and further still, that the absolute will in its own essence decided that through an arousal from below the revealed will should be aroused; and the inner self-nullification from the side of the essence of the soul, through which the absolute will itself is drawn. *This is a direct citation of the Rosh Hashanah sibling's own three-tier map (mitzvah / teshuvah / essence-bittul), imported wholesale as the vocabulary this section will now apply to a different liturgical detail — the psalm of the Ten Days.*

סעיף ו · 2

וע"פ הידוע שהעניגים דבנין המלכות הוא במשך כל עשרת ימי תשובה, יש לומר, שגם בעשרת ימי תשובה צריכה להיות עבודה שמצד עצם הנשמה. וזהו שבעשרת ימי תשובה אומרים שיר המעלות ממעמקים, ואיתא בזוהר עמיקא דעמיקתא (מעמקים לשון רבים) אקרי תשובה. ומבאר כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר בהמשך הנ"ל שהם ב' העומקים דרצון הנעלם ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו. דההמשכה מהעומק דרצון הנעלם היא ע"י צעקת הקול הבאה מהמקיף דחי', וההמשכה דרצון המוחלט היא ע"י צעקת הלב הבאה מהמקיף דיחידה.

And on the basis of the known [teaching] that the matter of the building of kingship extends through the whole of the Ten Days of Repentance, it may be said that in the Ten Days too there must be an avodah from the side of the essence of the soul. And this is why in the Ten Days the psalm "Shir HaMa'alos, Mi'maamakim" ["out of the depths"] is said — and the Zohar states that "the depth of depths" (מעמקים being a plural form) is called teshuvah. And my father-in-law the Rebbe explains, in the Hemshech cited above, that these are the two depths of the concealed will and the absolute will in its own essence: the drawing from the depth of the concealed will is through the cry of the *voice*, which comes from the encompassing light of chayah, and the drawing of the absolute will is through the cry of the *heart*, which comes from the encompassing light of yechidah. *"Depths," plural, is not poetic excess — the maamar reads it as naming exactly two distinct depths, mapped onto the same chayah/yechidah pair the sibling maamar used for the shofar. The Ten Days have their own version of the same architecture.*

And elsewhere the Zohar states "Shir HaMa'alos" without specifying who said it — rather, "a song of ascents that all the people of the world are destined to recite." And the passage continues there: "and did David say this? Indeed it is written, 'with all my heart I have sought You'… so what more is wanted? What is wanted? It has been taught: every person…" — "from the root of all roots." And it is explained in Chassidus that the Zohar's own precision — "and did David say this?" — is that since David had already said "with all my heart I have sought You," where "my heart" is the innermost point of the heart, why would he need to say "out of the depths" [as well]? And the explanation is that one must draw from the root of all roots, from the innermost point of the Essence Itself — and to draw from there requires an avodah from the innermost point of the essence of the soul and the Essence, "out of the depths" — which is above the avodah from the inner point of the inner point of the heart ("with all my heart"). *A second liturgical puzzle folded into the first: even the innermost point of the heart is still, technically, a point within the heart — one degree of internality among others. "Out of the depths" names something the heart's own innermost point cannot reach on its own, which is why David needs both phrases, not one.*

סעיף ו · 3

ובמקום אחר איתא בזוהר שיר המעלות סתם ולא פירש מאן אמרו, אלא שיר המעלות דזמנין כל בני עלמא למימר. ובהמשך העגין שם וכי אמר דוד שם והכי כתיב בכל לבי דרשתיך כו' ומי בעי מאי בעי תאנא כל ב"נ כו' מעיקרא דכל עיקרין. ומבואר בחסידות, שהדיוק בזהר וכי אמר וכי דוד הכי הוא, דכיון שכבר אמר בכל לבי דרשתיך, שבבי הוא פנימיות הלב, מהו צריך לומר ממעמקים. ומבאר, שצריך להמשיך מעיקרא דכל עיקרין, מפנימיות ועצמות א"ס, ובכדי להמשיך משם הוא ע"י העבודה שמפנימיות ועצמות הנפש ועצמות א"ס, ממעמקים, שלמעלה מהעבודה מפנימיות דפנימיות הלב (בכל לבי).

DEEP DIVE

Two depths, and why the heart's own innermost point isn't enough

The Zohar's question — why does David, having already said "with all my heart," need to add "out of the depths" — sounds almost pedantic until the maamar's own distinction is applied to it. "With all my heart" reaches the innermost point *of the heart*: still, for all its depth, a point located within a faculty, addressable by that faculty's own internal structure.

"Mi'maamakim" — plural depths — names something structurally different: not a deeper point within the heart, but a source the heart's own internality was never going to reach by going further inward along the same axis. This is the same move section ד made about encompassing light: no matter how far "inward" a faculty's own internality goes, it stays inside that faculty's own register. Reaching the root of all roots requires a different kind of avodah entirely — not "more heart," but the essence of the soul reaching past the heart's own internality altogether.

This is why the Zohar insists the psalm is for "all the people of the world," not for David uniquely: the depth it draws from is the essence of the soul, which every person has in equal measure, unlike the trained, cultivated internality of "my heart," which differs from person to person.

SUMMARY

The Ten Days have their own version of the shofar's three-tier structure: an avodah from the essence of the soul, corresponding to the absolute will's own depth. "Out of the depths," plural, names two distinct depths — the concealed will (reached by the cry of the voice) and the absolute will in its own essence (reached by the cry of the heart) — and "the depth of depths" specifically is what the heart's own innermost point, however deep, cannot reach by itself.

SECTION 7

Deeper still on Yom Kippur

BEFORE WE READ

A short section, but a real escalation: the avodah of the Ten Days, however deep, is still an avodah that "belongs" to the revealed faculties in some sense. Yom Kippur's own avodah reaches a register above that relation entirely.

It may be said that on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur [themselves], the avodah of "out of the depths" is loftier than the avodah of "out of the depths" on the days between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. For during the Ten Days of Repentance, whose matter is (as their name implies) days of teshuvah — and the matter of "that you make Me King over you" is not so openly revealed on these days — the avodah of "out of the depths" is principally at the depth of the essence of the soul *as it relates to* the revealed faculties. Whereas on Yom Kippur, whose principal matter depends on "you" [in the plural, essentially] — a matter that is principally from the side of the essence of the soul — the avodah of "out of the depths" is at the depth of the essence of the soul as it is *above any relation* to the revealed faculties. *A precise escalation, not a vague intensification: the Ten Days' depth still stands in relation to the revealed faculties (it reaches down to touch them); Yom Kippur's depth is the essence of the soul as it stands prior to and above that relation altogether — the same distinction, in a new key, that separated the Owner of the will from the Essence above Him in the sibling maamar.*

סעיף ז · 1

ז) **יש** לומר, דבר"ה ויוהכ"פ העבודה דממעמקים היא נעלית יותר מהעבודה דממעמקים שבהימים שבין ר"ה ליוהכ"פ. דבעשרת ימי תשובה, שענינם הוא (כשמם) ימי תשובה (והענין דתמליכוני עליכם אינו בגילוי כ"כ בימים אלה), העבודה דממעמקים (בעיקר) היא בהעומק דעצם הנשמה ששייכת לכחות הגלויים, וביוהכ"פ שעיקר ענינו תלוי מעליכם עליכם [דענין זה הוא בעיקר מצד עצם הנשמה], העבודה דממעמקים היא בהעומק דעצם הנשמה שלמעלה משייכות לכחות הגלויים.

And likewise regarding Yom Kippur: since its principal matter is the atonement from the side of the essence of the day — the revelation of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — therefore the avodah of Yom Kippur, too, is from the depth of the essence of the soul as it is above any relation to the revealed faculties.

סעיף ז · 2

ועד"ז ביוהכ"פ, דכיון שעיקר ענינו הוא הכפרה שמצד עיצומו של יום, גילוי ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, לכן, גם העבודה דיוהכ"פ היא מצד העומק דעצם הנשמה שלמעלה משייכות לכחות הגלויים.

IN AVODAH

There is a real, practical distinction here between two kinds of depth a person can reach in prayer. One kind still answers to the revealed faculties — it deepens what they can do, sharpens their reach, but stays legible to them. The other kind is not a deeper version of the same reaching; it is a register the revealed faculties were never going to arrive at by trying harder. Yom Kippur does not ask for more effort of the first kind. It asks for the second kind entirely — which is exactly why it cannot be manufactured by intensity alone, only received.

SUMMARY

The Ten Days' own "out of the depths" reaches the essence of the soul as it relates to the revealed faculties; Yom Kippur's reaches the essence of the soul as it stands above any such relation — matching Yom Kippur's own atonement, which (per section ה) is the revelation of a bond no flaw ever touched, not the repair of one that was.

SECTION 8

Closing the loop

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar returns to its opening verse and states the full answer: the sukkah's two reasons are two matters in Yom Kippur's own teshuvah, and the near/far distinction in the encompassing lights maps exactly onto the will/essence distinction the whole hemshech has been building.

סעיף ח

And this is "in sukkos shall you dwell… every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos… for I made [them] dwell in sukkos": that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" and "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" are two reasons for "in sukkos shall you dwell" (as explained in the maamar of Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703, cited above in section ב). And the matter is that "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur — and within the teshuvah of Yom Kippur there are three matters: teshuvah itself, and two matters in the root of teshuvah. For teshuvah itself (even the teshuvah of Yom Kippur) is that a person changes himself, going out of his previous state of being and becoming an entirely new being.

סעיף ח · 1

ח) **וזהו** בסוכות תשבו גו' כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות גו' כי בסוכות הושבתי גו', דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות וכי בסוכות הושבתי גו' הם שני טעמים על בסוכות תשבו (כמבואר בהמאמר דהמשך ר"ה תש"ג, הובא לעיל סעיף ב). והענין הוא, דבסוכות תשבו הוא גילוי התשובה דיוהכ"פ, ובהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, ג' עניגים. התשובה עצמה, ושני עניגים בשרש התשובה. דהתשובה עצמה (גם התשובה דיום הכפורים) היא שהאדם משנה את עצמו, שיוצא ממציאותו הקודמת ונעשה מציאות חדשה.

This change is in the revealed faculties of the soul, and this change in a person's revealed faculties comes about through his arousing and revealing the essence of the soul within him. [And so too Above: that a person becomes desired before Him as he was before the sin is because through teshuvah a new will is drawn from the Infinite Light as "Owner of the will."] And there is a further matter in the teshuvah of Yom Kippur, felt in it openly: that the true root and cause of teshuvah is the bond of the essence of the soul — a bond above any prior relation to the revealed faculties — now reaching the revealed faculties.

סעיף ח · 2

הוא בכחות הגלויים דהנשמה. ושינוי זה שבכחות הגלויים דהאדם הוא ע"י שמעורר ומגלה עצם הנשמה שבו. [ועד"ז הוא בנוגע למעלה, דזה שהאדם נעשה מרוצה לפניו ית' כמו קודם החטא הוא, כי ע"י התשובה נמשך רצון חדש מאוא"ס בעל הרצון]. ועוד ענין בהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, שנרגש בה בגילוי, שהשורש והסיבה האמיתית דתשובה הוא ההתקשרות דעצם הנשמה (שלמעלה מההתקשרות לכחות הגלויים) לכחות הגלויים.

סעיף ח · 3

ולכן, גם בהענין דבסוכות תשבו (שהוא הגילוי דהתשובה דיוהכ"פ), ג' העניגים — השינוי במקיף הקרוב, שנעשה אור מתיישב. והטעם על זה הוא ע"פ המובא לעיל סעיף ו דזה ש[ע"י] אתעדל"ת מתעורר הרצון הגלוי (אף שהאתעדל"ת אינה באין ערוך לגבי הרצון) אינו מצד הרצון הגלוי עצמו (דכיון שהרצון הגלוי הוא באין ערוך לגבי הרצון אין שייך לעורר אותו ביכלתם), אלא לפי שכן החליט ברצון המוחלט. ועד"ז הוא בהענין דבסוכות תשבו, שהשינוי שנעשה כביכול במקיף הקרוב להיות אור מתיישב אינו מצד המקיף הקרוב עצמו, כי אם משום שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (במקיף הרחוק — כי בסוכות הושבתי).

And therefore, even in the matter of "in sukkos shall you dwell" (which is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur), the same three matters [are present] — the change in the near encompassing light, that it becomes a settled light. And the reason for this follows what was cited above in section ו: that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will (even though the arousal from below is utterly incommensurate with the will) not from the side of the revealed will itself (for since the revealed will is utterly incommensurate with [an arousal from below], it is not within [the arousal's] own power to arouse it) — but because the absolute will so decided. And likewise regarding "in sukkos shall you dwell": the change that occurs, as it were, in the near encompassing light, that it becomes a settled light, is not from the side of the near encompassing light itself — but rather because "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" (at the level of the far encompassing light — "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos"). *The same non-negotiable point the sibling maamar made about the shofar returns here nearly verbatim: an incommensurate cause cannot arouse its effect by its own power. The near encompassing light's transformation into a settled light is not something the near light does or earns — it happens because the far light, the essence-level bond, already decided it would.*

סעיף ח · 4

דענין הישיבה (התיישבות) במקיף הרחוק אינו באופן דפעולה [כי במקיף הרחוק, בחינת לא אדם, אין שייך בו שינוי, כנ"ל סעיף ג], אלא שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (מקיף הרחוק) מצד עצמם, לפי שהם מושרשים בהעצמות. [וזהו שאמרו רז"ל עה"פ[43] כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות למד שכל ישראל ראויים לישב בסוכה אחת, כי בדרגא זו כל ישראל שוים]. והוא ע"ד הענין דעיצומו של יום הכפורים, שמצד ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות אין פגם מלכתחילה.

For the matter of "dwelling" (settledness) at the level of the far encompassing light is not in the manner of an action at all [since at the far encompassing light, the category of "not man," change does not apply, as above in section ג] — rather, "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" (the far encompassing light) [describes them dwelling there] of their own accord, because they are rooted in the Essence. [And this is what our Sages meant on the verse[43] "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — teaching that all Israel are fit to sit in a single sukkah, for at this level all Israel are equal.] And this follows the pattern of the essence of Yom Kippur, that from the side of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence, there was never any flaw to begin with. *The far encompassing light's "settledness" was never an event, only a standing fact now disclosed — exactly parallel to Yom Kippur's own atonement, which is not an action either, but a revelation of a bond that was never broken. And "all Israel fit in one sukkah" stops being a technical halachic curiosity and becomes the same point section ה made about the essence of the soul: at that level, there is no differentiation between one Jew and another at all.*

סעיף ח · 5

וכמו שביוהכ"פ, הענין דעיצומו מאיר גם בגילוי דהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, שבהתשובה דיוהכ"פ (כנ"ל) נרגש שהיא נמשכת מההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, עד"ז הוא בסוכות, שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות הוא טעם על בסוכות תשבו, דזה שמקיף הקרוב נמשך בפנימיות ונעשה אור מתיישב, נרגש בו שהטעם על זה הוא כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות, במקיף הרחוק, התקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות.

And just as on Yom Kippur, the matter of "the essence of the day" shines also within the revelation of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — for within the teshuvah of Yom Kippur (as above) it is felt that it is drawn from the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — so too on Sukkos: that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is the [deeper] reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell" means that in the very fact that the near encompassing light is drawn into internality and becomes a settled light, it is felt that the reason for this is "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — at the level of the far encompassing light, the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence. *The maamar's full circle: section א's opening puzzle — why does the commanded "you shall dwell" need the reported "I made dwell" as its reason — turns out to have the same shape as Yom Kippur's own structure of teshuvah revealing the day's essence. The near light's settledness doesn't merely depend on the far light causally; it is felt, in the act of sitting, as resting on it — the whole hemshech's essence-theme surfacing, for a moment, inside a piece of wood and roofing.*

IN AVODAH

The sukkah is a strange mitzvah to build a theology of the essential soul around — seven days in a temporary structure, walls and a roof of branches. But that may be the point the maamar is quietly making with its own choice of verse. The far encompassing light, the level at which "all Israel are fit to sit in one sukkah," is not reached by more elaborate effort than the near light requires. It is reached by the same simple, physical, undramatic act — sitting down — because at that level the distinguishing marks a person usually measures himself by (how hard he tried, how much he understood) are exactly the marks that do not apply.

SUMMARY

"In sukkos shall you dwell" draws the near encompassing light into settledness; "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" names the far encompassing light — the essence of the soul rooted in the Essence — which was never unsettled to begin with, only revealed. The near light's transformation is not its own doing, any more than the shofar's revealed will arouses itself; both happen because the absolute will, the essence-level bond, already decided they would. Sukkos is Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — three matters, the same three matters — made open and settled.

Method

This edition follows the format of its two siblings in the Hemshech Tishrei 5723 set: Hebrew right, English left, bold marks the maamar's own words translated in full, lighter italic carries the elucidation. Every printed footnote is carried into the back-matter apparatus with a citation status.

SOURCE TEXT — A GENUINE SCAN, NOT REFLOWED WEB TEXT.

Unlike the previous sibling (וכל אדם), whose he.chabad.org source was reflowed web text, this maamar's source is a page-image scan of Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 5 — the actual printed מוגה volume — linked from mafteiach.app's own "מוגה" entry for this maamar (as against a separate "מהדורה ישנה — בלתי מוגה" file also listed there, not used). The scan has no embedded text layer (confirmed: `pymupdf` text extraction returns 0 characters per page), so it was transcribed by direct visual reading at 300dpi, page by page.

A REAL TRANSCRIPTION-QUALITY INCIDENT, DISCLOSED RATHER THAN HIDDEN.

A first, faster transcription pass produced two kinds of error: duplicated body-text passages in sections ה and ח (the same paragraph copied twice with slight variation), and footnotes attributed to the wrong numbers across three separate ranges — including one case where content from a different maamar's apparatus, read earlier in the same session, was mistakenly carried into this one's footnote list. Both were caught before translation began, by a dedicated, slower re-transcription pass that cropped each page into smaller regions and cross-checked footnote-by-footnote against the scan. See `hebrew-source.md` for the full history. The body text is now cross-checked and confident; the footnote apparatus, while corrected, is disclosed as **AS CITED, unverified against a second copy** more strongly than either sibling's apparatus — an independent human read against the scan is recommended before this edition is treated as a final print-ready text.

PAGE-LETTER APPARATUS:

unlike the reflowed-web-text sibling, this edition has real printed page letters (כז–לד) from the scan itself, used in every block's loc marker alongside the section letter and paragraph number.

APPARATUS DEPTH:

two commissioned deep dives (relativity in section ד, the two depths of "Mi'maamakim" in section ו) plus avodah and summary boxes at the sections carrying the most direct practical weight — a smaller apparatus than the seed edition's, a deliberate pacing decision across the four-edition set, disclosed rather than silent. Every Hebrew clause is translated in full in the bilingual body regardless of apparatus depth.

Verification

EDITORIAL STATUS: מוגה, ON STRONGER FOOTING THAN THE PREVIOUS SIBLING.

This is the specific file mafteiach.app itself labels "מוגה" for this maamar (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 5), distinct from the separately-listed "בלתי מוגה" draft edition of the same maamar, which was not used. This is an external cataloguer's labeling, not this edition's own independent confirmation of an internal מוגה statement on the scanned pages themselves (no explicit "הוגה ע"י כ"ק אדמו"ר שליט"א" note was found on the scanned title/foreword pages, unlike the Rosh Hashanah sibling's source page) — recorded as such rather than overstated.

HEMSHECH POSITION CONFIRMED BY RETRIEVAL:

cross-checked against the Mafteiach year-index for Tishrei 5723 (already used for the previous sibling), and against this maamar's own footnote 1, which names both prior maamarim in the hemshech by their opening words and page numbers in the same kuntres run.

BASE TEXT:

the Frierdiker Rebbe's own maamar on this verse, in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703 — the *same* base text as the Rosh Hashanah sibling (יבחר לנו), not a different work this time; footnote 2 cites it directly, and section ח explicitly cross-references "the maamar of Hemshech R"H 5703" for the two-reasons reading of the verse.

Source notes

All 43 footnotes carried. VERIFIED *marks a citation independently confirmed — chiefly internal cross-references within this maamar or to the already-built sibling editions' own numbered sections.* AS CITED *marks every citation reproduced as the scan gives it, without independent retrieval of the target text. Given this maamar's harder transcription history (see the About page), treat every locator here — even ones marked VERIFIED for their cross-reference logic — as unconfirmed for exact page/volume numbers without a second read against the scan.*

1 VERIFIED Vayikra (Emor) 23:42–43 — the maamar's own opening verse, translated in full in section א.

2 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 43ff.; see there p. 44.

3 AS CITED At the start of the maamar of 5703 (p. 44) only the first point is explicit; the second is drawn out from the maamar's own closing explanation (p. 52, transcribed above in the body).

4 AS CITED Sukkah 11b (per one view) that the sukkos were clouds of glory; so Rashi ad loc.; so halachically, Shulchan Aruch Admor HaZakein, Hilchos Sukkah, start of §625 — from which it follows that "I made dwell" refers to the Creator's own act alone.

5 AS CITED Closing of the 5703 maamar (Sefer HaMaamarim there, p. 52).

6 AS CITED Cross-referenced below to section ג.

7 AS CITED I Shmuel 15:29.

8 VERIFIED Same verse as note 7, cited a second time for the body's second quotation of it.

9 AS CITED Referenced teaching on "our festive day" — concealed matters of Rosh Hashanah/Yom Kippur revealed on Sukkos; see Likkutei Torah, Drushim for Rosh Hashanah 54b ff.

10 AS CITED As cited in the scan; internal forward cross-reference within this maamar.

11 AS CITED Hemshech Basi LeGani 5710, ch. 18ff. (Sefer HaMaamarim 5710, p. 153ff.); 5728 ד"ה באתי לגני (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 243ff.; there p. 257).

12 VERIFIED I Shmuel 15:29 — the maamar's own citation, matching notes 7/8.

13 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Drushim for Rosh Hashanah 54c ff.; cross-referenced in this maamar of 5739 (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 4, p. 28, note 54).

14 VERIFIED Tehillim 81:4 — cited in the body at the "shofar" cross-reference.

15 AS CITED The known teaching that sukkah covering was made from the clouds of the Yom Kippur incense — Peiras Sha'ar Yom Kippur ch. 12 (28a); cross-referenced in this maamar of 5741 note 5 (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 121).

16 AS CITED At length in 5729 ד"ה באתי לגני, section ט (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 3, p. 47ff. per the scan's own locator).

17 AS CITED Semag, positive commandment 16; Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16b — cited in the Chiddushei Aggados of the Maharsha to Rosh Hashanah ad loc.

18 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:4.

19 AS CITED Cross-referenced below; also Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 137.

20 AS CITED Rashi's language on Shemos 3:3; see Sefer HaSichos 5702, p. 47 (transcribed in Sefer HaMaamarim there, p. 136, note 43) that this is the matter of the teshuvah of tzaddikim.

21 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 1, p. 366ff.; cross-referenced also to ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' of this year, section ח (above, p. 21), and its note 67.

22 AS CITED Bereishis Rabbah ch. 8:7; Rus Rabbah ch. 2:1 (3).

23 AS CITED The scan's own qualifying note: but from the side of the soul's root in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," this kind of change would not be possible, as below in section ה.

24 AS CITED The scan's own note: that the change wrought in a person through teshuvah is not only in the internal faculties but also in the matter of accepting the yoke [of Heaven], which is from the essence of the soul above the revealed faculties — on this basis it is understood that through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur a change is wrought (on Sukkos) in the encompassing lights, that they become settled lights.

25 AS CITED Tanya, end of ch. 24.

26 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar, ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי', section ז — confirmed against that edition's own text in this series.

27 AS CITED Added to the explanation from the maamar ד"ה וכל אדם, ibid.

28 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 1:3; see ד"ה הנ"ל, note 58.

29 VERIFIED Rosh Hashanah 16a; ibid. 34b. And see at length ד"ה יבחר לנו of this year (5723), section ז (above, p. 7).

30 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar, ד"ה יבחר לנו — its own three-tier map of the shofar, confirmed against that edition's text in this series.

31 AS CITED Pri Eitz Chaim, Sha'ar 24 (Sha'ar Rosh Hashanah); see also Sefer HaMaamarim 5723 (this year), as cited below note 35.

32 AS CITED The scan's own note on the matter of "mitzvah" within the Ten Days — that vigilance in mitzvos is greater in the Ten Days than the rest of the year (Shulchan Aruch Admor HaZakein, Orach Chaim, Hilchos Rosh Hashanah, start of §603).

33 AS CITED Tehillim 130:1; see the cross-reference in Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 115, note 2.

34 AS CITED Zohar III 70a.

35 AS CITED ד"ה שיר המעלות 5703 (Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 25ff.).

36 AS CITED Zohar II 63a ff.

37 AS CITED Tehillim 119:10.

38 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim 5668, p. 16.

39 AS CITED That in addition to the drawing of "the essence of the day" through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur, teshuvah itself is also loftier — see the maamar ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי', section ב.

40 AS CITED The scan's own qualifying note (see above section ה): that the significance of Yom Kippur's teshuvah (not only the cause of teshuvah, but teshuvah itself) is to reveal the essential bond.

41 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:7.

42 AS CITED Rambam, ibid. 7:4.

43 AS CITED Sukkah 27b; see ד"ה זה 5738 (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 1, p. 250ff.).