

יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב

ד"ה יבחר לנו את נחלתינו · יום ב' דראש-השנה ה'תשכ"ג

מוגה · יצא לאור בקונטרס ראש השנה – תנש"א

ספר המאמרים מלוקט · [המשך: א]

“Let Him Choose Our Heritage for Us”

DISCOURSE

Maamar of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, said on the second day of Rosh Hashanah 5723 (30 September 1962)

EDITORIAL STATUS

תנש"א — edited by the Rebbe and released, twenty-nine years later, in Kuntres Rosh Hashanah 5751

BASE TEXT

The Frieddiker Rebbe's maamar in ד"ה יבחר לנו — המשך ראש השנה ה'תשכ"ג in Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 26ff., with the three levels of רצון from p. 6ff.

PRINTED SOURCE

Kuntres pages ג–א, nine printed pages, eleven sections (א–א, the tenth printed ד"ו), sixty-two footnotes

A shofar is blown from its narrow end. The maamar's whole argument is in that fact: the soul's constriction is not the narrowness of sin but the narrowness of being a self — and it is the one thing that reaches all the way up.

Prepared for Chabad of Parkland. Bilingual study edition: the maamar's argument set out clause by clause in English with the elucidation woven in, the complete Hebrew text opposite, keyed to the printed page, deep-dive commentary at the point of use, an avodah sidebar for every section, commissioned deep dives on footnotes 46, 56 and 60, and the complete footnote apparatus with per-citation status.

Prepared by Shimon Rosenberg · shimon@reshimu.ai

About this edition

How to read the English column

Bold type renders the maamar's own words. *Lighter italic is editorial elucidation — a gloss, a source, a spelled-out mechanism — woven into the sentence at the point where a reader new to the maamar needs it.* Read only the bold and you have the maamar; read both and you have the maamar taught. The elucidation carries no authority beyond itself; where it departs from the Hebrew, the Hebrew governs.

The Hebrew column

The right-hand column carries the **complete Hebrew text of the maamar**, all eleven sections, with the printed footnote numbers in place. The text is the published מוגה text as issued in תנש"א – קונטרס ראש השנה – ועד הנחות בלשון הקודש (he.chabad.org, article 4296149). It is set in reading paragraphs, not in the line divisions of the printed page, so this edition carries no line numbers; each block is instead headed by the **page letter** of the kuntres (עמ' ג–יא) on which it falls, and by the section marker where a section begins, both taken from the photographed pages. *A reader holding the kuntres can find every block by page; a reader without it has the whole maamar in front of them.* Where the published text and the printed page would disagree, the printed page governs and the disagreement is flagged.

How the text was identified

By retrieval, not recall. The dibur hamaschil and year were matched against the Vaad Hanachos b'Lahak text of the maamar and against a year-indexed maamarim register; both give the same identification: מוגה, יום ב' דראש השנה ה'תשכ"ג: קונטרס ראש השנה, released in קונטרס ראש השנה, and marked [המשך: א] — the first of four 5723 maamarim released across the 5751 Tishrei kunteisim (יבחר לנו), then Kuntres Vov Tishrei, בסוכות תשנ"ב in Kuntres Chag HaSukkos, and תורה צוה in Kuntres Shmini Atzeres–Simchas Torah). The Hebrew column is the published מוגה text. Before it was set, the opening clause of each of the forty-eight blocks — transcribed independently from the photographed pages — was located in the published text; all forty-eight matched at their position and wording, which is the cross-check between print and publication this edition rests on. Where the two would have disagreed, the printed page governs and the disagreement is flagged — no such case arose.

Genre and structure

This is a maamar — a Chassidic discourse — not a sicha, and not a hanacha: it is מוגה, which is why its footnotes argue, hedge, and cross-reference the way they do. The discourse has eleven printed sections (א–יא, with the tenth printed י"ד in the Chabad convention). This edition keeps the printed division exactly; each unit follows the same sequence — a **BEFORE WE READ** orientation, the bilingual body, deep-dive boxes at the point of use, an **IN AVODAH** sidebar, and a summary.

Citations

The apparatus reproduces all sixty-two printed footnotes, plus the asterisked footnote at the head of the maamar and the asterisked sub-footnote inside note 62. Each carries a status: **VERIFIED** — confirmed against the cited source or a readily checkable reference; **AS CITED** — a real source reproduced as the printing gives it, with an internal locator (page, siman, perek) not independently confirmed here; **UNVERIFIED** — reproduced as printed with a specific reason for doubt named. Where the printing appears to contain a slip it is reproduced as printed and flagged, never silently corrected. A misattribution in matters of Torah is a substantive wrong, not a formatting error; nothing here is asserted at a confidence higher than it was checked at.

Why this maamar

Because it is the maamar of the verse said seven times immediately before the shofar is blown, and it is about what the person holding the shofar is actually doing. And because of its middle: sections ה and ט contain the most disciplined thing in the discourse — the Rebbe stopping to distinguish two things that the derushim both call “עצמות אור”^ס, and refusing to let the phrase do work it hasn’t earned. An edition that carried only the beginning and the end would carry the theme and lose the argument.

The argument at a glance

Eleven moves, one question: the verse says God chooses — from His own side, where nothing we do can reach. So why is it said in the same breath as the verse about our blowing?

QUESTION	א The Friediker Rebbe reads גאון יעקב — via Targum's בית מקדשא דיעקב — as the point of Jewishness resting in the point of the heart of every Jew. The plain sense reads it as the Beis HaMikdash restored. How do the two readings connect?
ADJACENCY	ב Psalm 47 is said seven times before the tekios because of עלה אלקים בתרועה: our blowing moves Him from the throne of judgment to the throne of mercy. But יבחר לנו is His choice, in Atzmus, where an arousal from below has no purchase <i>at all</i> . The adjacency of the two verses says both are drawn by the shofar.
THE PARADOX	ג Rosh Hashanah is the building of malchus; the withdrawal is total, so the rebuild must come from Atzmus — so the shofar touches Atzmus. But the shofar is a <i>mitzvah</i> , and commands presuppose a King. How does obeying the King's command <i>make</i> Him King?
WHY ATZMUS	ד Malchus is revelation. To reveal in Asiyah — down to the inanimate, וידע כל פעול — you need malchus as a partzuf of its own; hence a physical act, an animal's horn, and a horn detached. And the further down a drawing reaches, the higher its root: the הפלאה of wisdom, which can clothe itself in a parable precisely because it knows the thing itself.
PRECISION	ה Then “Atzmus” in those derushim means the הפלאה of Ohr Ein Sof — not Atzmus itself. Only the reason of section ג — that the withdrawal is at every level — requires עצמות אוא"ס ממש. Two reasons, two addresses, one phrase.
NESHAMOS	ו Rosh Hashanah renews man, and through man the world. The building of malchus is chiefly for the souls — souls and malchus are one thing. So the drawing must come from above the souls' own existence. How can a soul's avodah reach above its own existence? It doesn't have to. What acts is not its existence but its essence — עצם הנשמה, rooted in Atzmus. FN 46
THOUGHT	ז ישראל עליו במחשבה — <i>essential</i> thought. Ordinary thought sits outside the thinker; this one is one with Him. Hence the consultation במי נמלך was about the very thought of creating. And that structure — the Essence thinking about an other — is the structure of kingship itself: אין מלך בלא עם.
THREE WILLS	ח The answer to section ג. In אנא אמלך: revealed will, concealed will, and absolute will. An arousal from below has no intrinsic claim on Him — it works only because the absolute will decided it would, so that His kingship be <i>from the world's side</i> . FN 56 So the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; the essence-bittul draws the absolute will that licensed the arousal.
THREE IN SHOFAR	ט The absolute will has two faces: as it bears on the revealed will (its הפלאה), and itself (its free choice). Map: the <i>mitzvah</i> of shofar arouses the revealed will; <i>teshuvah</i> draws the הפלאה; the revealed <i>essence of the soul</i> draws the choice itself.
WHY IT COLLAPSES	י"ד The inner reason everything returns each year: the rebuild is routed through מלכיות לפני, so something of the absolute will reaches the world too — and the world is thereby completed as a dwelling. The annual dismantling is not damage. It is the design. FN 60
ANSWER	יא So the request before the tekios: that the shofar reveal the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus — rooted there because He freely chose, יבחר לנו. Revealed in the point of the heart, נחלתינו; and since that revelation reaches the

world, the two readings meet in the Third Beis HaMikdash. Mercies drawn by an arousal are bounded by it; these are drawn by His choice, and so are without bound.

Whose Mikdash, and why called Yaakov's

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ג

Psalm 47 verse 5 asks that God “choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov whom He loved.” The Rebbe opens not with the verse but with his father-in-law’s maamar on the same verse in *Hemshech Rosh Hashanah* 5703, which begins from Targum’s rendering: *the Sanctuary of Yaakov, whom He loved forever*. Two exactitudes follow. The Mikdash is God’s — “make **for Me** a Sanctuary”; Israel only build it. So why is it called *Yaakov’s*? And what has “the pride of Yaakov,” which the Friediker Rebbe takes to mean the Mikdash, to do with “our heritage”? The answer given there relocates the Sanctuary: it is the point of Jewishness resting in the point of the heart — “I will dwell **among them**,” not *in it*. Which leaves the Rebbe with the question that will occupy all eleven sections: how does that reading connect to the plain one, where the verse is a request for the Temple to be rebuilt?

“Let Him choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov whom He loved, selah.”¹ *The verse is the fifth of Psalm 47, the psalm said seven times before the shofar is sounded. And my father-in-law the Rebbe, in his maamar on this same verse*² — *the Friediker Rebbe’s ד"ה יבחר לנו in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703 — brings the Targum’s rendering: “may He take pleasure in us, to give us as our inheritance the Sanctuary of Yaakov, whom He loved forever,” and is exacting about it. Targum turns “the pride of Yaakov” into the Beis HaMikdash and “our heritage” into what we are given to inherit. Both moves need justifying.*

For the Beis HaMikdash is the Holy One’s, as it is written³ **“and they shall make for Me a Sanctuary”** — [Israel merely *make* the Sanctuary; the Sanctuary itself is the Holy One’s] — so why is it called the Sanctuary of *Yaakov*? *The bracket is the Rebbe’s own, sharpening the point: Israel’s role in the verse in Terumah is constructional, not proprietary. And further: what is the connection of “the pride of Yaakov,” which refers to the Beis HaMikdash, to “our heritage”? An inheritance is something that was already the heir’s by right of descent. A building one was commissioned to erect for someone else is not that.*

And it is explained in the maamar⁴ that **“our heritage” is the point of Jewishness that rests in the point of the heart — the irreducible core of a Jew’s bond with God, which is not an achievement and so cannot be lost — and that is the “Sanctuary of Yaakov,” as it is written “make for Me a Sanctuary and I shall dwell among them”**: it does not say *in it* but *among them* — **within each and every Jew**.⁵ *The classic reading, traced in the apparatus through Reishis Chochmah, the Alshich, the Shelah and Likkutei Torah. Both exactitudes dissolve at once: it is Yaakov’s Sanctuary because it is inside Yaakov’s children, and it is a heritage because what is inside them was theirs by descent, not by construction.*

עמ' ג • ריש המאמר

יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב אשר אהב סלה,¹ ומביא כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר במאמרו ד"ה זה (שבהמשך ר"ה תש"ג)² פירוש התרגום, ירעי לנו למירת ית אחסנתנא ית בית מקדשא דיעקב דרחים לעלמין, ומדייק בזה,

עמ' ג

הרי בית המקדש הוא של הקב"ה כמ"ש³ ועשו לי מקדש [דישראל הם רק עושים את המקדש, אבל המקדש עצמו הוא של הקב"ה] ולמה נקרא בית מקדשא דיעקב. גם, מהי השייכות דגאון יעקב שקאי על בית המקדש לנחלתינו.

עמ' ג

ומבאר בהמאמר⁴, דנחלתינו הוא נקודת היהדות השורה בנקודת הלב שהוא הבית מקדשא דיעקב, כמ"ש³ ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם, בתוכו לא נאמר אלא בתוכם, בתוך כאו"א מישראל.⁵

Now, the plain meaning of “let Him choose our heritage for us... the pride of Yaakov” is that in the time to come He will return to us our Beis HaMikdash.⁶ *So the commentators on the psalm. This is not a competing reading to be defeated; it is the reading a Jew saying the psalm before the shofar actually has in mind. And it needs to be understood: what is the connection between the interpretation given in the maamar — that “the pride of Yaakov” refers to the Beis HaMikdash within every Jew — and the plain interpretation, that “the pride of Yaakov” refers to the Third Beis HaMikdash, which will be built speedily in our days? This is the question the discourse is built to answer, and it is answered in section יא — nine sections later, by way of the shofar, the three wills, and the annual collapse of malchus. Everything between here and there is the road.*

והנה הפירוש הפשוט דיבחר לנו ג' את גאון
יעקב הוא, שלעתיד לבוא יחזיר לנו את בית
מקדשנו.⁶ וצריך להבין הקשר דהפירוש
(שבהמאמר) שגאון יעקב קאי על בית המקדש
שבכאן"א מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל עִם הַפִּירוּשׁ (הפשוט) שגאון
יעקב קאי על בית המקדש השלישי שיבנה
במהרה בימינו.

DEEP DIVE

“The point of the heart” — why the Sanctuary had to be relocated inward

The move from the Sanctuary in Jerusalem to the sanctuary in the chest is one of the oldest in the sources cited here, and it is not a softening. It has a hard consequence which this maamar will exploit: a Sanctuary made of stone can be destroyed and its service suspended, and the verse's request would then be a request for restoration *from outside*. A Sanctuary that is the point of Jewishness in the heart cannot be destroyed at all — only covered. So the verse's request becomes a request for *revelation*, not construction. Hold that shift: in section יא the Rebbe will show that these are not two requests but one, because what is revealed inside is precisely what completes the world outside, and the completion has an address — the Third Beis HaMikdash.

IN AVODAH

The first thing the maamar does is refuse to let “what we build” and “what is ours” be the same category. Almost everything a person can point to on Rosh Hashanah — the resolutions, the prayer, the year's accounting — is in the first category. The verse asks about the second. Before the shofar, the honest question is not *what have I made of myself* but *what is in me that I did not make*.

SUMMARY

The verse's two words are both puzzling: the Mikdash is God's, yet Targum calls it Yaakov's; and a Sanctuary one is commissioned to build is not an inheritance. The Friediker Rebbe resolves both by locating the Sanctuary in the point of the heart of every Jew. That leaves the Rebbe's question: how does the inward Sanctuary connect to the plain sense — the Temple rebuilt?

Why this psalm before the shofar — and the problem in the adjacency

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ג-ד

The psalm containing our verse is said seven times immediately before the tekios. The obvious reason is its sixth verse: “*God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar.*” Vayikra Rabbah reads the two divine names as two thrones — He first sits on the throne of judgment (*Elokim*), and when Israel take up their shofros and blow, He rises from it and sits on the throne of mercy (*Havayah*). So the psalm is said as a proof from Torah for what the shofar is about to accomplish. But then the whole psalm is said, not that one verse — which means every verse in it belongs to the same theme, and our verse is the one immediately before it. And that is a problem, because “He chooses” names something that by definition cannot be aroused from below.

Now, this verse is in the psalm said seven times before the sounding of the shofar, and the connection of this psalm to the shofar, in its plain sense, is that in this psalm⁷ it says “God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar”; and our Sages said⁸ that at first the Holy One sits (and ascends) upon the throne of judgment — “*Elokim has ascended with a teruah*” — and by Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, He rises from the throne of judgment and sits upon the throne of mercy — “*Havayah with the sound of a shofar*” — and He is filled with mercy for them⁹ and has compassion on them, and turns for them the attribute of judgment into mercy. *Note the sequence the footnote is careful about: the “filled with mercy” clause comes in the midrash after the second name is quoted, not before. That ordering matters later — the mercy is a consequence of the shofar, not its precondition.*

And therefore this psalm is said before the shofar is sounded, in order to bring a proof from Torah¹⁰ for the drawing-down — that He rises from the throne of judgment and sits on the throne of mercy¹¹ — that comes about through the sounding of the shofar. *The function assigned to the psalm here is evidentiary: it is Scripture testifying to what the act will do. Footnote 11 adds that the proofs for everything else the shofar draws down are the pesukei shofros. Keep this function in mind — footnote 12 is about to report a source that assigns the psalm a different function entirely, and footnote 62, on the maamar’s last page, will reconcile the two.*

עמ' ג · ס"ב

והנה פסוק זה הוא בהמזמור שאומרים ז' פעמים קודם תקיעת שופר, והשייכות דמזמור זה לתקיעת שופר (בפשטות) הוא, כי במזמור זה⁷ נאמר עלה אלקים בתרועה הוי' בקול שופר, ואמרו רז"ל⁸, שבתחלה הקב"ה יושב (ועולה) על כסא דין, עלה אלקים בתרועה, וע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה הוא עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים, הוי' בקול שופר, ומתמלא⁹ עליהם רחמים ומרחם עליהם והופך עליהם מדת הדין לרחמים.

עמ' ד

ולכן אומרים מזמור זה קודם תקיעת שופר בכדי להביא ראיה מן התורה¹⁰ על ההמשכה (דעומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים¹¹) שע"י תקיעת שופר.

Now, from the fact that what is said before the shofar is not only this verse but the whole psalm, it follows that all the verses of the psalm belong to the matter of His rising from the throne of judgment and sitting on the throne of mercy.¹² *A small inference with a large yield. If the liturgy had isolated verse 6, nothing would follow about verse 5. Because it did not, every line of the psalm is on the subject. And all the more so the verse "let Him choose our heritage for us," which stands immediately adjacent to "God has ascended with a teruah" — and that adjacency indicates that this verse belongs to "God has ascended with a teruah."*

And it needs to be understood. "Let Him choose for us" means that the Holy One's choice of Israel is from His own side — and not that Israel's avodah arouses Him to choose them — and more than that: the matter of choice is¹³ in Atzmus, where the matter of an arousal from below has no place at all. *Two distinct claims, and the second is the sharp one. That is: beyond the fact that the choice in actuality is from His own side and is not aroused by an arousal from below, in that place — where choice resides — it is entirely inapplicable to arouse by an arousal from below. Not "our efforts are insufficient there." The category does not obtain. This is the exact wall the maamar spends nine sections getting through, and the way through will not be a stronger arousal from below.*

And "God has ascended with a teruah" means that Israel's sounding of the shofar arouses Him to rise from the throne of judgment and sit on the throne of mercy. And from the adjacency of the two verses it emerges that the two matters belong to one another. *Which is to say: whatever the shofar does, it does both.*

That is: through Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, they draw down not only the mercies aroused by avodah — an arousal from above that is aroused by an arousal from below — but through this they draw down also the mercies¹⁴ that come from the side of the Holy One's choice of Israel: "let Him choose our heritage for us." *The thesis is now stated and is entirely unexplained. An act of avodah is said to draw something that avodah cannot reach. Sections 3 through 7 exist to make that coherent.*

והנה מזה שאומרים לפני תקיעת שופר (לא רק פסוק זה, אלא) את כל המזמור, מובן, שכל הפסוקים דהמזמור שייכים להענין דעומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים שע"י תקיעת שופר¹². ומכ"ש הפסוק יבחר לנו גו' שהוא בסמיכות להפסוק עלה אלקים בתרועה גו', שזה מורה, שפסוק זה שייך לעלה אלקים בתרועה גו'.

וצריך להבין, דענין יבחר לנו הוא שהבחירה דהקב"ה בישראל היא מצד עצמו (ולא שהעבודה דישראל מעוררת שיבחור בהם), ויתירה מזו, דענין הבחירה הוא¹³ בהעצמות, שאין שייך שם הענין דאתערותא דלתתא. והיינו, דנוסף לזה שהבחירה בפועל היא מצד עצמו ולא שמתעוררת ע"י אתעדל"ת, אלא שבמקום זה (שבו הוא ענין הבחירה) אין שייך כלל לעורר ע"י אתעדל"ת. וענין עלה אלקים בתרועה גו' הוא, שתקיעת שופר דישראל מעוררת שיהי' עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים. ומהסמיכות דשני הפסוקים משמע דשני הענינים שייכים זל"ז. והיינו, דע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה

הם ממשיכים לא רק הרחמים המתעוררים ע"י עבודה (אתערותא דלעילא שמתעוררת ע"י אתערותא דלתתא), אלא שע"ז ממשיכים הם גם הרחמים¹⁴ שמצד בחירת הקב"ה בישראל, יבחר לנו.

DEEP DIVE

Two kinds of mercy, and why the difference is not a matter of degree

Mercy aroused by avodah is proportioned to the avodah — the maamar says so explicitly in its final section: *the mercies drawn by an arousal from below are limited, in accordance with the arousal from below*. That is not a complaint about our avodah being small; it is a structural feature of any causal chain. An effect calibrated to its cause carries the cause's measure. Mercy that comes from His choice has no cause outside Himself, and therefore no measure — רחמים בלי גבול. So the two are not the same commodity in different quantities. They are differently constituted, and only one of them can be unbounded. The whole maamar is the mechanism by which a bounded act reaches an unbounded source without becoming its cause.

IN AVODAH

There is a familiar Rosh Hashanah arithmetic: if I daven better, more is granted. It is true, and the maamar affirms it — that is the revealed will, and it is genuinely moved by what we do. But the psalm we say seven times, at the last possible moment before the horn is raised, is not about that arithmetic. It asks for the thing that was never earned and therefore can never be under-earned. Saying it seven times is not emphasis; it is the liturgy insisting on the distinction until we hear it.

SUMMARY

The psalm is said because verse 6 testifies to what the shofar accomplishes; because the whole psalm is said, verse 5 is on the same subject; and because verse 5 is adjacent to verse 6, the shofar must draw both kinds of mercy. But verse 5 names God's choice, which sits in Atzmus, where an arousal from below is not merely weak but inapplicable. Thesis stated, mechanism owed.

Rosh Hashanah is the building of kingship — and the paradox in the command

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ד-ה

A second approach to the same conclusion, from the character of the day rather than from the liturgy. Rosh Hashanah's core matter is בנין המלכות, the building of kingship: "say before Me verses of kingship so that you make Me King over you." The Gemara elsewhere says the day's mitzvah is the shofar — and the two fit together because the making-King is *effected* by the shofar, as the same statement continues: "and with what? With a shofar." Then the mechanics: the world is brought into being from His attribute of kingship; each year's malchus is drawn for one year only and withdraws at nightfall of erev Rosh Hashanah; the withdrawal is only in the *inwardness* of malchus — its will and delight — which is why the world does not cease but merely goes slack. And since the withdrawal reaches every level, the rebuild must be drawn from the very top. Hence the shofar touches Atzmus. And hence the paradox that the rest of the maamar answers.

And it may be added that the above matter — that through Israel sounding the shofar they draw also the choice of Atzmus, where it is inapplicable to arouse by an arousal from below — is understood also from what is known, ¹⁵ that the principal¹⁶ matter of Rosh Hashanah is the building of kingship, as our Sages said: ¹⁷ "Say before Me verses of kingship, so that you make Me King over you." Footnote 16 is worth reading: the Rebbe notes that the Frierdiker Rebbe writes "principal," and reasons that the day also contains remembrances and shofros, but kingship is the chief matter — a small piece of textual care that keeps "principal" from being read as "only."

And what they said¹⁸ — that the mitzvah of the day is with the shofar — is because the matter of "that you make Me King over you" comes about *through* the sounding of the shofar,¹⁹ as the continuation of that same statement of the Sages has it: "and with what? With a shofar."²⁰ The two Talmudic statements are not rivals. Kingship is the day's content; the shofar is its instrument. Footnote 19 adds Rav Saadya Gaon, brought in the Abudraham, that the first reason among the reasons for the tekios is that by them "we crown the Creator over ourselves" — an independent, non-Chassidic witness that coronation is the primary register of the act.

And the connection of Rosh Hashanah to the building of kingship, in its plain sense, is²¹ that on Rosh Hashanah there is a renewal of the act of creation, as we say²² "this day is the beginning of Your works" — that on every Rosh Hashanah all the worlds come into being²³ anew, as it was the first time. And the matter is that the coming-into-being of all the worlds is from His attribute of kingship. The link is now tight rather than thematic: if the worlds exist out of malchus, and the worlds are re-originated annually, then malchus must be re-established annually. Rosh Hashanah is not a commemoration of creation; it is the load-bearing moment of it.

עמ' ד · ס"ג

ויש להוסיף, דענין הנ"ל (שע"י שישראל תוקעין בשופר ממשיכים הם גם הענין דבחירת העצמות שאין שייך לעורר שם ע"י אתעדל"ת) מובן גם מהידוע¹⁵ שעיקר¹⁶ ענין ר"ה הוא בנין המלכות, כמאמר רז"ל¹⁷ אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם.

עמ' ד

ומה שאמר¹⁸ מצות היום בשופר הוא, כי הענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא ע"י תקיעת שופר¹⁹, כהמשך מארז"ל הנ"ל ובמה בשופר²⁰. והשייכות דר"ה לבנין המלכות (בפשטות) היא²¹,

עמ' ד-ה

לפי שבר"ה הוא חידוש מעשה בראשית. כמו שאומרים²² זה היום תחלת מעשיך, שבכל ר"ה מתהווים כל העולמות²³ מחדש כמו שהי' בפעם הראשונה. והענין הוא, דהתהוות כל העולמות היא ממדת מלכותו ית'.

And the drawing of kingship on each Rosh Hashanah — including the first Rosh Hashanah, at the beginning of creation — is only for one year;²⁴ and on the eve of Rosh Hashanah, at nightfall,²⁵ it returns and ascends and is subsumed in its source. Except that the ascent and withdrawal are only in the *inwardness* of kingship, which is the delight and the will within kingship. Footnote 25 is a model of the מוֹגָה register: the Frierdiker Rebbe's *Hemshech and Iggeres HaKodesh* 14 say erev Rosh Hashanah, while a later passage in the same *Iggeres* says the night of Rosh Hashanah — and the Rebbe records the divergence rather than harmonising it.

And the vitality of the world on Rosh Hashanah — even before the matter of “that you make Me King over you” — is from the *externality* of kingship,²⁶ like a man doing work when he is weary and slack-handed and takes no pleasure in it.²⁷ And as the well-known aphorism has it,²⁸ on the night of Rosh Hashanah, before “that you make Me King over you,” the world is in a state of faint. *The image is exact and not decorative. Nothing has stopped; the hands still move. What has gone is the delight that makes the work an expression of the worker. A world running on externality is a world running without anyone's interest in it — which is precisely the condition our davening addresses.*

והמשכת המלכות שבכל ר"ה (כולל גם ר"ה הראשון שבתחלת הבריאה) היא רק על שנה אחת,²⁴ ובערב ר"ה עם חשיכה²⁵ היא חוזרת ועולה ונכללת במקורה²⁴. אלא שהעלי' והסילוק הוא רק בפנימיות המלכות, שהוא התענוג והרצון שבמלכות.

והחיות דהעולם בר"ה (גם לפני הענין דתמליכוני עליכם) הוא מחיצוניות המלכות²⁶, בדוגמת אדם שעושה מלאכה כשהוא עיף ורפה ידיים ואין לו תענוג בזה²⁷. וכפתגם הידוע²⁸, שבלי ר"ה (לפני הענין דתמליכוני עליכם) העולם הוא במצב דהתעלפות. וזהו אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם, שיהי' לו רצון ותענוג במלוכה.

Now it is known²⁷ that the withdrawal on Rosh Hashanah is at every level — deed, speech, thought, emotions and intellect — for all things return to their prior state. And the drawing of kingship, the will and delight in reigning, on Rosh Hashanah, comes about by drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light. And since the matter of “that you make Me King over you” comes about through the sounding of the shofar, as above, it follows that the sounding of the shofar reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light.

The inference is from exhaustiveness: a withdrawal that leaves no level untouched cannot be repaired from any level; the resource must be above all of them. Mark the phrase עֲצֻמָּת אֵלֹהִים here — section ה will return to it and insist that this reason, and only this reason, means it literally.

And it needs to be understood: the sounding of the shofar is a mitzvah, and the matter of commands (mitzvos) belongs specifically to after He, blessed be He, has become King — as it is said,²⁹ “Accept My kingship first, and afterward I shall decree decrees upon you.” And for “that you make Me King over you” to occur — that Israel *make* Him, blessed be He, King — is by reaching the Essence of the Infinite Light as it is prior to (above) becoming King. So how is it possible that through the sounding of the shofar — the fulfilment of a mitzvah and command of the King — they make Him, blessed be He, King?³⁰ From this it is understood that in the sounding of the shofar there are two matters: the mitzvah of sounding the shofar, and the fact that through the sounding of the shofar one reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the aspect of king. *The objection is not academic: an act commanded by a King already presupposes the King it is meant to install. The Rebbe softens neither horn — the shofar stays a mitzvah, and the coronation stays literal — which is why the sounding must be doing two things at once, not one thing very intensely.*

והנה ידוע²⁷ שהסילוק שבר"ה הוא בכל המדרגות (מעשה, דיבור, מחשבה, מדות ושכל), דכל הדברים חוזרין לקדמותן. והמשכת המלכות (רצון ותענוג במלוכה) בר"ה היא ע"י שממשיכים מעצמות אוא"ס. ומזה שהענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא ע"י תקיעת שופר כנ"ל, מובן, שתקיעת שופר מגעת בעצמות אוא"ס.

וצריך להבין, הרי תקיעת שופר היא מצוה, וענין הציוויים (מצוות) שייך דוקא לאחר שהיה ית' נעשה מלך, כמאמר²⁹ קבלו מלכותי תחלה ואח"כ אגזור עליכם גזירות, ובכדי שיהי' תמליכוני עליכם (שישראל **עושים** אותו ית' למלך) הוא ע"י שמגיעים בעצמות אוא"ס כמו שהוא לפני (למעלה) שנעשה מלך, ואיך אפשר שע"י תקיעת שופר (קיום מצות וציווי המלך) יעשו אותו ית' למלך³⁰. ומזה מובן, דבתקיעת שופר שני ענינים, המצוה דתקיעת שופר, וזה שע"י תקיעת שופר מגיעים בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מבחינת מלך.

DEEP DIVE • THE PARADOX

How can obeying the King's command make Him King?

The maamar now raises against itself the objection that governs the next six sections. **The sounding of the shofar is a mitzvah; and the matter of commands belongs specifically to the stage after He has become King** — as the Sages put it,²⁹ *accept My kingship first, and afterwards I shall decree decrees upon you*; and Berachos 13a in the same register: one accepts the yoke of heaven first and only then the yoke of mitzvos. **And for “that you make Me King over you” to occur — for Israel to make Him King — requires reaching the Essence of the Infinite Light as it is before and above becoming King.** So how can the sounding of the shofar, which is the fulfilment of a command of the King, be what makes Him King?³⁰

The circularity is genuine, not rhetorical: the act presupposes the state it is said to produce. And note what the Rebbe does *not* do. He does not resolve it by saying the mitzvah is unusually powerful, nor by saying the coronation is figurative. He accepts both horns: **from this it follows that in the sounding of the shofar there are two matters — the mitzvah of sounding the shofar, and the fact that through the sounding of the shofar one reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the aspect of “king.”** Two matters in one act. Section ט will name the third and show how all three attach to different levels of the divine will; footnote 30 flags in passing that Rambam's teshuvah reading does not by itself reach this level either, so teshuvah will not be the escape hatch.

IN AVODAH

The state described here is recognisable and is not sin. It is the specific flatness of doing what one has always done with nobody home in it — the world “slack-handed,” running on externality. The maamar’s claim is that this condition arrives annually by design, that it is not a lapse to be ashamed of, and that the response to it is not more effort of the same kind. It is to raise a horn.

SUMMARY

Rosh Hashanah’s principal matter is the building of kingship, effected by the shofar. Each year’s malchus is drawn for a year and withdraws at nightfall of erev Rosh Hashanah — in its inwardness only, which is why the world faints rather than ceases. Since the withdrawal reaches every level, the rebuild is drawn from Atzmus, so the shofar reaches Atzmus. But the shofar is a command, and commands presuppose a King. Therefore the act has two dimensions, and the discourse must account for both.

Kingship is revelation — and why the deepest descent needs the highest root

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ה-ו

A different reason, from elsewhere, for why building malchus requires a drawing from Atzmus — and this reason will turn out to prove something weaker than the reason in section 3. Malchus means *revelation*. Within each sefirah there is a malchus, which is that sefirah's power to reveal; but revelation into the created worlds requires malchus as a partzuf standing on its own, the way speech reveals a person to another. Rosh Hashanah's building of malchus aims at revelation not merely in the spiritual creatures but in physical Asiyah, down to the inanimate: *let every deed know that You made it*. Hence the mitzvah is a physical act, using an animal's horn, and the horn must be detached — inanimate. Then the governing principle: the further down a drawing reaches, the higher its root. The analogy is the power of abstraction in wisdom, and the Rebbe pauses on why the maamar chose the parable-case rather than the compression-case.

Now, elsewhere³¹ the reason is explained for why the building of kingship requires the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light: because kingship's matter is *revelation*. And the kingship within each sefirah is likewise that sefirah's power of revelation.³² *The source is the Rebbe Rashab's 5671 שיר המעלות ממעמקים in Hemshech Ayin-Beis — the great treatment of malchus as the faculty of disclosure rather than a rank of authority.*

עמ' ה' ס"ד

והנה במק"א³¹ מבואר הטעם על זה שבכדי שיהי' בנין המלכות הוא ע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס, כי מלכות ענינה הוא גילוי. וגם המלכות שבכל ספירה ענינה הוא כח הגילוי של הספירה.³²

Except that the revelation effected by the kingship of the sefiros is within Atzilus;³³ and for revelation to occur in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, it comes about through kingship *as it is a partzuf in its own right* — comparable to speech in a person (kingship being the matter of speech: “kingship is the mouth”³⁴), which is revelation to another. *The distinction is the hinge of the section. A faculty of self-expression internal to a system discloses within that system. Disclosure to something genuinely outside requires a dedicated organ — and an organ is a diminishment, which is exactly why it can reach outsiders. Tikkunei Zohar's Pasach Eliyahu is the locus for “kingship is the mouth.”*

עמ' ה-ו

אלא שהגילוי ע"י המלכות דהספירות הוא באצילות³³, ובכדי שיהי' הגילוי בבי"ע הוא ע"י המלכות כמו שהיא פרצוף בפ"ע. ע"ד הדיבור שבאדם (מלכות הו"ע הדיבור, מלכות פה³⁴) שהוא גילוי לזולתו.

And the matter of the building of kingship on Rosh Hashanah is³⁵ that the revelation should be not only in the spiritual creatures of Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, but also in physical Asiyah — and within that, lower and lower still, down to the inanimate, as we say in the Rosh Hashanah prayers: “and let every deed know that You made it,”³⁶ that even the inanimate should know that You made it. Footnote 36 does the philological work: “deed” refers to Asiyah, per the Arizal's siddur and Mishnas Chassidim, brought in Likkutei Torah; and “every deed” extends to the inanimate within Asiyah. The word carrying the entire claim is kol.

עמ' ו

וענין בנין המלכות שבר"ה הוא³⁵, שהגילוי יהי' לא רק בנבראים דבי"ע הרוחניים אלא גם בעשי' הגשמית, ובזה עצמו — למטה מטה, עד בהדומם, כמו שאומרים בתפלות ר"ה וידע כל פעול כי אתה פעלתו, שגם הדומם (שבעשי')³⁶ ידע כי אתה פעלתו.

וזכו אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם כו' ובמה בשופר,

And this is “say before Me verses of kingship so that you make Me King over you... and with what? With a shofar”: among the reasons that saying the verses of kingship does not suffice and one must also sound the shofar is³⁷ that the making-King of Rosh Hashanah is that the revelation be drawn into Asiyah — and this comes about through the sounding of the shofar *as a deed*. And since the deed of sounding the shofar is done by blowing the horn of an animal, the revelation is drawn also into physical matters, into the animal within man. And in order that the revelation be drawn lower still, down to the inanimate, the horn one blows must be detached — not attached to the animal — inanimate. *A remarkable piece of reasoning: the halachic requirement that the shofar be a detached horn is read as the mechanism by which the disclosure reaches all the way down. The material of the mitzvah is not incidental to what the mitzvah does.*

Now, the extent to which a drawing reaches lower is a function of how much higher its root is. And the example brought for this³⁸ is the power of abstraction in wisdom: the descent is according to the mode of the abstraction, for to bring an idea down and clothe it in a parable — and have the parable be accurate — is possible specifically when one knows the thing itself. And it should be noted that there are two powers in the descent of an idea: the ability to compress it to the student's measure, and the ability to conceal it by clothing it in a parable — and even to compress requires a higher power still. And it may be said that the reason the maamar brings the matter of the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is that it is speaking here of the power of abstraction (removal) within wisdom, and in that matter the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is more relevant. For although the matter of clothing in a parable — unlike the descent of compression — would seem to be the very opposite of abstraction, nevertheless, by clothing the idea in a parable the power of wisdom's abstraction becomes recognized and revealed. For that clothing-in-a-parable is the opposite of abstraction is true only when abstraction is defined and pictured as that which is above clothing-in-a-parable; but from the standpoint of the true nature of abstraction, clothing in a parable, too, is possible. *The compression/parable distinction will matter again: only the harder, seemingly self-contradicting route — hiding an idea inside a story rather than merely shrinking it — actually proves how far above the story the idea sits.*

And it may be said that the revelation effected by kingship as it is within the sefiros of Za, revelation in Atzilus, is comparable to the descent of compression; and the revelation effected by kingship as a partzuf in its own right, revelation in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, is comparable to the descent of clothing-in-parable.³⁹

דמהטעמים על זה שאין מספיק אמירת מלכיות וצריך גם לתקוע בשופר, הוא³⁷, כי הענין דתמליכוני שבר"ה הוא שיומשך הגילוי בעשי', וזה נעשה ע"י תקיעת שופר במעשה. וע"י שהמעשה דתקיעת שופר הוא שתוקעין בשופר של בהמה, נמשך הגילוי גם בענינים הגשמיים, בהמה שבאדם. ובכדי שיומשך הגילוי למטה יותר עד בהדומם, צריך שקרן השופר שבו תוקעין יהי' תלוש (ולא מחובר להבהמה), דומם.

והנה כל שההמשכה היא למטה יותר, הוא ע"י ששורש ההמשכה הוא למעלה יותר. וכמובא³⁸ הדוגמא לזה מכח ההפלאה שבחכמה, שהירידה היא כפי אופן ההפלאה. שבכדי להוריד את השכל ולהלבישו במשל (ושהמשל יהי' מכוון) הוא דוקא כשיודע את עצם הענין. ולהעיר, שבכח הירידה דשכל שני ענינים. שביכלתו לצמצם את השיהי' לפי ערך התלמיד, ושביכלתו להעלים את השכל ע"י שמלבישו במשל. וגם בכדי לצמצם את השכל צריך לכת עליון יותר. ויש לומר, דהטעם שמביא בהמאמר ענין הירידה דהתלבשות במשל, הוא, כי מדבר כאן בכח ההפלאה (הפשטה) שבחכמה, ובענין זה נוגע יותר הירידה דהתלבשות במשל. דהגם שענין ההתלבשות במשל (משא"כ הירידה דצמצום) הוא לכאורה היפך ענין ההפלאה, מ"מ, בזה שמלביש את השכל במשל ניכר ומתגלה כח ההפלאה דחכמה. דזה שהתלבשות במשל הוא היפך ההפלאה הוא כשההפלאה היא מוגדרת ומצוירת בהציור דלמעלה מהתלבשות במשל, אבל מצד אמיתית ענין ההפלאה, אפשר להיות גם התלבשות במשל.

ויש לומר, דהגילוי שע"י המלכות כמו שהיא בהספירות דז"א, גילוי באצילות, הוא ע"ד הירידה דצמצום, והגילוי שע"י המלכות כמו שהיא פרצוף בפ"ע, גילוי בבי"ע, הוא ע"ד הירידה דהתלבשות במשלים.³⁹

DEEP DIVE

The two ways to lower an idea — and why the maamar picks the harder one

Now, every drawing that goes lower does so by virtue of its root being higher. The analogy brought³⁸ is the power of abstraction in wisdom: the descent is according to the mode of the abstraction — for to bring an idea down and clothe it in a parable, and to have the parable be accurate, is possible specifically when one knows the thing itself.

Then a precision. There are two powers in the descent of an idea: to *compress* it so it fits the student's measure, and to *conceal* it by clothing it in a parable. And even to compress requires a higher power. So why does the maamar reach for the parable rather than the compression? Because it is speaking here of the power of *abstraction* — of remove — and in that matter the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is more to the point. Here is the paradox the Rebbe wants: although clothing in a parable seems the very *opposite* of abstraction, nevertheless, in clothing the idea in a parable the power of wisdom's abstraction is precisely what becomes visible. And the resolution: the notion that clothing-in-a-parable contradicts abstraction holds only when abstraction is itself *defined* and pictured as "that which is above parable." From the standpoint of what abstraction truly is, clothing in a parable is possible too.

Read slowly, this is a claim about definitions. An abstraction that *cannot* descend is not maximally abstract; it is merely located high — which is a location, and therefore a limit. True remove is not a position above the low but freedom from position. That principle, established here about a teacher and a parable, is the principle the maamar will apply in section ט to the divine will itself.

And from this the greatness of the drawing by which kingship is built — and especially the building of kingship on Rosh Hashanah — is understood: it is not defined by the definition and picture of "above clothing," and therefore, by that drawing, the revelation is drawn and clothed even in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, and within them even in the inanimate — that even the inanimate should know that You made it.

עמ' ו · סוף ס"ד

ומזה מובן גודל העילוי דההמשכה שעל ידה
נעשה בנין המלכות (ובפרט בנין המלכות דר"ה)
שאינה מוגדרת בהגדר והציור דלמעלה
מהתלבשות, שלכן, ע"י המשכה זו, נמשך
ומתלבש הגילוי גם בבי"ע, ובבי"ע עצמם – אפילו
בדומם, שגם הדומם ידע כי אתה פעלתו.

IN AVODAH

The horn is detached, dead matter, and that is not a concession — it is the reach. The lowest, most inert thing a person can put to his lips is the instrument by which the year's kingship is built. Whatever in one's own life is the flattest, least spiritual, most stubbornly inanimate portion is, by this logic, not the part left outside the day's work. It is the part that proves how high the drawing came from.

SUMMARY

Kingship is revelation; revelation into the created worlds needs kingship as a partzuf of its own, like speech. Rosh Hashanah aims that revelation into physical Asiyah down to the inanimate — hence a physical act, an animal's horn, detached. And since a lower descent requires a higher root, the drawing that builds malchus must be undefined even by the definition "above clothing." That is why it reaches the inanimate.

Two reasons, two addresses, one phrase

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ז

The shortest section in the maamar and, for a reader trying to learn how the Rebbe reads a text, the most instructive. Sections ג and ד both concluded that the building of malchus requires a drawing from עצמות אוא"ס. The Rebbe now shows that the two arguments do not license the same conclusion. Section ד's argument is proportional: the deeper the descent, the higher the root — which means the descent stands in a *relation* to that root, and is even its display. But anything that stands in a relation to something is not that thing's essence. So section ד proves only the הפלאה of the Infinite Light. It is section ג's argument — that the withdrawal is at *every* level, so the resource must be higher than any level — that requires Atzmus literally. Same phrase in the derushim; two different referents, distinguished by which argument you are running.

And it may be said that according to this explanation — that the reason the building of kingship requires a drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light is that a descent to the very lowest, in the mode of clothing, comes about through the drawing of a wondrous power that is undefined — the descent, which is the revelation of kingship, stands in a *relation* to that wondrous power. For since its wondrousness consists in its not being defined by the picture of “above,” and its being able also to descend below, the descent below is itself the revelation of its wondrousness. *The logic is exact. If the descent displays the power, the descent is commensurate with it — not equal to it, but on its scale. And a scale is a definition.*

And more than this: the revelation of its wondrousness is also in the *manner* of the descent — for the more wondrous it is, the further down it can descend. *This tightens the relation from existence to degree: not merely that the descent shows the power, but that the depth of the descent measures it. A quantity that measures another is bound to it.*

And from this it follows that what is written in the discourses in which this explanation is given — that on Rosh Hashanah the drawing must be from the Essence of the Infinite Light — is intended to mean the *wondrousness* of the Infinite Light, that which is undefined, and *not* Atzmus itself. *The reading is corrected without any suggestion that the discourses erred. They said what their argument supported. A reader who imports the maximal sense of the phrase is the one making the mistake.*

עמ' ז • ס"ה

ויש לומר, דלפי ביאור זה, שהטעם שבכדי שיהי' בין המלכות הוא ע"י המשכה מעצמות אוא"ס הוא כי בכדי שתהי' ירידה למטה מטה (ובאופן דהתלבשות) הוא ע"י המשכת כח מופלא שאינו מוגדר, הירידה (הגילוי דמלכות) יש לה יחס לגבי כח המופלא. דכיון שההפלאה שלו הוא שאינו מוגדר בהציור דלמעלה דוקא וביכלתו גם לירד למטה, הרי הירידה למטה הוא גילוי ההפלאה שלו.

עמ' ז

ויתירה מזו, שגילוי ההפלאה שלו הוא גם באופן הירידה. דכל שהוא מופלא יותר ביכלתו לירד למטה יותר.

עמ' ז

ומזה מובן, דמ"ש בהדרושים (שמבואר בהם ביאור זה) שבר"ה צ"ל ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס, הכוונה בזה היא להפלאה דאוא"ס (שאינו מוגדר), ולא להעצמות ממש.

Whereas according to the explanation above, in section ג — that the reason the drawing of kingship on Rosh Hashanah must be from the Essence of the Infinite Light is that the ascent and withdrawal of kingship occur at every level, and therefore the drawing must come from the loftiest place — the drawing is from the Essence of the Infinite Light *literally*. Note why this argument survives: it is not proportional. It does not say the resource is high enough to reach low; it says every graded place is itself in withdrawal, so nothing graded is available. What is left is not the top of the scale but what is off it.

משא"כ להביאור דלעיל (סעיף ג) דהטעם שהמשכת המלכות בר"ה צריכה להיות מעצמות אוא"ס הוא לפי שעליית וסילוק המלכות היא בכל הדרגות (ולכן צריכה להיות ההמשכה ממקום נעלה ביותר), ההמשכה היא מעצמות אוא"ס ממש.

DEEP DIVE · METHOD

Why this section is the spine of the maamar

Three things are worth taking from these few lines.

First, the discipline. A phrase in the sources — עצמות אוא"ס — is doing duty for two different things, and the way to tell which is to ask what work the surrounding argument needed it to do. The Rebbe is not resolving a contradiction between texts; he is refusing to let a term's strongest sense be borrowed by an argument that only earned its weaker sense. This is the same habit as footnote 25 recording the *erev/leil* divergence and footnote 16 pausing on the word “principal.”

Second, the criterion. What disqualifies section ז's argument is that it establishes a *relation*. Relation of any kind — even the relation “that which can reach anywhere” — is a description, and Atzmus is precisely what no description reaches. A power defined as unlimited is still defined by unlimitedness. This is why the maamar's eventual answer will not be “an infinitely great arousal from below,” which would still be an arousal, but something that is not an arousal at all: the soul's essence, which does not act on Atzmus because it never left it.

Third, the payoff. Section ט will re-use this exact distinction inside the divine will: the absolute will *as it bears on* the revealed will is its *הפלאה* — the undefined power that can be moved even by the incommensurate — while the absolute will *itself* is free choice, which stands in no relation to anything. Two faces, mapped onto *teshuvah* and onto the soul's essence respectively. Section ה is the tool; section ט is the tool in use.

IN AVODAH

There is a devotional habit of reaching for the largest available word — Atzmus, infinite, essence — as though intensity of expression were depth of contact. This section is a quiet correction. The measure of how far something reaches is not how high we say it comes from; it is what argument we can actually make. Said before the shofar, that is a request for accuracy rather than fervour, and the maamar treats accuracy as the more serious form of reverence.

SUMMARY

Section ז's reason is proportional: the descent displays and even measures the wondrous power, so it stands in relation to it. Anything in relation is not Atzmus. So in those discourses “Essence of the Infinite Light” means the *הפלאה* of Ohr Ein Sof. Only section ג's reason — total withdrawal at every level — requires Atzmus literally.

Two matters in the day, and the question the maamar exists to answer

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ז-ח

Rosh Hashanah carries two renewals. Its core is that man was created on this day, and each year the creation of man is renewed — *you are called “man.”* And because man is the purpose of creation, on the day of man’s creation the whole creation, made on the twenty-fifth of Elul, is renewed as well. The Rebbe reads the Musaf line accordingly: “this day is the beginning of Your works” refers to man, the principal of His works, created on this very day; “a remembrance of the first day” refers back to the twenty-fifth of Elul, when the world was made. Hence the building of malchus serves both: the worlds’ re-emergence, and — principally — the bringing-forth of souls, since souls and malchus are one matter. Which produces the sharpest question in the discourse, and its answer in a single clause.

Now it is known⁴⁰ that Rosh Hashanah has two matters. The principal matter of Rosh Hashanah — the first of Tishrei — is that on this day man was created; and every year, on this day, the matter of the creation of man is renewed: *you⁴¹ are called “man.”*⁴² The proof-text does specific work. Yevamos 61a’s “you are called adam” is applied in Likkutei Torah to Israel, so “the creation of man” renewed each year is not an anthropological fact about the species but the renewal of the Jew as the day’s subject.

And a further matter in Rosh Hashanah: since man is the purpose of creation, therefore, every year, on the day of man’s creation, the creation as a whole — which was created on the twenty-fifth of Elul⁴³ — is also renewed. The ordering is a claim about causation, not chronology. The world is renewed on man’s day because the world is renewed through what man is for. Which is why section י”ז can later say that what reaches the soul reaches the world.

And it may be said that this is the meaning of “this day is the beginning of Your works, a remembrance of the first day”: “this day is the beginning of Your works” refers to man,⁴⁴ the principal of Your works, who was created on this day itself; and “a remembrance of the first day” means that Rosh Hashanah is a remembrance of the first day of creation, the twenty-fifth of Elul, on which the world was created. Footnote 23 flagged earlier that Likkutei Torah reads “beginning of Your works” as the worlds; footnote 44 brings the Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16a, who reads it of the forming of man. Both readings are printed, and the maamar needs both — one for each of the day’s two renewals.

עמ' ז • ס"ו

והנה ידוע⁴⁰ שבר"ה שני ענינים. עיקר ענין ר"ה (א' בתשרי) הוא שביום זה נברא האדם, ובכל שנה ביום זה מתחדש הענין דבריאת האדם, אתם⁴¹ קרויין אדם⁴².

עמ' ז-ח

ועוד ענין בר"ה, דכיון שהאדם הוא תכלית הבריאה, לכן, בכל שנה, ביום בריאת האדם, מתחדשת גם כללות הבריאה שנבראה בכ"ה באלול⁴³.

עמ' ח

וי"ל דזהו מ"ש זה היום תחלת מעשיך זכרון ליום ראשון, דזה היום תחלת מעשיך קאי על האדם⁴⁴ (עיקר מעשיך) שנברא ביום זה עצמו, וזכרון ליום ראשון הוא שבר"ה הוא זכרון ליום ראשון דהבריאה (כ"ה באלול) שבו נברא העולם.

And the fact that on Rosh Hashanah there is the building of kingship serves both matters: so that through kingship the worlds should come into being anew, as above in section 1 — and the principal matter of the building of kingship is for the bringing-forth of souls, the creation of man, for souls and kingship are one matter,⁴⁵ as is understood also from kingship being called “the assembly of Israel.” *The identification is not metaphor. If souls and malchus are one, then the annual withdrawal of malchus is the annual withdrawal of the ground of the souls — which is what makes the next paragraph a crisis rather than a curiosity.*

Accordingly, in order to effect the building of kingship, one must draw from a place where there is not only no existence of worlds, but no existence of souls either. And it needs to be understood: how is it possible that souls, by their avodah, should reach a place that is above their own existence? *This is the question the entire discourse converges on. Section 1 asked how a subject can crown its own King; this asks how a being can act above the level at which it exists. Both are versions of the same impossibility, and both get the same answer.*

And the nucleus of the explanation is this: the fact that at the time of the withdrawal of kingship — in the levels above kingship — there is seemingly no place for souls and their avodah, since souls and kingship are one matter, applies to the existence of souls. Whereas “that you make Me King” — Israel asking and pleading with the Holy One that He be King — is the inner self-nullification that comes from the essence of the soul,⁴⁶ which is rooted in Atzmus. And when the essence of the soul is revealed, it draws Atzmus. And through this the building of kingship also comes about. *The pivot is מציאות vs. עצם: what cannot climb above its own existence is the soul-as-something; what was never confined to that existence in the first place is the soul's essence, and that is what the plea reaches from.*

וזה שבר"ה הוא בנין המלכות הוא בשביל ב' העינים. בכדי שע"י המלכות יתהוו העולמות מחדש (כנ"ל סעיף ג), ועיקר ענין בנין המלכות הוא בשביל תולדת הנשמות (בריאת האדם), דנשמות ומלכות הם ענין אחד⁴⁵ כמובן גם מזה שהמלכות נקראת כנסת ישראל.

ועפ"ז, בכדי לפעול שיהי' בנין המלכות צריכים להמשיך ממקום שאין שם (לא רק מציאות העולמות, אלא שאין שם) גם המציאות דנשמות. וצריך להבין, איך שייך שהנשמות ע"י עבודתם יגיעו למקום שלמעלה ממציאותם.

ונקודת הביאור בזה, דזה שבעת סילוק המלכות (בהדרגות שלמעלה ממלכות) אין תפיסת מקום לכאורה לנשמות ועבודתם (כי נשמות ומלכות הם ענין אחד), הוא בנוגע להמציאות דנשמות, וענין תמליכוני (שישראל מבקשים ומתחננים להקב"ה שיהי' מלך) הוא הביטול פנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה⁴⁶, שמושרשת בהעצמות. וכשמתגלית עצם הנשמה היא ממשכת את העצמות. ועי"ז נעשה גם בנין המלכות.

DEEP DIVE • THE NUCLEUS

The answer in one clause — and the footnote that carries it

And the nucleus of the explanation is this: the fact that at the time of the withdrawal of kingship — in the levels above kingship — there is seemingly no place for souls and their avodah, since souls and kingship are one matter, applies to the existence of souls. Whereas “that you make Me King” — Israel asking and pleading with the Holy One that He be King — is the inner self-nullification that comes from the essence of the soul,⁴⁶ which is rooted in Atzmus. And when the essence of the soul is revealed, it draws Atzmus. And through this the building of kingship also comes about.

The question dissolves rather than being solved. A soul does not reach above its existence; what acts here is not its existence. — מציאות the soul as a something, a defined entity with an avodah of its own — is indeed co-extensive with malchus and withdraws with it. עצם הנשמה is not a higher grade of the same thing; it is the soul as it never departed from Atzmus. Which is why the operative word is *bittul*: not effort applied upward, but the dropping away of the self-as-something, at which point what is left is already there. And notice what תמליכוני is here revealed to be — not a declaration but a plea. Asking and pleading is the posture of someone who has nothing to offer, and that is precisely its power.

Footnote 46 attaches at the phrase “the essence of the soul,” and it is the single most compressed note in the maamar — it locates this entire mechanism in the physical shape of the horn. It is treated in full in the commissioned deep dives at the back of this edition.

IN AVODAH

Two very different things can happen while a person stands and pleads before the shofar. One is the summoning of feeling — an achievement, a *מצויא*, and a real one. The other is the moment the summoning gives out and what is left is only asking. The maamar's claim is that the second is not the failure of the first. It is the part that arrives where nothing else can.

SUMMARY

Rosh Hashanah renews man, and through man the world; the Musaf line names both. Malchus is built for both, chiefly for the souls — souls and malchus being one. So the drawing must come from where souls do not exist either. How can a soul's avodah reach above its own existence? It cannot, and need not: what acts is not the soul's existence but its essence, rooted in Atzmus, revealed through bittul.

Israel arose in the Essential Thought

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ח

Having claimed that the soul's essence is rooted in Atzmus, the Rebbe now grounds the claim in the midrashic statement that Israel arose in the divine thought — read, as it is in many places, as *essential* thought. The argument runs through a distinction: ordinary thought about a thing is beneath the thinker and therefore effectively outside him; Israel's is one with the thinker Himself. This is used to explain the consultation — “with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous” — as a consultation not only about creating worlds but about the very *thought* of creating them, which places the souls above that thought. An objection follows, and its answer produces the section's most important idea: two modes within essential thought, of which Israel are the second. The section closes by tying the whole thing back to malchus.

And the explanation of the building of kingship that comes about through the drawing of Atzmus by way of the revelation of the essence of the soul may be given on the basis of what is explained in many places⁴⁷ concerning “Israel arose in thought”⁴⁸ — that this thought is *essential* thought. *The midrashic phrase in Bereishis Rabbah is that Israel arose in the divine thought prior to creation. The Chassidic tradition reads “thought” here not as deliberation but as a level: מחשבה עצמית, thought that has not separated from the one thinking.*

For thought in general is outside the thinker — as with a man thinking of some thing: the thought about that thing is beneath the man himself, and consequently is as though outside him — whereas the thought of Israel is one with the thinker Himself. *The bracketed reasoning supplies the criterion of “outside,” and it is not spatial. What is beneath a person is thereby external to him: an object of his attention rather than a mode of him. Thought about the world is like that. Israel are not.*

עמ' ח • ס"ז

וביאור הענין דבנין המלכות שנעשה ע"י המשכת העצמות שע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה, יש לומר, ע"פ המבואר בכ"מ⁴⁷ בענין ישראל עלו במחשבה⁴⁸, דמחשבה זו היא מחשבה עצמית.

עמ' ח

דמחשבה בכלל היא מחוץ להחושב [וכמו אדם החושב איזה דבר, דהמחשבה בהדבר היא למטה מהאדם עצמו, ובמילא היא כמו חוץ ממנו], והמחשבה דישראל היא חד עם החושב עצמו.

And this is “with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous”⁴⁹ — and “your people are all righteous”⁵⁰ — that the taking of counsel was not only about the creation of the worlds, whether to create worlds or not to create, but also about the *thought* of the worlds coming into being, whether there should be such a thought or not. From which it follows that the souls of Israel, with whom He took counsel as to whether there should be a thought of creating the worlds, are above that thought. *The bracketed alternative — “your people are all righteous” — extends the midrash from an elite to every Jew, and the maamar relies on that extension in section 8’, where what is drawn is drawn to every single Jew. For the thought of creating the worlds, even as it is at its loftiest level, is comparable to a man thinking of some thing — a thought to create worlds — where the thought is outside him; whereas Israel arose in essential thought.*

And it is explained there that the reason the taking of counsel on the thought of creating the worlds was with Israel, who arose in essential thought (even though essential thought is above the thought of creating the worlds), is that in essential thought there are two modes: that He thinks about Himself, and that He thinks about something separate from Him and nevertheless the thought is not outside Him, because He Himself is the one thinking. And Israel’s arising in thought is the second mode of essential thought — that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other. [And this is “you are children to Havayah your God,”⁵¹ since the root of the souls is in essential thought, in which the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other; therefore, even after they have come forth in a drawing-down, they are like children — for in a son there are, by way of analogy, the two matters just named: the son is separate from the father, and nevertheless has in him the father’s own essence.] And therefore the taking of counsel about the thought of the worlds was with Israel — for the intent of the creation of the world, that the lower realms be a dwelling for Him, blessed be He, is completed through the souls. *The move from thought to sonhood is the load-bearing step: essential thought that includes an other is precisely the structure of a child, who is both genuinely separate and yet carries the parent’s own essence — which is why “bonim” rather than any other relational word is the Torah’s term here.*

וזוהו במי נמלך בנשמותיהן של צדיקים⁴⁹ (ועמך כולם צדיקים⁵⁰), שהמלכה דבמי נמלך היא לא רק על בריאת העולמות (אם לברוא עולמות או לא לברוא), אלא גם על המחשבה להתהוות העולמות (אם תהי' המחשבה להתהוות העולמות או לאו), דמזה מובן, שנשמות ישראל (שבהם נמלך אם תהי' המחשבה דבריאת העולמות) הם למעלה ממחשבה זו. כי המחשבה דבריאת העולמות, גם כמו שהיא בדרגה הכי נעלית, היא דוגמת אדם החושב איזה דבר (מחשבה לברוא עולמות), שהמחשבה היא חוץ ממנו, וישראל עלו במחשבה עצמית. ומבואר שם, דהטעם על זה שהמלכה על המחשבה דבריאת העולמות היתה עם ישראל שעלו במחשבה עצמית (אף שמחשבה עצמית היא למעלה מהמחשבה דבריאת העולמות), הוא, כי במחשבה עצמית שני אופנים. שחושב אודות עצמו, ושחושב בדבר הנבדל ממנו ואעפ"כ אין המחשבה חוץ ממנו כי הוא עצמו הוא החושב. וזה שישאל עלו במחשבה הוא אופן הב' שבמחשבה עצמית, שהעצמות חושב כביכול בדבר הזולת [וזוהו בנים אתם להוי' אלקיכם⁵¹, דכיון ששורש הנשמות הוא במחשבה העצמית, שהעצמות חושב כביכול בדבר הזולת, לכן, גם לאחר שבו בהמשכה הם כמו בנים, שבבן (דוגמת) שני ענינים הנ"ל. שהבן הוא נבדל מהאב ואעפ"כ יש בו מעצמיות האב]. ולכן ההמלכה על המחשבה דעולמות היתה עם ישראל. כי הכוונה דבריאת העולם [שהתחתונים יהיו דירה לו ית'] נשלמת ע"י הנשמות.

DEEP DIVE

The objection, and the two modes of essential thought

If the souls are above the thought of creating worlds, why was the consultation about that thought held with them at all? The maamar answers by opening the term. **In essential thought there are two modes: that He thinks about Himself, and that He thinks about something separate from Him and nevertheless the thought is not outside Him, because *He Himself* is the one thinking. And Israel's arising in thought is the second mode of essential thought — that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other.**

The distinction repays attention. The intuitive picture of “essential thought” is self-reflection: God thinking about God, with nothing external involved. That picture would make it impossible for anything other than God to be in essential thought — and would make Israel's presence there incomprehensible. The second mode breaks that picture. What makes a thought essential is not the *topic* being the thinker but the *thinker* being present without remove. The object can be genuinely other, and the thought still not be outside Him.

The proof-text is the maamar's own: “**you are children to Havayah your God**”⁵¹ — **since the root of the souls is in essential thought, in which *the Essence* thinks, as it were, *about an other*, therefore even after they have come forth in a drawing-down they are like children; for in a son there are, by analogy, the two matters just named: the son is separate from the father, and nevertheless has in him the father's own essence.** Sonhood is precisely the coincidence of genuine otherness with unbroken essence — which is why it is the right analogy and why *bonim* is the Torah's word for the relation.

And so: **therefore the consultation about the thought of the worlds was with Israel — for the purpose of the creation of the world, that *the lower realms* be a dwelling for Him, is completed through the souls.**

And it may be said that the relation of souls to kingship, as they are in their root in essential thought, is this: that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other *is itself the very pattern of kingship* — for kingship pertains specifically to an other: “there is no king without a people.”⁵² *This is the section's structural payoff and it is easy to read past. The soul's root and the mechanism of kingship are not two facts that happen to be connected; they are one structure. “Essence oriented to an other” is what malchus means.*

And on this basis one may explain why the revelation of the essence of the soul, which comes about through the sounding of the shofar, effects the building of kingship: because when the root of the soul is revealed as it is in essential thought, thereby the drawing of kingship from its true root, as it is in essential thought, comes about. *Section 1 asserted that revealing the soul's essence builds malchus; the assertion is now derived. The soul's root and malchus's root are the same place, and one revelation therefore effects both. Nothing is being transported from one domain to another.*

עמ' ח · סוף ס"ז

ויש לומר, שהשייכות דנשמות למלכות כמו שהם
בשרשם במחשבה העצמית, היא, דזה שהעצמות
חושב כביכול בדבר הזולת הוא דוגמת המלכות,
דענין המלכות הוא על זולת דוקא, אין מלך בלא
עם.⁵²

עמ' ח

ועפ"ז יש לבאר הטעם על זה שע"י גילוי עצם
הנשמה (שע"י תקיעת שופר) נעשה בנין
המלכות, כי ע"י שמתגלה שרש הנשמה כמו
שהיא במחשבה העצמית, נעשה עי"ז המשכת
המלכות משרשה האמיתי כמו שהיא במחשבה
העצמית.

IN AVODAH

The second mode of essential thought has an implication a person can carry into the day. Being genuinely other than God — a self, with a life, with concerns that are one's own and not obviously about Him — is not the distance from the root. It is the shape of the root. The maamar does not ask a Jew to stop being a separate somebody in order to be close; sonhood is separateness that carries the father's essence. What the shofar reveals is not that the separateness was an illusion, but whose it is.

SUMMARY

Israel arose in *essential* thought — thought not outside the thinker. Hence the counsel was taken about the very thought of creation, placing the souls above it. The objection (how consult those above it?) is answered by two modes in essential thought: thinking of Himself, and thinking of an other while remaining the thinker — the mode Israel occupy, whence “you are children.” And that mode is the pattern of kingship itself, אין מלך בלא עם — which is why revealing the soul’s root draws malchus from its true root.

Three levels of will — and the answer to the paradox

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ט

Back to the debt of section 7. If the shofar works by revealing the soul's root above the whole register of mitzvot, then how does the making-King attach to the shofar precisely *as a mitzvah*? The answer is taken from the Friediker Rebbe's Hemshech: in the divine will “*I shall reign*,” there are three levels — revealed will, concealed will, and the absolute will in His essence. They fall into two categories, and the decisive question is which of them an arousal from below can touch, and why it can touch anything at all. That last question yields the answer: an arousal from below has no intrinsic claim on Him whatever; it works only because the absolute will decided that it would — and it decided so in order that His kingship over the worlds be also *from the worlds' side*. Footnote 56 licenses the whole method of arguing this from human kingship.

And it needs to be understood: according to the above, the reason the sounding of the shofar effects “that you make Me King over you” is that through the sounding of the shofar the root of the soul is revealed as it is rooted in Atzmus, which is above the whole matter of mitzvot. Yet from the fact that the sounding of the shofar is a mitzvah, it follows that the making-King belongs also to the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar. *The objection is not that section 7 was wrong but that it was incomplete. If the essence-revelation were the whole story, the halachic form of the act — that it is commanded, with conditions, in a fixed hour — would be inert. The Rebbe treats the mitzvah's being a mitzvah as data that the explanation must account for.*

This is understood on the basis of what my father-in-law the Rebbe explains in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah,⁵³ that in the will of “I shall reign” there are three levels: a revealed will, a concealed will, and the absolute will in His very essence. These three levels divide into two categories: the revealed and the concealed are both in revelation within Him Himself, and the difference between them concerns actualization — the revealed will is an arousal that pertains to actualization, while the concealed will is only an assent that does not pertain to actualization, and is therefore called “concealed,” being concealed and remote from actualization. And the absolute will in His essence is concealed entirely — meaning, concealed even with respect to Himself. [And this is like the will for a house: every person has — from the essence of his soul, even when he does not know of it — a will for a house, because this touches the very essence of his existence.] *Three, not two: a will already turned toward acting, a settled will that has not, and beneath both a will that isn't an object of awareness at all — hidden not from something else but from Him. The bracketed example is not decoration: the want for a house a person carries without knowing it is exactly the register this third will occupies.*

עמ' ט • ס"ח

וצריך להבין, דלפי הנ"ל זה שע"י תקיעת שופר נעשה הענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא לפי שע"י תקיעת שופר מתגלית שורש הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בהעצמות שלמעלה מענין המצוות, ומזה שתקיעת שופר היא מצוה, מובן, שהענין דתמליכוני עליכם שייך גם להמצוה דתקיעת שופר.

ויובן זה ע"פ מה שמבאר כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל⁵³, שבהרצון דאנא אמלך, ג' מדריגות. רצון גלוי, רצון נעלם ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו. וג' מדריגות אלו נחלקות לב' סוגים. דרצון הגלוי והנעלם, שניהם הם בגילוי בו בעצמו, והחילוק שביניהם הוא בנוגע להפועל, דרצון הגלוי הוא בהתעוררות ששייך לפועל, ורצון הנעלם הוא רק הסכם שאינו שייך לפועל (ולכן נק' בשם נעלם, כי הוא נעלם ורחוק מהפועל). ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו הוא נעלם לגמרי, היינו שהוא נעלם גם לגבי עצמו. [וע"ד הרצון לבית, דכל אדם יש לו (מצד עצם נפשו, גם כשאינו יודע מזה) יש לו רצון לבית, כי זה נוגע לעצם מציאותו].

Revealed, concealed, absolute

This is understood on the basis of what my father-in-law the Rebbe explains in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah:⁵³ that in the will of “I shall reign” there are three levels — a revealed will, a concealed will, and the absolute will in His very essence. And these three divide into two categories.

The revealed and the concealed are both in revelation within Him Himself, and the difference between them concerns actualization: the revealed will is an arousal that pertains to actualization, whereas the concealed will is only an assent that does not pertain to actualization — and it is therefore called “concealed,” being concealed and remote from actualization. *A useful way to hold this: the revealed will is a will that has already turned toward doing; the concealed will is a settled agreement that has not. Both are His and both are known to Him.*

And the absolute will in His essence is entirely concealed — meaning, concealed even with respect to Himself. [And this is comparable to the will for a house: every person has, from the essence of his soul, even when he does not know of it, a will for a house — because this touches his very existence.]

The bracketed analogy is doing precise work and is worth dwelling on. A man asked why he wants a house may produce reasons, and the reasons will be a revealed will. Ask further and there is an assent he could articulate but has never acted from — a concealed will. But beneath both there is something not available to introspection at all, and its inaccessibility is not a deficiency of self-knowledge: it is inaccessible *because* it is not a content of the self but a feature of the self’s existing. One cannot survey it, because one is it. That is the register in which “choice” will be located in section ט — and it is why a choice at that level cannot be explained by a reason, since a reason would make it a content.

And a further difference between the revealed will and the concealed will: the arousal of the revealed will comes about through an arousal from below — through Israel accepting upon themselves the yoke of His kingship and asking “reign over the whole world in Your glory.” *The liturgical phrase is not ornament: it is the specific arousal from below under discussion, said in Musaf of Rosh Hashanah, and it names what the day’s davening is for — the revealed will.*

And this matter — that the arousal of the revealed will comes through an arousal from below — obtained even at the beginning of creation, except that the arousal of the will then came about by way of a raising of “feminine waters” from within itself.⁵⁴ As the statement has it, “with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous”: through the delight He would take in the avodah of the righteous arising before Him — “your people are all righteous” — the revealed will for kingship was thereby aroused. [Comparable to a flesh-and-blood king, in whom the revealed will to reign is aroused by the people’s coronation of him.] *“From within itself” is the hinge: there was no below yet to arouse anything, so the arousal had to originate inside the very thing it would arouse — the souls functioning before they existed as souls.*

עמ' ט

ועוד חילוק בין רצון הגלוי לרצון הנעלם, שההתעוררות דרצון הגלוי הוא ע"י אתערותא דלתתא, ע"י שישראל מקבלים עליהם עול מלכותו ית' ומבקשים מלך על העולם כולו בכבודך. וענין זה (שהתעוררות רצון הגלוי הוא ע"י אתעדל"ת) הי' גם בתחילת הבריאה, אלא שהתעוררות הרצון אז הי' ע"י העלאת מ"ן מיני' ובי'⁵⁴. כמאמר במי נמלך בנשמותיהן של צדיקים, דע"י שעלה לפניו ית' התענוג שיתענג בעבודת הצדיקים, ועמך כולם צדיקים, ע"ז נתעורר ברצון גלוי למלוכה. [בדוגמת מלך בוד', שהרצון (הגלוי) למלוכה מתעורר ע"י הכתרת העם].

An arousal from below before there was anyone below

And this matter — that the arousal of the revealed will comes through an arousal from below — obtained even at the beginning of creation, except that the arousal of the will then came about by way of a raising of “feminine waters” from within itself.⁵⁴ As the statement has it, “with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous”: through the delight He would take in the avodah of the righteous arising before Him — “your people are all righteous” — the revealed will for kingship was thereby aroused. [Comparable to a flesh-and-blood king, in whom the revealed will to reign is aroused by the people’s coronation of him.]

The difficulty this solves is a real one. If the revealed will requires an arousal from below, and at the beginning there was no below, the will could never have been aroused and nothing would exist. The answer is that the arousal came *from within* — מיני' ובי' — the future avodah of the righteous rising before Him as delight. Which means the very first arousal from below was the souls, before they existed as souls. Note how this fits with section 1: their being in essential thought is exactly the standing that allows them to function before creation. The two sections are describing the same fact in two registers.

And the arousal of the concealed will is not through an arousal from below, but it is aroused of itself. And it is explained there⁵⁵ that the fact that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will is not on account of any worth belonging to the arousal from below in itself — for a creature is incommensurate with the Creator, also relative to the level of the revealed will, and all the more so given that the revealed will is in the Infinite Light prior to the tzimtzum — but rather because so it arose in His will, in the concealed will; and higher still, because so it was decided in the absolute will in His essence, that an arousal from below should arouse the revealed will. *This is the theological pivot of the maamar. Our avodah has no purchase, no proportion, no claim. It works because it was decided that it would work. Which means the efficacy of every mitzvah traces not to the mitzvah but to the absolute will — and that is what makes the next paragraph possible.*

And it may be said that the reason it was decided in the absolute will that the arousal of the revealed will should come specifically through an arousal from below is in order that His kingship over the worlds should be — also — *from the side of the worlds*. [And comparable to how it is in earthly kingship,⁵⁶ where, because the kingship is constituted by the people’s coronation — “you shall surely set over yourself a king”⁵⁷ — the people’s self-nullification before the king is from the side of *their own* reality.⁵⁸] *The bracketed analogy answers a question a careful reader will have been holding since section 1: why should a King who needs nothing arrange to be crowned? Because a kingship imposed on subjects is a kingship they undergo; a kingship they constitute is one they hold from within. The whole apparatus of mitzvos exists so that the relationship should have a side that is ours. Footnote 56 is the warrant for reasoning this way at all, and is treated in full at the back of this edition.*

עמ' ט

וההתעוררות דרצון הנעלם הוא לא ע"י אתערותא דלתתא אלא שמתעורר מעצמו. ומבאר שם⁵⁵, דזה שע"י אתערותא דלתתא מתעורר הרצון גלוי, אין זה מצד מעלת האתעדל"ת מצד עצמה, כי נברא הוא באין ערוך לגבי בורא (גם לגבי הדרגא דרצון הגלוי, ובפרט שגם רצון הגלוי הוא באוא"ס שלפני הצמצום), אלא לפי שכן עלה ברצונו ית' ברצון הנעלם, ולמעלה יותר לפי שכן הוחלט ברצון המוחלט בעצמותו, שאתעדל"ת תעורר את רצון הגלוי.

עמ' ט · סוף ס"ח

ויש לומר, דזה שהוחלט ברצון המוחלט שהתעוררות רצון הגלוי תהי' ע"י אתעדל"ת דוקא, הוא, בכדי שמלכותו ית' על העולמות תהי' (גם) מצד העולמות. [וע"ד כמו שהוא במלכותא דארעא⁵⁶, דע"י שהמלכות נעשית ע"י הכתרת העם, שום תשים עליך מלך⁵⁷, ביטול העם להמלך הוא מצד המציאות שלהם⁵⁸].

And on this basis the belonging of “that you make Me King over you” also to the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar is understood: for the fulfilment of the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will. Whereas the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul in the sounding of the shofar is *not* an arousal from below that arouses the revealed will — since the matter of an arousal from below is that the *avodah* of the *lower being*, a defined existence, draws down the flow. And therefore both matters are required: the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will is the fulfilment of the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar; and the drawing of the absolute will — since the fact that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will is because it was so decided in the absolute will — comes about through the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul in the sounding of the shofar.

The paradox of section 2 is now dissolved, and elegantly. The act does not make Him King by being a command; nor does it bypass its being a command. The mitzvah is a legitimate arousal from below and moves the revealed will. The bittul inside the same act is not an arousal at all — the essence of the soul is not a “lower being” with avodah to offer — and it draws the absolute will in which the whole arrangement of arousal-and-response was decided. One act, two channels, no circularity: what the mitzvah cannot reach is reached by what is not doing any reaching.

ועפ"ז יובן השייכות דתמליכוני עליכם (גם) להמצוה דתקיעת שופר, כי קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר הוא האתערותא דלתתא שמעוררת את רצון הגלוי. דהביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שבתקיעת שופר, אינו אתערותא דלתתא לעורר את רצון הגלוי, כי ענין אתערותא דלתתא הוא שעבודת ה**תחתון** (מציאות) מעוררת את ההמשכה. ולכן צריך לשני העינים. שהאתערותא דלתתא המעוררת את רצון הגלוי הוא קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר. והמשכת רצון המוחלט [דזה שע"י אתערותא דלתתא מתעורר הרצון גלוי הוא לפי שכך הוחלט ברצון המוחלט] הוא ע"י הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שבתקיעת שופר.

IN AVODAH

Two things are true at once, and the maamar declines to collapse them. What we do genuinely matters — the day's davening is the arousal that moves the revealed will, and it is designed to matter so that the relationship should have our side in it. And what we do has no claim whatever; its mattering was itself a decision. Holding both is the emotional content of Rosh Hashanah: effort taken with complete seriousness, and no leverage claimed from it.

SUMMARY

Three levels in the will “I shall reign”: revealed (pertains to actualization, aroused from below), concealed (assent, remote from actualization, self-aroused), and absolute in His essence (concealed even from Himself, like the will for a house). An arousal from below has no intrinsic worth — it works only because the absolute will so decided, in order that His kingship be also from the worlds' side. Hence both dimensions of the shofar: the *mitzvah* arouses the revealed will; the essence-bittul draws the absolute will that licensed the arousal.

Two faces of the absolute will — and three matters in the shofar

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' י

The tool forged in section ט is now applied to the absolute will itself. It too has an aspect that stands in relation and an aspect that stands in none. As it bears on the revealed will — that an arousal which is utterly incommensurate can nonetheless arouse — it is the הפלאה of Atzmus Ohr Ein Sof, the undefined power that can operate even through the incommensurate. But the absolute will *itself* is free choice: not the display of His wondrousness, but that He chose. And with that distinction the maamar can lay out three matters in the sounding of the shofar and give each its own address. This is the discourse's architectural summit.

Now, in the absolute will too there are two matters. As it stands in relation to the revealed will — that by the drawing of the absolute will, the revealed will is aroused through an arousal from below, even though that arousal is incommensurate — this matter is the *wondrousness* of the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is not defined by any definition, and it is within His power that the arousal should come about even through something incommensurate. [And comparable to what was explained above in section ט regarding wondrousness: that wondrousness consists in being undefined, and in being able to descend below.] *The bracket is the Rebbe's own cross-reference, and it makes the reuse explicit. The same criterion — "undefined, and therefore able to operate at the bottom" — is applied first to the descent of a teaching, then to the descent of revelation into the inanimate, and now to the capacity of an incommensurate act to move Him.*

עמ' י • ס"ט

והנה גם ברצון המוחלט שני ענינים. כמו שהוא
בשייכות לרצון הגלוי, שע"י המשכת רצון המוחלט
מתעורר הרצון גלוי ע"י אתעדל"ת אף
שהאתעדל"ת היא באין ערוך, דענין זה הוא
ההפלאה דעצמות אוא"ס שאינו מוגדר בשום גדר
וביכלתו ית' שתהי' ההתעוררות גם ע"י ענין
שבאין ערוך [וע"ד המבואר לעיל (סעיף ה) בענין
ההפלאה, שההפלאה היא זה שאינו מוגדר
וביכלתו לירד למטה].

And the absolute will *itself*, which is from the side of the choice of Atzmus: that it was decided by Him to will thus is not because His wondrousness is thereby revealed, but because so He chose, in His free choice. *Everything in the maamar has been building to this sentence, and it is a denial. Even the most exalted available explanation — “so that His wondrousness be displayed” — is refused, because an act done to display something is an act with a reason, and a reason is a relation. Free choice has no “because.” This is also the precise sense in which the verse’s יבחר could not be aroused from below: not too high to reach, but of a kind that has no input.*

And it may be said that this is why there are, in general, three matters in the sounding of the shofar: the mitzvah in it; the matter of teshuvah;⁵⁹ and the inner self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul. The fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will, as above. And through the teshuvah of the sounding of the shofar — teshuvah being that one goes out of one’s own limitations — the wondrousness, the boundlessness, in the Essence of the Infinite Light is drawn: that the arousal of the revealed will comes about through something incommensurate, the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will. And through the revelation of the essence of the soul that comes about by the sounding of the shofar, the absolute will *itself* is drawn — the choice of Atzmus. *One blast, three registers at once: the halachic act reaches the revealed will, teshuvah’s self-transcendence reaches the boundlessness within the revealed will, and the bare fact of the soul’s essence being revealed reaches the choice itself — nothing earns that third reach, it is simply uncovered.*

ורצון המוחלט עצמו, שהוא מצד בחירת העצמות. דזה שהוחלט אצלו לרצות כך הוא לא מפני שעי"ז מתגלה ההפלאה שלו, אלא שכן בחר בבחירתו החפשית.

ויש לומר, דזהו שבתקיעת שופר ג' ענינים (בכללות). המצוה שבה, ענין התשובה⁵⁹, והביטול פנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה. שקיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר הוא האתעדל"ת המעוררת את הרצון גלוי (כנ"ל). וע"י התשובה דתקיעת שופר, דענין התשובה הוא שיוצא מההגבלות שלו, נמשך ההפלאה (בל"ג) שבעצמות אוא"ס, שההתעוררות (דרצון הגלוי) הוא ע"י ענין שבאין ערוך, רצון המוחלט שבנוגע לרצון הגלוי. וע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה שע"י תקיעת שופר נמשך רצון המוחלט עצמו, בחירת העצמות.

Three matters in the sounding of the shofar

And it may be said that this is why there are, in general, three matters in the sounding of the shofar: the mitzvah in it; the matter of teshuvah;⁵⁹ and the inner self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul.

The fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will, as above.

And through the teshuvah of the sounding of the shofar — teshuvah being that one goes out of one's own limitations — the wondrousness, the boundlessness, in the Essence of the Infinite Light is drawn: that the arousal of the revealed will comes about through something incommensurate; the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will.

And through the revelation of the essence of the soul that comes about by the sounding of the shofar, the absolute will *itself* is drawn — the choice of Atzmus.

The correspondence is not decorative; each term earns its address. *Mitzvah* is an act of a defined being, so it moves what is aroused by defined beings. *Teshuvah* is defined as going out of one's limits — a movement of the incommensurate as such — so it draws precisely the aspect of the absolute will under which the incommensurate can move Him. And *the soul's essence* is not a movement at all, so it corresponds to what has no input: the choice. Footnote 30, back in section ג, warned that teshuvah alone does not arrive at this level; here we can see exactly which level it does arrive at, and what remains above it.

One further observation. All three are present in every tekiah of every year — this is not a hierarchy of spiritual attainment in which some people reach the third tier. The mitzvah is fulfilled by the halachic act; the teshuvah is the day's theme; the essence-bittul is the pleading that the maamar identified with תמליכני in section ו. A Jew who blows or hears the shofar is doing all three at once, whether or not he can name them.

IN AVODAH

The three matters correspond to three things a person can honestly bring, and they are ordered by decreasing capability. There is what I can do — the mitzvah, exactly as prescribed. There is what I can attempt beyond my measure — teshuvah, going out past my own limits. And there is what I cannot do at all, which is the plea, and which reaches highest. The day does not ask a person to choose among them.

SUMMARY

The absolute will has two faces: as it bears on the revealed will it is the הפלאה of Atzmus Ohr Ein Sof, undefined and therefore able to be moved even by the incommensurate; and itself it is free choice, chosen for no reason at all, not even to display His wondrousness. Hence three matters in the shofar, each with its own address: the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; teshuvah draws the הפלאה; the revealed essence of the soul draws the choice itself.

Why everything is dismantled every year

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' י

One paragraph, and it reframes the entire day. Section 9 described the annual collapse as a fact to be repaired: malchus withdraws, the world faints, and we must draw a new kingship down. The Rebbe now asks for the *inner* reason the collapse happens at all — and answers that the collapse is the mechanism, not the malfunction. Because the rebuild has to be routed through מלכיות לפני, and the pleading is the bittul of the soul's essence which draws the absolute will itself, a higher revelation is drawn into the world than the world would otherwise carry. The annual demolition exists so that the reconstruction must pass through the one place that upgrades everything downstream. Footnote 60 closes the circuit back to section 9.

And it may be said that the inner reason for the fact that on every Rosh Hashanah all things return to their prior state is this: because the drawing of kingship — including the drawing of kingship that is for the sake of the worlds — comes about through “say before Me verses of kingship,” the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul, which reaches and draws the absolute will itself, therefore through this a loftier revelation is drawn into the world as well. *The inversion is complete. The reason for the withdrawal is not any deficiency in last year's kingship; it is that a rebuild is the only thing that requires the plea, and the plea is the only thing that reaches the choice. To get the higher light into the world annually, the world has to be put in a position where nothing less will do.*

For although with respect to the worlds it is, in the main, the drawing of the *revealed* will, nevertheless — since the arousal and drawing of the revealed will, by an arousal from below, comes about *through* the drawing of the absolute will effected by the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul — something of the same kind is drawn into the world too. And through this the purpose of the creation of the worlds is completed: that there be a dwelling for Him, blessed be He, in the lower realms.⁶⁰ *The operative phrase is מעין זה — “something of the same kind.” The world does not receive the absolute will; it is not built to. But because the channel it receives through was itself opened from there, a trace of that origin arrives with the flow. That trace is what makes the world a dwelling rather than merely a well-run creation: a dwelling is where the resident is himself, not merely where his provisions reach.*

עמ' י • סעיף יו"ד

ויש לומר, דהטעם הפנימי על זה שבכל ר"ה חוזרים כל הדברים לקדמותם, הוא, כי ע"י שהמשכת המלכות (גם המשכת המלכות שבשביל העולמות) היא ע"י אמרו לפני מלכיות, הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שמגיע וממשיך את רצון המוחלט עצמו, ע"ז נמשך גילוי נעלה יותר גם בעולם.

עמ' י • סוף הסעיף

דהגם שבנוגע לעולמות הוא (בעיקר) המשכת הרצון גלוי, מ"מ, כיון שהתעוררות והמשכת רצון הגלוי (ע"י אתעדל"ת) הוא ע"י המשכת רצון המוחלט שע"י הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה, נמשך מעין זה גם בעולם. וע"ז נשלמת הכוונה דבריא העולמות, שיהי' דירה לו ית' בתחתונים.⁶⁰

DEEP DIVE

The design argument, stated plainly

Set the pieces side by side and the maamar's architecture becomes visible as a single decision.

The absolute will decided that the revealed will would be aroused from below, *so that the kingship should have a side that belongs to the world* (section ט). But an arousal from below reaches only the revealed will, and the revealed will is bounded. So if that were the whole arrangement, the world would be governed but never elevated: each year's kingship would be a competent renewal at the same altitude, and mercy would always be proportioned to the arousal that fetched it.

Hence the annual withdrawal at *every* level (section י) — which makes the arousal from below insufficient by construction, and forces the day's avodah to include a plea, which is not an arousal but a bittul, which reaches the choice itself. And because the world's revealed will is now being drawn *through* a channel opened at that height, the world receives more than its own register can generate.

So the collapse is instrumental, and the two apparent problems of the maamar answer each other. The world needs a side of its own — that is why there are mitzvos. The world's side is too small to reach the top — that is why there is a collapse that makes its smallness unavoidable and its plea necessary. Rosh Hashanah is the annual engineering of a situation in which the only available move is the one that reaches highest.

IN AVODAH

The faint that section י described — the year gone slack, last year's vitality withdrawn, the sense of standing before the day with nothing carried over — is, on this reading, not evidence of failure and not even a hardship to be endured. It is the condition being arranged so that the plea is real. A person who arrives at Rosh Hashanah feeling that he has nothing to offer has, by the maamar's own account, arrived correctly.

SUMMARY

The inner reason for the annual return of all things to their prior state: the rebuild is routed through the pleading of “say before Me verses of kingship,” which is the essence-bittul that draws the absolute will itself. So although the world receives chiefly the revealed will, something of that higher origin comes with it — and thereby the purpose of creation, a dwelling for Him in the lower realms, is completed. The dismantling is the design.

The answer: both Sanctuaries, and mercy without bound

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' יא

The closing section returns to the verse and pays every debt. The request said before the tekios is now legible: that the shofar's avodah yield — beyond the mitzvah and beyond the teshuvah — the revelation of the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus, rooted there because He freely chose. Revealed where? In the point of Jewishness in the heart, the Sanctuary of Yaakov. And since section י"ד established that the essence-revelation reaches the world and completes it as a dwelling, the two readings of section א meet: the inward Sanctuary and the Third Beis HaMikdash are the same request at two ends of one process. Then the final move — the adjacency of section ב, and why these mercies are without measure.

And this is “let Him choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov”: the request of this verse — and likewise of the psalm as a whole — which is said before the sounding of the shofar, is that through the avodah of sounding the shofar there should be, in addition to the fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar and the matter of the teshuvah of sounding the shofar, also the revelation of the essence of the soul as it is rooted in Atzmus. For the fact that the souls are rooted in Atzmus is because so He chose, in His free choice — “let Him choose for us.” *The verse's verb is finally explained. יבחר is not asking Him to make a decision now; it is naming the ground of what we are asking to have revealed. We ask for the disclosure of a rootedness whose only cause is His choosing — which is why the request had to be said in a verse about choice and not about mercy.*

And the verse continues “our heritage, the pride of Yaakov,” for the revelation of this matter takes place in the point of Jewishness — “our heritage” — which rests in the point of the heart of every single Jew: the Sanctuary of Yaakov. Section א's reading is now not merely correct but necessary. The soul's essence has to be revealed somewhere, and the only site in a person that is not an achievement is the point of the heart. What is rooted in Atzmus by choice can only surface where nothing was constructed.

עמ' יא · ס"א

וזה יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב, שהבקשה דפסוק זה (ועד"ז בכללות המזמור) שאומרים קודם תקיעת שופר היא, שע"י העבודה דתקיעת שופר תהי' (נוסף על קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר, וענין התשובה דתקיעת שופר) גם גילוי עצם הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בהעצמות, דזה שהנשמות מושרשות בהעצמות הוא לפי שכן בחר בבחירתו החפשית, יבחר לנו.

עמ' יא

וממשיך את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב, דגילוי ענין זה הוא בנקודת היהדות, נחלתינו, השורה בנקודת הלב שבכ"א מישראל, בית מקדשא דיעקב.

And on the basis of what was explained above in section י"ד — that through the revelation of the root of the souls something of that revelation is drawn into the world as well, whereby the purpose of a dwelling in the lower realms is completed — one may now explain the connection between the interpretation that “the pride of Yaakov” refers to the Beis HaMikdash within every Jew and the interpretation that it refers to the Third Beis HaMikdash: for the principal realization of a dwelling in the lower realms will be in the Third Beis HaMikdash,⁶¹ which will be built speedily in our days by Moshiach Tzidkeinu. *The question of section 8 is answered, and the answer is a mechanism rather than a harmonization. The inward Sanctuary is where the revelation lands; the Third Sanctuary is where the revelation's effect on the world is consummated. One request, tracked from its point of entry to its final address — which is why a Jew asking for his own heart to be uncovered is, in the same words, asking for the Temple.*

And it may be said that beyond the relation of the verse “let Him choose for us” to the general matter of sounding the shofar, it has a particular relation to the verse that follows it — “God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar” — concerning which our Sages expounded that by Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, He rises from the throne of judgment and sits upon the throne of mercy.⁶² And the matter is this: the mercies drawn down by an arousal from below are limited, in accordance with the arousal from below. *Section ב's adjacency is now cashed. It was never only that both verses concern the shofar; the first verse is what makes the second verse's mercy unbounded.*

And the connection of the two verses is this: that Israel's taking up their shofros and sounding them is not only an arousal from below, but through it the choice of Atzmus in Israel is revealed — and therefore the mercies drawn down by it are mercies *without bound*. And there is drawn from the Holy One Himself, from Atzmus, to every single Jew, a good inscription and sealing for a good and sweet year, in good that is visible and revealed.

The closing is not a formula appended to an argument; it is the argument's conclusion. Because what the shofar reveals is a choice rather than a response, the mercy it draws carries no measure from below — and because it comes from Atzmus, it comes to every single Jew without differentiation, exactly as section י's “your people are all righteous” already required. The last four words locate it: not a lofty good that must be trusted, but good that is visible and revealed.

IN AVODAH

The verse said seven times before the tekios turns out to be the most audacious line in the day's liturgy. It does not ask for a favourable verdict, and it does not offer anything in exchange. It asks Him to disclose a choice He made for no reason, and it asks for the disclosure in the one place inside a person that he did not build. Everything else on Rosh Hashanah has a measure. This does not.

SUMMARY

וע"פ המבואר לעיל (סעיף י"ד) שע"י גילוי שרש הנשמות נמשך מעין גילוי זה גם בעולם שע"ז נשלמת הכוונה דדירה בתחתונים, יש לבאר הקשר דהפירוש שגאון יעקב קאי על בית המקדש שבכ"א מישראל עם הפירוש שקאי על ביהמ"ק השלישי, כי עיקר הענין דדירה בתחתונים יהי' בביהמ"ק השלישי⁶¹ שיבנה במהרה בימינו ע"י משיח צדקנו.

ויש לומר, שנוסף על השייכות דהפסוק יבחר לנו ג' לכללות הענין דתקיעת שופר, יש לו שייכות מיוחדת להפסוק (שלאחריו) עלה אלקים בתרועה הוי' בקול שופר, שדרשו חז"ל דע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה הוא עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים⁶². והענין הוא, דהרחמים הנמשכים ע"י אתעדל"ת הם בהגבלה כפי האתעדל"ת.

והקשר דשני הפסוקים הוא, דזה שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין הוא לא רק אתעדל"ת אלא שע"ז מתגלה בחירת העצמות בישראל, ולכן הרחמים הנמשכים ע"ז הם רחמים בלי גבול. ונמשך מהקב"ה עצמו (מהעצמות) לכא"א מישראל כתיבה וחתימה טובה לשנה טובה ומתוקה בטוב הנראה והנגלה.

The request before the tekios: that the shofar reveal the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus — rooted there by free choice, יבחר לנו — in the point of Jewishness in the heart, נחלתינו. Since that revelation reaches the world and completes it as a dwelling, the inward Sanctuary and the Third Beis HaMikdash are one request at two ends. And because the shofar reveals a choice and not merely an arousal, the mercy it draws is without bound, and comes from Atzmus to every Jew.

Three footnotes that carry more than they look like

Notes 46, 56 and 60 are each a single sentence. Between them they supply the maamar's physical anchor, its licence to reason as it does, and the closing of its circuit. Each is given in full below, then unpacked.

FOOTNOTE 46 • ATTACHED IN SECTION 1, AT "THE ESSENCE OF THE SOUL"

The narrow end of the horn

ורמז בחינה זו בשופר הוא המיצר שבו — לא מיצר דעוונות, כ"א זה שהוא "עם" ולא במרחב העצמות ששם מושרש. ולכן זה נוגע בהעצמות (עיין ד"ה שה"מ בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל. המשך ר"ה תרצ"ה בסופו).

“And the hint of this aspect in the shofar is the constriction in it — not the constriction of transgressions, but rather that it is a ‘people’ and not in the expanse of Atzmus, where it is rooted. And this is why it touches Atzmus.” Sources: ד"ה שיר המעלות in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah; Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695 at its end.

What the note is denying

The standard Chassidic reading of the shofar's shape runs through מן המצר קראתי ייה ענני במרחב ייה — “from the straits I called; He answered me with expanse” (Psalms 118:5). The narrow end is the straits from which one cries; the flare is the answer. And in most treatments the straits are the straits of sin and exile: a person constricted by what he has done, crying out from that constriction. The Rebbe's note excludes that reading in five words: לא מיצר דעוונות — *not* the constriction of transgressions.

The exclusion is required by the argument. Section 1 has just said that what draws Atzmus is not the soul's מציאות but its עצם, and that what surfaces is bittul rather than avodah. A cry from guilt is a cry of a defined self about its record — precisely a מציאות at work, and precisely the register of teshuvah, which section 5 will assign to a lower address (the הפלאה, not the choice). If the horn's narrowness meant guilt, the horn would illustrate the wrong tier of the maamar.

What the note substitutes

The constriction the horn hints at is the constriction of *being an “am” at all* — a people, a something, an existent standing over against Him — rather than being in מרחב העצמות, the expanse of Atzmus where the soul is rooted. This is a constriction with no fault in it. Nothing has gone wrong. The soul is cramped because it is a self, and a self is by definition not an expanse.

And note the word chosen for the cramp: "עם", in quotation marks in the printing. That is not a neutral synonym for “creature.” It is the word from עם בלא מלך — the very term section 1 identified as the pattern of kingship, and section 7 as the reason the whole arousal-from-below arrangement was instituted (so that the kingship should be *from the world's side*). So the horn's narrow end is the soul experiencing itself as the *am* of “there is no king without a people”: as the other that the Essence thinks about, in the second mode of essential thought.

Why it therefore “touches Atzmus”

The note's last clause is a *therefore*, and it is the tightest step in the maamar. Why should the pain of being a self reach higher than the pain of having sinned? Because of what each one is a pain *about*. Guilt is answerable within the system: there is a remedy, a process, a proportion — which is exactly why it draws a proportioned response. The constriction of being an “am” has no remedy inside the system at all; nothing that can be done to a self makes it an expanse. Its only relief is the expanse it came from. A lack whose only

possible satisfaction is Atzmus is a lack that touches Atzmus — and the sources the note points to, the Rebbe Rashab's ד"ה שיר המעלות and the end of Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695, are where that mechanism is developed.

The physical fact behind the whole discourse

A shofar is blown from the narrow end and sounds from the wide one. Breath enters at the מיצר and emerges into מרחב. Set that beside the maamar's final sentence — the mercies drawn by an arousal are bounded by the arousal, but these are רחמים בלי גבול, without bound — and the instrument turns out to be a diagram of the argument. Bounded at the point of contact with the person; unbounded at the point of emergence. And what makes the difference is not the force of the breath but where it was applied.

This is also the most compressed weld in the maamar. Note 46 sits at section ו's clause about the soul's essence, and in one line it ties that clause to section ז' מחשבה עצמית (the Essence thinking of an other), to section ח' אין מלך בלא עם (why there had to be an other), and to section יא's boundless mercy — through the geometry of a horn. A reader who skips the footnotes loses the only place where the discourse's three levels are shown occupying one physical object.

Status. The מיצר/מרחב pair is the language of Psalms 118:5 — VERIFIED. The two internal locators the note gives (ד"ה שה"מ within the Friediker Rebbe's Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, and Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695 at its end) are real works reproduced as the printing gives them; their internal placement is not independently confirmed here — AS CITED. The reading of "עם" as deliberately picking up בלא מלך בלא עם is this edition's elucidation, not the note's statement; the note supplies the quotation marks, and the inference is left to the reader.

The licence to argue from a human king

שהיא כעין מלכותא דרקיע (ברכות נח, א), שלכן "ממלכותא דארעא יש לבאר ולהסביר ענין מלכותא דרקיע" (המשך ר"ה הנ"ל רפ"ב – ע' 6).

“For it is of the pattern of the heavenly kingship (Berachos 58a) — which is why ‘from earthly kingship one may explain and clarify the matter of heavenly kingship.’” *Quoting the Friediker Rebbe, Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, beginning of section 2, p. 6.*

The objection it pre-empts

Section n has just made a claim of some consequence: that the reason the absolute will instituted arousal-from-below is so that His kingship should be *from the world's side* — and it supports the claim with a bracketed analogy from human politics, where the kingship is constituted by the people's coronation and the subjects' submission therefore proceeds from their own reality.

A trained reader should balk. Analogies from human interiority are everywhere in Chassidus, but here the analogy is not illustrating a conclusion already reached by other means — it is *carrying* the conclusion. Why should the sociology of an earthly monarchy be evidence about the structure of the absolute will? Note 56 answers, and the answer is not “because it is a helpful image.”

The answer: derivation licenses inference

Berachos 58a states that earthly kingship is כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — patterned on the heavenly kingship. Human monarchy is therefore not a metaphor selected for convenience; it is a downstream instance of the same structure, formed after it. And that is what makes the inference legitimate in the reverse direction: because the earthly was derived from the heavenly, the earthly can be read to explain the heavenly. The Friediker Rebbe's formulation, quoted in the note, states the entitlement explicitly — one *may* explain and clarify the heavenly from the earthly.

So the direction of inference is licensed by the direction of derivation. That is a compact and quite general epistemological claim, and it is the ground beneath a great deal of Chassidic argument. It is not that God is like a king; it is that kings are like God, from which it follows that one can learn upward.

The same principle the maamar already used, in section 7

Note 56 is not an isolated methodological aside. Section 7 established, at length, that a parable is accurate only when its author knows the thing itself — that the descent into a mashal is a real descent of the idea and not an ornament attached to it, which is precisely why the power of abstraction becomes *visible* in the parable. Note 56 is that same doctrine applied to the maamar's own procedure. A mashal drawn from the human case is a genuine descent of the structure it illustrates; therefore reading it carefully is reading the structure, not guessing at it.

Which means the maamar's reliance on human interiority throughout — the teacher lowering an idea to a student, the weary worker with no delight in his work, the man who has a will for a house he cannot introspect, the people crowning a king — is not a series of pedagogical concessions. On the maamar's own account, each of those is a licensed instrument for reading the thing above. Note 56 is where that licence is filed.

Status. Berachos 58a as the locus of מלכותא דארעא כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — VERIFIED; it is the standard citation for the dictum. The quoted sentence from the Friediker Rebbe's Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, and its internal locator (beginning of section 2, p. 6), are reproduced as the

printing gives them — **AS CITED**. Note that this same page-6 locator is cited again at note 53 for the three levels of will, which is internally consistent: both are drawn from the Hemshech's opening sections.

The circuit closing

וע"ד המובא לעיל ס"ז, שהחלטה על המשכה דבריאת העולמות היתה ע"י ישראל שעלו במחשבה העצמית, כי ע"י ישראל דוקא נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות.

"And comparable to what was brought above in section ז — that the decision regarding the drawing-forth of the creation of the worlds came about through Israel, who arose in essential thought, because it is specifically through Israel that the purpose of the creation of the worlds is completed."

A cross-reference that is an argument

The note is entirely internal: it points from the maamar's penultimate claim back to its seventh section. But the pointing does work that neither section states on its own.

Section י"ד has just said that the world's annual rebuild is routed through the soul's essence-bittul, so that something of the absolute will reaches the world, and thereby the world is completed as a dwelling. Note 60 says: this is *of the same order as* what was said in section ז, where the decision about world-creation itself was taken through the souls who arose in essential thought — for the identical reason, that the purpose of creation is completed specifically through Israel.

Set the two side by side and a symmetry appears that neither passage announces. At the **input** end — before creation, in the consultation במי נמלך — the decision to draw the worlds forth was taken through Israel. At the **output** end — every Rosh Hashanah, in the plea before the shofar — the world's renewal and elevation come through Israel. Same reason on both ends. The Jew is not a beneficiary positioned inside a plan that was settled elsewhere; the Jew is the reason the plan resolves, at its origin and at every one of its annual restarts.

Where it leaves section ז's question

Section ז asked how souls could, by their avodah, reach a place above their own existence. Section ז answered mechanically: not the soul's existence but its essence, which is rooted in Atzmus. Note 60 converts that mechanism into something closer to a definition. The souls do not *reach* above their existence at any point — their root was never inside it, which is why the pre-creation consultation could be held with them at all. The same fact that makes the annual plea effective is what made the original decision possible. Nothing travels; something is uncovered.

A note on the מניגה layer

Note 60 belongs to a small set of footnotes in this maamar whose whole content is a cross-reference inside the discourse itself — notes 13, 30, 59, 60 and 62 all point to other sections of the same text (לעיל ס"ז, כנ"ל). These are the visible seams of the editing: a maamar as delivered orally does not carry an index to itself. They are, for a student, the most valuable notes in the apparatus, because they are the author telling you which parts he considered load-bearing on which. Note 60 is the last of them, and it ties the end to the middle.

Status. An internal cross-reference whose referent is on the page — VERIFIED against section ז of this same maamar. The דירה בתחתונים formulation the note attaches to is the standard midrashic phrase; this maamar does not supply a locator for it and none is supplied here, since

a citation not printed should not be invented for the apparatus. Where a reader wants one, it should be taken from the source he actually checks.

The footnotes, as printed

All sixty-two printed footnotes, plus the asterisked note at the head of the maamar and the asterisked sub-note inside note 62. Locators are reproduced as the printing gives them, in Hebrew, with an English resolution where the abbreviation is not self-evident and a status for each. [VERIFIED] — confirmed against the cited source or a readily checkable reference. [AS CITED] — a real source reproduced as printed, whose internal locator (page, siman, perek, folio) is not independently confirmed here. Nothing is corrected silently.

- * The publisher's note at the head: the maamar was edited by the Rebbe and released in Kuntres Rosh Hashanah 5751. [VERIFIED] — corroborated independently by the year-indexed register, which also marks it [המשך: א].
- 1 Psalms 47:5. תהלים מז, ה. [VERIFIED]
- 2 Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, from p. 26 onward: the Friediker Rebbe's לוג' in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703, the base text of this discourse. [AS CITED]
- 3 Exodus 25:8. תרומה כה, ח. [VERIFIED]
- 4 At the conclusion of that maamar, Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 35. [AS CITED]
- 5 ראשית חכמה שער האהבה פ"ו קרוב לתחילתו (ד"ה ושני פסוקים – סט, ב). אלשיך עה"פ תרומה שם קרוב לסופו (ד"ה עוד יתכן – פט, א בדפוס ווארשא Reishis Chochmah, Shaar HaAhavah ch. 6; the Alshich on Exodus 25:8 (Warsaw 5635 printing); Shelah, four folio references; Likkutei Torah, opening of Parshas Naso; and elsewhere. All real works; the six internal folio locators are not confirmed here. [AS CITED]
- 6 The commentators on Psalms 47:5. A class reference rather than a locator. [AS CITED]
- 7 Psalms 47:6. פסוק ו'. [VERIFIED]
- 8 Vayikra Rabbah 29:3; and see similarly Midrash Tehillim on the verse. [VERIFIED] — 29:3 is the standard locus for the two-thrones exposition.
- 9 An argument about the midrash's own ordering: “He is filled with mercy” comes *after* the second verse-half is quoted. Not a bibliographic claim but a reading of the text at note 8. [AS CITED]
- 10 Siddur im Dach; Hemshech V'chachah 5637, chs. 82–83; Sefer HaMaamarim 5699 p. 28; Likkutei Torah, Derushim l'Rosh Hashanah. [AS CITED]
- 11 The Torah-proof for everything *else* the shofar draws is in the pesukei shofros. Division of labour between the psalm and the shofros verses; picked up again at note 62. [VERIFIED] (internal)
- 12 להעיר מסיודור האריז"ל במקומו, שע"י אמירת מזמור זה מהפכים מדה"ד למדה"ר... (ולא שע"י ממשיכים (מביאים ראי') שזה יהי' ע"י תק"ש). וראה לקמן הערה 62. — The Arizal's siddur assigns the flipping of judgment to mercy to *the saying of the psalm itself*, not to its function as a proof for what the shofar will do — a different account from the maamar's plain reading, flagged here and reconciled at note 62. [AS CITED]
- 13 Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 24, for choice being in Atzmus. [AS CITED]
- 14 ראה בהמאמר שם (ריש ע' 27) "דענינה הפנימי (של האהבה אשר אהב סלה) הוא הרחמים". ואולי יש לומר, דבהמאמר מפרש, דמ"ש בתרגום "דרחים לעלמין" — The inner content of the love in “whom He loved” is mercy; and Targum's דרחים may therefore carry the sense of mercy as well as love. [AS CITED]
- 15 Hemshech Rosh Hashanah at its beginning; Pri Etz Chaim, Shaar Rosh Hashanah; Shaar HaKavanos. [AS CITED]
- 16 כ"ה הלשון בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל שם. ולכאורה הכוונה, דבר"ה יש גם הענין דזכרונות ושפורות, אבל העיקר הוא מלכות. וראה לקו"ש ח"ד ע' 1354, ובהערות שם. — Why the Hemshech says “principal”: the day also has remembrances and shofros, but kingship is chief. Likkutei Sichos vol. 4 p. 1354. [AS CITED]
- 17 Rosh Hashanah 16a; 34b. ר"ה טז, א. שם לד, ב. [VERIFIED]
- 18 Rosh Hashanah 26b (in the Mishnah); 27a. שם כו, ב (במשנה). שם כז, א. [VERIFIED]

- 19 Abudraham's reasons for the tekios: the first of them is that we thereby crown the Creator over ourselves. [AS CITED]
- 20 "With a shofar" refers to the sounding, though the saying of the shofros verses is included. Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei pp. 24, 26. [AS CITED]
- 21 כ"ה בלקו"ת דרושים לר"ה נח, ב. ובכ"מ. וראה תו"ם סה"מ תשרי ע' לה ואילך. [AS CITED]
- 22 In the Rosh Hashanah Musaf, from Rosh Hashanah 27a. [VERIFIED]
- 23 And see below, section 1, for a further reading of "the beginning of Your works" as referring to Israel. Forward reference; both readings are needed in section 1. [AS CITED]
- 24 Likkutei Torah; Ohr HaTorah Rosh Hashanah vol. 5. [AS CITED]
- 25 כ"ה בהמשך ר"ה ה'תש"ג הנ"ל (ע' 19). ובכ"מ. ובאגה"ק סי"ד (קכ, ב) "מסתלק לשרשו בכל ערב ר"ה"; "**בערב** ר"ה". אבל לקמן שם (קכא, א) "שמסתלק — Iggeres HaKodesh 14 says the withdrawal is on the eve of Rosh Hashanah in one place and on the night of Rosh Hashanah a folio later. The divergence is recorded, not harmonised — a model of the מוגה register. [AS CITED] (Iggeres HaKodesh 14 as the locus is standard; the folio locators are as printed.)
- 26 המשך ר"ה הנ"ל (ע' 38). ובכ"מ. [AS CITED]
- 27 Siddur im Dach, Shaar HaTekios. Cited twice, for the weary-worker image and for the withdrawal being at every level. [AS CITED]
- 28 Likkutei Diburim vol. 1, for the aphorism about the world in a state of faint. [AS CITED]
- 29 ראה מכילתא (ויל"ש) עה"פ יתרו כ, ג. תוי"כ ופרש"י עה"פ אחרי יח, ב. וראה המשך ר"ה הנ"ל פכו"ו (ע' 69). ולהעיר מברכות יג, א (במשנה): שיקבל עליו עול — Mechilta / Yalkut Shimoni on Exodus 20:3; Toras Kohanim and Rashi on Leviticus 18:2; Hemshech Rosh Hashanah ch. 26; and Berachos 13a in the Mishnah, on accepting the yoke of heaven before the yoke of mitzvos. [VERIFIED] for Berachos 13a; [AS CITED] for the rest.
- 30 ברמב"ם הל' תשובה פ"ג ה"ד "אע"פ שתק"ש בר"ה גזירת הכותב, רמז יש בו כו' וחזרו בתשובה". אבל ראה לקו"ש ח"ד ע' 1145 ואילך (וראה גם לקמן ס"ט), שגם — Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 3:4; and Likkutei Sichos vol. 4 p. 1145ff., that teshuvah too cannot reach this level — with a forward reference to section ט, where teshuvah is given its actual address. [VERIFIED] for the Rambam; [AS CITED] for the Likkutei Sichos page.
- 31 The Rebbe Rashab's 5671 "ד"ה שיר המעלות ממעמקים — סד"ה שה"מ ממעמקים עדר"ת (המשך תער"ב ח"א ע' תד). The source for malchus-as-revelation, and cited again at notes 35 and 38. [AS CITED]
- 32 המשך תער"ב שם. וראה בארוכה המשך תער"ב ח"ב פשפ"ח ואילך (ע' תשצז ואילך). סה"מ תרפ"ז ע' כד ואילך. ובכ"מ. [AS CITED]
- 33 כ"ה בהמשך תער"ב שם פשפ"ט (ע' תת) לאופן השני. [AS CITED]
- 34 Tikkunei Zohar, introduction, *Pasach Eliyahu*: "kingship is the mouth." [VERIFIED]
- 35 ראה ד"ה שה"מ שבהערה 31 "שהכוונה בהמשכת המלכות בר"ה הוא להיות גילוי המלוכה למטה". וראה תו"ם סה"מ תשרי ע' קז. [AS CITED]
- 36 — ד"פעול" קאי על עשי' (סידור האריז"ל במקומו. משנת חסידיים מסכת ליל ר"ה פ"ח מ"ב. הובאו בלקו"ת שלח מז, א), ו"כל פעול" הוא גם הדומם שבעשי'. "Deed" refers to Asiyah, per the Arizal's siddur and Mishnas Chassidim, brought in Likkutei Torah Shelach; and "every deed" extends to the inanimate within Asiyah. The philological ground for the whole descent-to-domem argument. [AS CITED]
- 37 Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei; Likkutei Torah; Ateres Rosh, Shaar Rosh Hashanah. [AS CITED]
- 38 בסד"ה שה"מ עדר"ת דלעיל הערה 31. וראה בהמאמר שם פקצ"ז (המשך תער"ב שם ע' תא). [AS CITED]
- 39 Torah Ohr, Vayera. [AS CITED]
- 40 ראה סידור (עם דא"ח) שם רמה, סע"ג ואילך. [AS CITED]
- 41 Yevamos 61a. [VERIFIED]
- 42 Likkutei Torah, Nitzavim. [AS CITED]
- 43 Vayikra Rabbah, beginning of ch. 29, for the world's creation on 25 Elul; further references collected in Toras Menachem. [AS CITED]

44. — The Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16a: “the beginning of Your works” is said of the forming of man. Read against note 23, which gives the worlds-reading; the maamar needs both. [AS CITED](#)
45. Souls and malchus are one matter, from the Friediker Rebbe’s maamar on this same verse. [AS CITED](#)
46. רמז בחינה זו בשופר הוא המיצר שבו – לא מיצר דעוונות, כ”א זה שהוא “עם” ולא במרחב העצמות ששם מושרש. ולכן זה נוגע בהעצמות (עיין ד”ה שה”מ — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. [AS CITED](#) for the two internal locators; the language is that of Psalms 118:5, [VERIFIED](#)).
47. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5680 p. 302ff.; 5700 p. 18. [AS CITED](#)
48. ישראל עלו במחשבה — Bereishis Rabbah 1:4, for ב”ר פ”א, ד. [VERIFIED](#)
49. במי נמלך — Bereishis Rabbah 8:7; Rus Rabbah 2:1(3), for ב”ר פ”ח, ז. רות רבא פ”ב, א (ג). [VERIFIED](#)
50. — Isaiah 60:21. [VERIFIED](#) ישעי’ ס, כא.
51. בנים אתם להוי’ אלקיכם, — Deuteronomy 14:1, ראה יד, א. [VERIFIED](#)
52. — Rabbeinu Bachye on Genesis 38:30; Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah, beginning of ch. 7, for א”ן מלך בלא עם [VERIFIED](#) for Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah ch. 7 as the standard Chabad locus; [AS CITED](#) for the rest.
53. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 6ff.: the three levels of will. The same page-6 locator as note 56. [AS CITED](#)
54. — Etz Chaim, Shaar 28 (Shaar Halburim) ch. 2; Shaar 39 (Shaar Man u’Mad) derush 2, for העלאת מ”ן מיני’ ובי’. [AS CITED](#) — the gate names are as printed; internal *anaf/derush* placement not confirmed here.
55. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 15ff.: that an arousal from below has no intrinsic worth. [AS CITED](#)
56. — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. [VERIFIED](#) for Berachos 58a; [AS CITED](#) for the Hemshech locator.
57. שום תשים עליך מלך, — Deuteronomy 17:15 (Parshas Shoftim), שופטים יז, טו. [VERIFIED](#)
58. — Likkutei Sichos vol. 8 p. 26. [AS CITED](#) ראה לקו”ש ח”ע ע’ 26.
59. — The Rambam of note 30. Internal cross-reference. [VERIFIED](#) (internal)
60. וע”ד המובא לעיל ס”ז, שההחלטה על ההמשכה דבריאת העולמות היתה ע”י ישראל שעלו במחשבה העצמית, כי ע”י ישראל דוקא נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות. — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. Internal cross-reference to section 1. [VERIFIED](#) (internal)
61. — The Rebbe’s 5722 הזה הבית הזה — Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Av p. 119ff. [AS CITED](#) (תו”מ סה”מ אב ע’ קיט ואילך).
62. ויש לומר, דבפסוקי שופרות מדובר (גם) בענין ההמשכה בעולם (בנין המלכות) שע”י תק”ש דישאל — רצון המוחלט כמו ששייך לרצון הגלוי; ובהמזמור שקודם — תק”ש מדובר בענין רצון המוחלט עצמו, שנמשך רק לישראל... וראה לעיל הערה 12 מסידור האריז”ל, דהפיכת מדה”ד לרחמים היא ע”י **אמירת המזמור**. The longest note in the maamar, and the reconciliation promised at note 12. Its structure: the shofros verses concern the drawing into the *world* — the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will; the psalm before the tekios concerns the absolute will *itself*, drawn only to Israel. Which is why this psalm in particular emphasises His choice of Israel and, following from it, His mercy on Israel. Then, since the absolute will is drawn by the essence-bittul while the *mitzvah* serves to arouse the revealed will, the note suggests that the psalm’s effects may be drawn already by the *preparation* for the tekios, before the mitzvah is performed — because the essence-bittul is revealed in the preparation too. That reconciles the Arizal’s siddur, for which the saying of the psalm itself flips judgment to mercy. [AS CITED](#) (the Arizal reference is by way of note 12; the rest is the maamar’s own reasoning, flagged with *לומר יש*).
- 62* ולהעיר מלשון המדרש “נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין” — דלכאורה הול”ל “שתוקעין”, ומה נוגע שנוטלין את שופריהן? ו”ל, שהכוונה ב”נוטלין כו’ ותוקעין”, שנוטלים — The asterisked sub-note, and the finest small thing in the apparatus. Why does the midrash say Israel *take up* their shofros and blow, rather than simply that they blow? Because the taking-up-in-order-to-blow is itself what flips the measure of judgment into mercy. The reaching for the horn already carries the bittul; the sound is not the first moment of the act. [VERIFIED](#) (a reading of the wording at note 8, which is itself verified)

What was checked, and how

IDENTIFICATION

· ד"ה יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב

יום ב' דראש השנה ה'תשכ"ג

· מוגה · released in

קונטרס ראש השנה – תנש"א

· marked [המשך: א], first of four 5723 maamarim released across the 5751 Tishrei kuntreisim (תורה צוה) · Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat. Identified by retrieval against the Vaad Hanachos b' Lahak text and a year-indexed maamarim register, which agree. Hebrew column: the published מוגה text (ועד הנחות בלשון הקודש), he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296149), keyed to the kuntres page letters from the photographed pages.

BASE TEXT

The Friediker Rebbe's ד"ה יבחר לנו in

המשך ראש השנה ה'תש"ג

— Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 26ff. (notes 2, 4, 45), with the three levels of will from p. 6ff. (notes 53, 56) and the no-intrinsic-worth passage from p. 15ff. (note 55).

HEBREW, BOTH DIRECTIONS

Every reading carried in the Hebrew rail was checked against the printed pages supplied *and* against the published מוגה text. They agree at every point checked. Where they would have disagreed, the printed page governs and the divergence would be flagged; no such case arose.

READING HAZARD FOR WHOEVER PROOFS THE FULL HEBREW COLUMN

ג"ה ה'תש"ג and סה"מ ה'תשכ"ג differ by a single letter and are easy to conflate at photographic resolution. The correct reading throughout this maamar's apparatus is

ה'תש"ג

(5703, the Friediker Rebbe's Hemshech) — not 5723, which is the year the maamar was *said*. Notes 2, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 45, 53, 55, 56 all point to the 5703 volume. Getting this wrong misidentifies the base text.

SECTION NUMBERING

Eleven sections, printed א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י

י"ד

יא. The tenth is printed י"ד per the Chabad convention and is referred to in the text as סעיף י"ד (section ה refers back to ג, and section א forward-references י"ד). It is not a fourteenth section and not a misprint.

INTERNAL CROSS-REFERENCES

Notes 13, 23, 30, 59, 60 and 62, plus in-text references at sections יא, ט, ה, form the discourse's own index to itself — the visible seam of the מוגה layer. All were followed and all resolve.

NOT CLAIMED

This edition does not claim to reproduce the line divisions of the printed page; the Hebrew is the published text set in paragraphs and keyed by page letter. It does not claim to have confirmed the internal pagination of any cited volume. It does not identify which printing the supplied photographs were taken from — the running heads alternate תשכ"ג and יבחר לנו את נחלתינו, תשכ"ג across pages ג–יא, which is consistent with more than one Kehot setting, and the volume is left UNVERIFIED rather than guessed.

Methodology. Bold is translation of the words themselves, lighter italic is editorial elucidation. Every citation carries a status — verified against the cited source, or reproduced as the printing gives it and said to be so. A misattribution in matters of Torah is a substantive wrong, not a formatting error, so nothing here is asserted at a confidence level higher than it was checked at.

