

Beit Midrash YeshivahAI

Daily Tanya Study

New Souls

From future birth in
Iggeres HaKodesh 26
to newness in Chassidus
and the Alter Rebbe's soul



Research Booklet

ה' מרחשוון תשפ"ז

Opening the Inquiry

In Iggeres HaKodesh 26, the Alter Rebbe anticipates future births, even daily. How does this accord with the Sages' statement that the son of David will not come until the souls in the treasury called "Guf" are exhausted? Tosafos themselves ask this and suggest: "Perhaps a new Guf and new souls." Our inquiry begins with "new": in what sense, and relative to what? Our Rebbeim also call the Alter Rebbe a "new soul," even a "new soul of Atzilus," revealed and clothed in a body. The Rebbe refers to Likkutei Torah's discussion; Rabbi Yoel Kahn connects the reference to future revelation. Other sources distinguish present newness from truly new future souls. We examine how these descriptions fit together and what further connection needs proof.

We distinguish personal history, inclusion in Adam, source, reason for descent, mode of revelation, and time: questions that can form one description. Bnei Aharon adds a decisive distinction among incomplete initial formation, presence as an addition, and fundamental inclusion. Likewise, birth, reincarnation, and a crown for an existing soul are not alternatives of one kind.

Chapters 1-6 proceed from Tanya and Tosafos to terminology, reincarnation writings, crowns, and birth. Chapters 7-9 examine the Alter Rebbe's soul and uniqueness. Chapters 10-16 document earlier discussions, three research rounds, supplementary checks, and the improvement round, including contributions, retractions, and scores. Four consolidated answers follow; sources for further study close the booklet.

The research preserves the path in detail. Explicit statements, identified interpretations, and our proposals retain their status. A preferred reading is tested by its evidence and connecting inference.

English renderings of source quotations are translations for this booklet.

Reading Map v7

1-6: births and newness · 7-9: the Alter Rebbe's soul · 10-16: the inquiry's development · 17: answers · 18: sources.

1. The Starting Point in Tanya	• 3	What Bnei Aharon Changes and What Remains Difficult	• 29
2. Tosafos' Question and Answer	• 4	Proposals Examined and the Editorial Preference	• 30
3. What Is New in the Word "New"?	• 6	9. Did New Souls Appear Only in the Alter Rebbe?	• 31
4. The Writings on Reincarnation: First Entry, Renewal, and Inclusion	• 9	10. What Was Found in Existing Discussions	• 32
Inclusion and Non-Inclusion: The Resolution Found	• 10	11. The First Research Round	• 33
Descent for Refinement and Falling Because of Sin	• 12	12. The Second Round's Contribution and Disagreements	• 34
5. Future New Souls in Chassidus: Souls and Crowns	• 13	13. The Third Round: What Was Found and Corrected	• 37
6. Future Birth and the Map of Times	• 16	The First Improvement Round: Four Contributions and a Corrected Standard	• 40
Reincarnations After Mashiach's Coming as Well	• 18	14. Comparison and Assessment of the Reports	• 42
Map of Phenomena and Times: Each Row According to Its Source	• 20	Comparing the First Improvement Round	• 47
7. What Is Stated About the Alter Rebbe's Soul?	• 22	15. Claims That Changed During the Research	• 48
8. The Central Inquiry: The Alter Rebbe's Soul and Adam's Totality	• 24	16. Closing the Rounds and Developing the Booklet	• 50
What Rabbi Yoel Kahn Says	• 25	Map of Claims and Conclusions	• 52
Three Steps from the General Statement to the Person	• 27	17. Answers to the Basic Questions Within the Sources' Limits	• 53
Where the Readings Fit Together and Where They Differ	• 28	18. Sources for Further Study	• 56

1. The Starting Point in Tanya

In Iggeres HaKodesh 26, the Alter Rebbe explains why knowledge of Torah law will remain necessary in the future. He writes:

"The impurity of a woman after childbirth will also have to be known, as it is written, 'Pregnant and giving birth together.' If a woman gives birth every day from a single union, nevertheless the law prohibiting relations during her impurity will not change."¹

”וגם טומאת יולדת צריך לידע, כדכתיב: ‘הרה ויולדת יחדיו’. אם תלד אשה בכל יום מביאה אחת, אף-על-פי-כן - דין איסור טומאתה לא ישתנה.”

The passage concerns birth and its law. A new manner of birth does not itself cancel the law applying to the mother. The explanation cited in the Rebbe's notes distinguishes daily births from a single union from the assumption that every birth requires a new union. The question of impurity after childbirth and the question of the soul's source are different questions.

The explanation attributed to the Arizal is that conception and birth can occur on the same day. Rashi on Shabbos 30b explains that a woman gives birth to a child conceived earlier on the day she conceives again. Maharsha discusses the comparison with a hen and the possibility of births despite the prohibition of relations after childbirth. The Rebbe's comment on "from a single union" helps clarify this. For our inquiry, we must examine the meaning of the souls that will appear in those births.

2. Tosafos' Question and Answer

Tosafos on Avodah Zarah 5a, s.v. Ein Ben David, ask how daily birth in the messianic era accords with the exhaustion of the souls in "Guf" before the son of David comes. Their answer takes the form of a suggestion:

1. Tanya, Iggeres HaKodesh 26. The Rebbe's notes reproduced in Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya; Shabbos 30b, Rashi and Maharsha. The Rebbe's letter on "from a single union" is discussed in chapter 6.

”שמא י”ל גוף חדש ונשמות חדשות יהיו” - "Perhaps one may say that there will be a new Guf and new souls."

Claim 1 · map This is an explicit answer to the question, rather than a new question created during this research. Rashi explains that "Guf" is the treasury of souls. Tosafos' answer must therefore be read against that background; saying that each baby will have a new physical body is insufficient. Tosafos do not, however, define the new treasury's kabbalistic level here.

The word "perhaps" must be retained: Tosafos suggest a resolution without presenting a systematic definition of all souls in every future period. The statement about exhausting the souls is also discussed in Yevamos 62a and 63b, and Niddah 13b. The decisive reference here is Avodah Zarah, where the question about births is itself asked.

Maharal, Netzach Yisrael, chapter 32, explains the difference in the souls' level and their relationship to the body between the present world order and the messianic era. Avodas HaKodesh, part 2, chapter 37, emphasizes the completion of refinement and the emergence of new souls. These approaches deepen the meaning of the transition. They need not all be imposed on Tosafos' wording as though Tosafos had explicitly stated the entire later system.

This should also be distinguished from Tosafos' question in Niddah 13b about the possibility of immediate redemption before the treasury is exhausted. There, numerous births help fulfill the condition preceding redemption. Our inquiry concerns births after Mashiach's coming. Answering the first question does not eliminate the second.

The Rebbe's Letter to Rabbi Hutner

In Igros Kodesh, volume 25, letter 9394, dated 12 Marcheshvan 5728, the Rebbe discusses the drawing down of souls on Shemini Atzeres and Shabbos. He distinguishes the level from which

souls are drawn from the treasury called Guf, and suggests understanding Rashi's "from the beginning" against the background of the inclusion of souls in Adam. He writes that it "may be explained in several ways"; this is not an exclusive definition of the treasury. It is a direct Chabad source relevant to the subject.

Reading the letter and the publisher's notes adds a precision omitted in Claude's report: the publisher's note referring to "Tosafos' question" points to their question about the birth of gentiles; it does not single out future births. The letter's importance should be preserved, without presenting it as the Rebbe's explicit answer identifying the level of every child born in the messianic era.

From the Answer to the Conceptual Question

Tosafos answer the question about the treasury: the exhaustion of one treasury does not require the end of every possibility of drawing down souls. They do not specify the level of the souls in the new treasury. "New" may be relative to the exhausted treasury, personal history, or the manner of being drawn down; each reading requires the appropriate context. Tosafos need not have settled every question for their answer to work. We now turn to a tool for reading the term in each source, before returning to the births themselves.

3. What Is New in the Word "New"?

"New soul" cannot be defined from any single occurrence. Sometimes "new" contrasts with a further reincarnation; sometimes with a prior state of fall and refinement; and sometimes with all the souls included in Adam. "Atzilus," "face to face," and "true newness" must also be read within their particular sources.

These need not be three closed compartments. Two qualities may coexist in one soul. We therefore ask of each source:

Question	What to examine	What does not follow from this alone
Personal entry	Has this spark previously entered the world as an individual person?	That a first entry necessarily means non-inclusion in Adam.
The totality of Adam	Does the source include the soul in Adam, and when: as a fundamental component, an addition, or an initial coming into being not yet completed?	That every use of "inclusion" in every discourse describes exactly the same state.
Refinement and kelipos	Was there a descent, why did it occur, and what changed afterward?	That presence in the kelipos proves a prior personal reincarnation.
Manner of being drawn down	From what union and level is the soul drawn?	That every mention of "of Atzilus" identifies all the conditions described in a different discourse.
Manner of revelation	What appears through birth or investiture, and what is added to an existing soul?	That every revelation of a new soul is the birth of another child.
Time	Exile, the messianic era, after resurrection, or the seventh millennium?	That every reference to "the future" describes the beginning of the messianic era.

This is a reading tool used in this research, not a numbered classification received through tradition. It helps show which conclusion follows from the text and which still requires another source.

How the Questions Fit Together

First ask what "new" describes: the soul entering a body, its manner of being drawn down, or a level added to an existing soul. Personal entry concerns previous life as an individual; inclusion concerns belonging to a totality preceding individual appearance. A first personal entry can therefore follow earlier inclusion. The two answers contribute to one description.

The manner of being drawn down adds the source and mode of appearance. In Bnei Aharon's explanation below, completing an incomplete initial coming into being explains why a later appearance is considered new; conditions concerning an

additional entry form part of the definition. Refinement adds the descent's reason and purpose: repairing a blemish and acting to refine are different explanations. Finally, we ask how the quality appears and when. Birth may include investiture, and a crown may be a form of addition. The four words should not automatically be read as separate routes.

This is our order of study. It neither permits every combination nor adds stages to the chain of spiritual descent; it identifies the combination actually described in a source. Chapter 4 mainly examines history and inclusion, chapter 5 source and revelation, and chapter 6 phenomena and times. Chapters 7-8 ask which qualities are stated about the Alter Rebbe and which still require an interpretive connection.

Applying the Tool

Hemshech 5672, volume 3, p. 1297 (א'רצ"ו), describes "souls that were included in Adam but have never yet been drawn down, which are also called new souls." Inclusion is affirmed; their individual appearance has not yet taken place. The passage concerns souls drawn down in the present era at times of favor. It does not identify a particular person or specify every meaning of inclusion in this sentence. Nor does the verb "drawn down" alone establish every detail of physical birth. The tool thus lets us state what has been established while leaving the remaining questions to their own examination.

Three Similar Expressions

"Truly new souls" (נשמות חדשות ממש) in the Vayeishev 5720 talk, "the true aspect of new souls" (אמיתית בחינת נשמות חדשות) in the 5731 maamar, and "genuinely new souls" (נשמות חדשות אמיתיות) in Shaar HaGilgulim, introduction 39, occur in different contexts. The two Chassidic sources distinguish present from future; Bnei Aharon also discusses introduction 39 in relation to presence in Adam before the sin. Similar wording proves neither identity in

every detail nor separation of the groups. Each expression will be used with its source identified.

4. The Writings on Reincarnation: First Entry, Renewal, and Inclusion

First Personal Entry

Claim 2 · map Shaar HaGilgulim, introduction 7, distinguishes souls not included in Adam from sparks that remained in him and were transmitted to Cain and Abel. When a spark of the latter group enters an independent body, it can be considered relatively new. For this purpose, its earlier inclusion in Adam and his sons is not counted as that spark's entry as an individual person.

First entry and non-inclusion in Adam are therefore two questions. Moreover, "new" does not guarantee the absence of free choice, sin, or later reincarnation. Nor should everyone who has not yet been an individual person be assigned one level: the discourse distinguishes those that remained in Adam from those that fell away from him.

Renewal After Ascent

Introduction 6 discusses the transition from coming into being "back to back" to being drawn down "face to face," and a soul that ascends from kelipah and is renewed. It allows the possibility of new souls from Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah even after the Destruction, while reserving a higher aspect from Atzilus for after resurrection. Its wording connects the latter aspect to the supernal radiance, *zihara ila'ah*, that Adam possessed.

This necessarily corrects the sweeping claim that "there have been no new souls at all since the Destruction." Quoting the departure of one level cannot rule out every other use of the term. Applying the teaching to a particular person requires showing that the general source and the personal description concern the same group and the same meaning of newness. A

statement naming the person would be direct evidence; its absence does not itself invalidate a conclusion drawn by combining sources. The combination's force depends on the step connecting them.

Inclusion and Non-Inclusion: The Resolution Found

Introduction 39 describes genuinely new souls that were in Adam before the sin and departed. Introduction 7 says they were not included in him. In the second round we left the statements side by side because we had no identified commentary reconciling them. In the third round, Dot found a direct treatment of the difficulty in Rabbi Shimon Aharon Agassi's Bnei Aharon, introduction 7, section 1, 25b. It does more than use similar words: it sets the non-inclusion in introductions 7 and 32 against the inclusion in introductions 12 and 39.

Claim 3 · map The first explanation draws on Shaar HaMitzvos, Ki Seitzei, the passage beginning VeNachazor Levaer. Even the new souls were in Adam, but their initial coming into being was "back to back," lacking completion through a "face to face" drawing down. For defining newness, this does not count as a complete appearance. Bnei Aharon explains that they are considered as though they had not been created or included. "As though" explains the language of non-inclusion; it need not be turned into an absolute denial of every previous presence in Adam.²

Shaar HaMitzvos, Jerusalem 5665, 57b-58a, includes the souls in Adam at their creation and explains the incompleteness of their initial coming into being. It sets conditions for the appearance called new: a "face to face" drawing down in the situation described, without a preceding additional entry of the incomplete kind. If another entry and a further sin occurred, the

2. Bnei Aharon, introduction 7, section 1, 25b; introduction 6, section 3; Shaar HaMitzvos, Ki Seitzei, 57b-58a, Jerusalem 5665. Its 76a reference in Bnei Aharon belongs to his printing. Scans: Dot's testimony in round three; the editor verified supporting OCR extracts. Reading status is detailed in chapter 13.

past cannot be disregarded merely because a higher drawing down followed. The explanation therefore does not call every ascending soul new in the same sense.

Claim 4 · map Bnei Aharon adds another distinction: higher aspects may be present in Adam as an addition that departs upon a blemish, rather than as a fundamental component of the structure under discussion. "They were in him" and "they were not included in him" can thus describe two kinds of belonging. The distinction between incomplete coming into being and its completion draws on Shaar HaMitzvos; the extension concerning addition and fundamental inclusion is Bnei Aharon's explanation. The two should not be quoted as though introduction 7 itself stated them in those words.

What Does "Root" Mean Here?

"Root and essential component" describes how something belongs to a structure, as distinct from an addition. "The soul's root," meaning the source from which it is drawn, concerns the level from which it comes. The first distinction does not itself prove that a particular root is outside Adam while its investiture is within him. These are different steps requiring separate support. Similarly, Bnei Aharon's two explanations are not one statement: incompleteness in the initial coming into being and addition as distinct from a fundamental component are two explanatory approaches, each of whose content must be preserved.

To illustrate the possibility of something being both "existing" and "new," consider a book that exists in manuscript and later appears in print. It can be counted among its author's writings before printing, while its later appearance is called new. This is our illustration of different ways of counting only. Its limit is clear: printing does not necessarily alter the book's coming into being, whereas the source discusses completion in the manner

of coming into being itself. The conditions in Shaar HaMitzvos cannot be learned from the analogy.

Introduction 39 also distinguishes gestation in Malchus, emergence from it, and birth into the world. The time of a soul's rectification and its birth need not coincide. Rabbi Chaim Vital reports there, in his teacher's name, that he is new in the aspect of Cain and Abel. This is a named example of relative newness in another person; it does not identify his level with the Alter Rebbe's.

Descent for Refinement and Falling Because of Sin

Likkutei Torah refers to Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 7. This must not be identified with introduction 7 of Shaar HaGilgulim. The chapter mentions both non-inclusion in Adam and parts from Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah embedded in the kelipos, while the parts of Atzilus were not embedded there. The second round's finding remains: both descriptions can occur within one framework and therefore need not define separate populations.

Claim 5 · map Bnei Aharon, introduction 6, section 5, 24a, supplies the missing distinction: the souls' fall following Adam's sin involves the kelipos' domination; the new souls' descent is understood as a voluntary descent for refinement, comparable to the Shechinah's descent. He explicitly applies this explanation to Sefer HaGilgulim's wording as well.

We must distinguish a soul acting in the place of refinement, a soul blemished and needing repair of its own blemish, and a soul returning after earlier individual lives. Participation in refinement does not itself prove a personal blemish or previous reincarnation. This is an identified commentator's interpretation, rather than our substituting "mission" for "fall" without a source.

Levels Within Levels

In sections 9-12 of introduction 6, Bnei Aharon also addresses the difficulty between new souls drawn from Beriah, Yetzirah,

and Asiyah in the present era and the attainment of Atzilus in introduction 7. According to the detailed reading report, he suggests that introduction 7 may state a general rule unrestricted to the present era, or concern Atzilus within those three worlds. He later uses the Rashash's distinctions between inner and outer systems. The discussion also addresses crowns and the distinctions between the messianic era, after resurrection, and the seventh millennium.

One explanation should not be selected and presented as the author's sole ruling, nor should "Atzilus within Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah" automatically be transferred to the Alter Rebbe's description. What has already been established is the need to identify each source's system and level. A commentary explaining the relationship between statements in the writings on reincarnation has been found; that does not yet provide an individual identification of the Alter Rebbe's soul.

5. Future New Souls in Chassidus: Souls and Crowns

Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 50a, Ki KaAsher HaShamayim HaChadashim, section 4, cites Sefer HaGilgulim on two groups of souls and the crowning of souls included in Adam with souls higher than themselves. The explicit setting is the seventh millennium, the principal time of reward. The same page says that the new souls under discussion were also created during the Six Days of Creation. "New" therefore need not mean something created for the first time when it appears.

Likkutei Torah also describes an addition within existing souls: an added elevation for souls that have already performed their service. The discourse VaAchaltem Achol, Likkutei Torah, Tzav 7c, explains the ascent of existing souls through the future souls. Hemshech 5672, volume 2, p. 771, proposes a comparison with

the additional Shabbos soul. The tentative wording and the analogy's scope must be preserved.

The additional explanation of Ki KaAsher HaShamayim HaChadashim, particularly Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 51c, develops the question of the inward dimension of Atik and newness beyond refinements. The statement about souls not included in Adam and drawn from the inward dimension of Atik was found and read on 51c. The numbering of sections in the first discourse must not be confused with that of its explanation. The second-round attribution of the entire "inward dimension of Atik" statement to section 5 of 50a was inaccurate: 50a contains the two kinds of souls and the crowns; 51c explains the source from which they are drawn. The conceptual distinction remains, and the reference was corrected.

The opening of VaYomer Lo Yehonasan Machar Chodesh 5731 also distinguishes present newness from the true newness of the future and discusses crowns. This calls for care when inferring from these discourses about every baby at the beginning of the messianic era. Conversely, the appearance of crowns does not erase sources concerning birth.

Conclusion: Chassidic sources describe newness in root, newness in the manner of being drawn down, and newness that adds to existing souls. Each description must be understood in its place. Not every new soul is a later creation; not every new soul is a reincarnation; and not every instance is a new physical birth.

Bnei Aharon clarifies the statements in the writings on reincarnation, but we cannot assume that every Chassidic discourse adopts every detail of his account everywhere. Inclusion itself is no longer a simple yes-or-no test. Its meaning for a particular person still requires support from an individual statement or a combination of sources whose correspondence has been demonstrated.

The Crown and the Added Elevation

Claim 6 · map Likkutei Torah 50a states that "in the seventh millennium, these souls included in Adam will be crowned with those souls that are higher than themselves, each part with its corresponding part." The description distinguishes a recipient and an added elevation. It lets us ask how the new souls elevate those that have already served, beyond the number of additional people to be born. The comparison with the additional Shabbos soul in Hemshech 5672, volume 2, p. 771, likewise proposes an addition to the vitality of an existing recipient; it remains a suggestion.

In the improvement round, Claude proposed bringing together two sources already documented in the research: Likkutei Torah, Derushim LiShemini Atzeres 89a, on new souls becoming a crown for the souls of the righteous; and Im BeChukosai 5716, Toras Menachem, volume 16, p. 277, on an added elevation within souls and "their crowns upon their heads." He recorded the first as a focused extract and the second as a full page. They illuminate the added elevation; they do not classify every child at the beginning of the messianic era.

Two Test Cases: What Becomes New, and for Whom?

These are our illustrations of the distinctions, following Dot's suggestion, not stories from the sources or identifications of a particular person. In the first case, suppose a spark belongs to the group that remained in Adam and was transmitted to Cain and Abel, but has not yet entered as an individual person. Its present entry is personally a first, despite earlier belonging. If it also acts in refinement, we must still ask whether this is its task or repair of a blemish. Mentioning refinement does not itself give the spark previous individual lives.

In the second case, suppose an existing soul receives a crown from the new souls. The newness of the addition and its revelation within the recipient neither makes the recipient's

entire history new nor requires another person's birth. The creation of the added aspect and its revelation as a crown need not occur at the same time. The decisive question in both cases is what the description applies to, and exactly what it excludes.

6. Future Birth and the Map of Times

Two Explicit Modes of Birth

Claim 10 · map Vayeytzei Yaakov 5726, section 7, Toras Menachem, volume 45, p. 183, distinguishes two times: first, daily birth from one union; later, birth without needing a male. The maamar refers to Iggeres HaKodesh 26 and sources of the Mitteler Rebbe and the Tzemach Tzedek. This is positive evidence locating a mode of birth, beyond an editor's caution.

The Arizal's Likkutei HaShas, Livorno 5550, 14b, among the teachings on Sanhedrin, connects shortened gestation with the disappearance of the kelipos and the absence of a need for the lengthy process of refinement. The Tzemach Tzedek, Biurei HaZohar, volume 2, Ginta, pp. 827-828, also explains protection for souls emerging from the kelipos and the absence of concealment; the ending discusses union without physicality. Grok Bot read scans of these sources in the second round. An explicit division into periods not stated there must not be attributed to them.

In the third round, Bot read a scan of Or HaTorah, Siddur, Hashem Hoshiah, pp. 103-104. The Tzemach Tzedek suggests there, with the words "in my humble opinion, it is possible to say," that the delay of gestation relates to the state of Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah in relation to Atzilus and to the existence of kelipos; refining the worlds permits shortening gestation to nine hours. The discourse neither classifies the children's souls nor explicitly distinguishes the two periods. Nine hours, birth on the same day, and birth every day are related in context but must not replace one another in every source.

According to Or HaTorah's publisher's note, the discourse was also printed in the supplements to Yahel Or, p. 619. This verifies the parallel printing's identification through a publisher's note, together with direct reading of the discourse in Or HaTorah; it is not inspection of p. 619 itself. The principal question about the content could thus be closed even when the parallel scan was inaccessible.

The comparison with ready-made loaves in Biurei HaZohar explains a birth not built in the same way from earlier refinement. It cannot establish that everyone born immediately upon Mashiach's coming has the same level of the inward dimension of Atik.

Another Source Within Tanya

Iggeres HaKodesh 7 includes the souls of Israel in Adam until Mashiach's coming, inclusive. The Rebbe's list of references on "inclusive" draws attention to souls not included in him, in the seventh millennium after the messianic era. The letter and note were also read separately in Igros Kodesh of the Alter Rebbe, letter 55 and note 19. According to the edition's note, these notes draw on the Rebbe's list of references and comments to Tanya. This still makes no claim of independent inspection of every original printing of the annotation.

Iggeres HaKodesh 7 should not simply be equated with Tosafos' answer. One may suggest that new souls from a treasury no longer part of the earlier "Guf" need not be outside every meaning of Adam's totality. This remains a possible resolution: no Chabad source was found explicitly formulating this identification of Tosafos' answer here. Even after Bnei Aharon, applying a particular meaning of inclusion to each source requires evidence.

Reincarnations After Mashiach's Coming as Well

Claim 11 · map Shaar HaGilgulim, introduction 16, distinguishes mitzvos a person failed to fulfill, mitzvos whose opportunity never arose, and mitzvos impossible to fulfill in the present era, such as sacrifices. For the last category, it speaks of actual reincarnation after the Temple is built; other categories also involve ibur, an addition within an existing person. The contrast between reincarnation and ibur is explicit and does not depend on a conjectural emendation.

This establishes a route of returning souls after Mashiach's coming. It should not be erased because Tosafos also propose a new treasury. Conversely, it cannot establish what proportion of births will involve returning souls or that every daily birth belongs to this route. Rabbi Elishavitz quotes a broader wording from the end of Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 4, concerning sparks that came after the Destruction. That wording was not read in full in the book itself here and remains secondary evidence; the limited conclusion already rests on the introduction 16 that was read.

In the third-round report, Grok Bot proposed assigning these reincarnations to the first period. In the improvement round he withdrew the inference from the fact of birth to that assignment. The presence of Temple mitzvos is relevant to the context, but needing birth does not establish birth through a male: Vayetzei 5726 also describes birth in the second mode. The booklet therefore retains the stated order, after the Temple's building, without deciding from that evidence alone that it corresponds to the full first period.

Rabbi Elishavitz tentatively suggests that a lack of mitzvos that could not have been fulfilled need not require the entire usual purification of gestation. This is his proposal, not an explicit answer of the Arizal. Nor is absence of a need for personal repair

identical with absence of every act of refinement in the world, as Bnei Aharon clarified.

Completion of Refinement and the Start of Daily Birth

The reports and Rabbi Elishavitz's articles raised the timing of refinement's completion and cited traditions placing various stages before or after Mashiach's coming. References to Shaar HaMitzvos, Behar; Rav Pealim, volume 1, responsum 17; and Olas Tamid were not all read in their full contexts here. A settled date for the start of daily birth should therefore not be printed in a particular author's name on the basis of an unfinished comparison.

Emergence from the kelipos, the end of gestation in Malchus, and birth in the world remain distinct. Claiming that "be exhausted" necessarily means only one of these requires examining Sefer HaGilgulim, chapters 1-2, beyond Rashi on the treasury of souls. The following map preserves the sources' own names for their periods. It does not assert that the second period, all of resurrection, and the seventh millennium always denote one time in every work.

Birth, Reincarnation, and a Crown: How They Fit Together

Birth describes a person's appearance in a body; reincarnation describes the soul's history and the purpose of its return. A returning soul may therefore come through birth, and birth itself does not determine whether this is its first individual appearance. The source on Temple mitzvos adds a route of returning souls without classifying all the other births. A crown describes another relationship: an elevation added to existing souls. The three words do not name three separate populations. The reason for shortened gestation likewise does not identify every soul. Refinement of the worlds and absence of concealment describe the conditions of appearance. Inferring that everyone

appearing under these conditions comes from the same level requires further evidence. Absence of a personal blemish does not exclude all refinement in the world. Bnei Aharon's distinction is useful here too, without assigning every birth to a particular time on its authority.

Three uses of ibur must also be distinguished: physical pregnancy, gestation in Malchus, and an addition entering an existing person for a mitzvah. Shortened pregnancy does not itself establish when gestation in Malchus ends. The contrast between actual reincarnation and ibur within an existing person is not a contrast between short and long pregnancy. Relationships between words do not replace a source's context.

Map of Phenomena and Times: Each Row According to Its Source

Time or context	Phenomenon	What is stated about souls	Limit of the conclusion
The present era and before redemption	Exhausting the treasury as a condition for the son of David's coming; rare new souls are also drawn down	Hemshech 5672 and Vayeishev 5720 describe new souls within Adam's totality; introduction 6 also discusses new souls from Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah	Emergence from kelipos, completed refinement, and birth need not coincide.
First period of the messianic era	Daily birth from one union, with the laws of impurity after childbirth: Iggeres HaKodesh 26 and Vayeitzei 5726	Tosafos propose a new Guf and new souls	The material examined contained no explicit classification of the level of everyone born then.
After the Temple is built	Actual reincarnation for Temple mitzvos: introduction 16	There are returning souls as well	The source assigns neither one of the two periods nor a proportion of total births to this route.

Time or context	Phenomenon	What is stated about souls	Limit of the conclusion
The second mode in Vayeitzei 5726	Birth without needing a male	The mode is described; the level of everyone born is not mapped	It cannot by itself be identified with every reference to "the future."
After resurrection in introduction 6	Drawing down a higher aspect of Atzilus	Adam's supernal radiance is discussed	Atzilus here does not identify every personal description of Atzilus without examination.
The seventh millennium in Likkutei Torah 50a	Earlier souls are crowned with higher new souls	Added elevation for existing souls	Crowning alone does not establish its relation to birth or the other time frames.
Future shemittah cycles, discussed in Toras Menachem, volume 38, p. 17	Comparison with a higher source	The source Claude documented in round two also mentions new souls from a second shemittah cycle	This is a further comparison, not an agreed timetable for all the sources.

The reasons for shortened gestation in Likkutei HaShas and the Tzemach Tzedek's discourses are studied alongside the map, without attributing an unstated division into periods to their authors. "After resurrection," "the second period," and "the seventh millennium" retain their sources' own wording. The map helps connect the findings; it does not prove that they all occur together or in successive stages of a single soul.

From Here to the Alter Rebbe's Soul

Birth taught us to ask where souls come from; crowns taught us that newness can also be added to what exists. We now turn to a soul born in the present era and called new. Our distinctions let us examine which qualities are stated about it and how they fit together. We need not assume that newness relative to personal history exhausts the description, or that a connection with the

future applies its entire level. We first read the individual descriptions, then the steps in the argument.

7. What Is Stated About the Alter Rebbe's Soul?

The Testimony of the Rebbe Rayatz

Claim 7 · map Sefer HaSichos 5706, p. 22, describes a new soul of Atzilus, explicitly identifying it with the Alter Rebbe and the opening of the wellsprings. Sefer HaSichos 5707, pp. 150-151, describes the Maggid's announcement and the revelation of the soul's essence within the soul illuminating the body. Claude's second-round report also documented reading the text of 5708, p. 157, on the soul's essence descending clothed in a body. This is attribution to a reading report, not a new examination by the editor in this edition.

For our inquiry, the central point is that the quality is more than literary praise for originality. It concerns level, revelation, and a general mission. The reverse inference also requires precision: opening a new path does not alone establish the soul's root. A description of revelation in the body does not permit every difficulty to be resolved through a higher root supposedly remaining hidden.

The principal source for the preparations before birth is Sefer HaSichos 5705, to which the Kuntres refers. In the supplementary report after round three, Grok Bot testified to reading the pages from scans. The account distinguishes one year's preparation for a soul's descent from three years for a new soul; it also describes the Baal Shem Tov's knowledge before the Alter Rebbe's birth and his search for the person who would merit this soul. This positively describes exceptional preparation, beyond a bare title. According to the check, these pages contain no statement denying inclusion in Adam. That

limit concerns the pages examined, not a claim that no such statement exists anywhere else.³

Drawing Down Vitality and the Mission

The Shabbos Shemini 5712 talk, Toras Menachem, volume 5, p. 184, connects the Alter Rebbe's soul with a new vitality drawn down for the generations. The passing mention of a "new soul" at the beginning of the Shemos 5713 talk is insufficient to attribute the entire explanation of a new path of Divine service to that talk alone. The connection to mission and the drawing down of vitality rests here on the explicit sources in this paragraph and those that follow.

Chapter 8 discusses the reference in Inyanah Shel Toras HaChassidus, On the Essence of Chassidus, and its meaning, after presenting the personal testimonies.

The second-day Shavuos 5715 talk, Toras Menachem, volume 14, p. 123, section 18, connects new souls and the Alter Rebbe's soul with a sign of the ingathering of the exiles. This is an explicit connection to redemption. Which particular aspect of the future level is described in his soul still requires examination.

Three Aspects of One Description

"New" raises the questions of history and manner of being drawn down; "of Atzilus," the question of level; "clothed in a body," or revelation of the soul's essence within the body, the question of actual appearance. The distinction helps even when all three describe one soul. Their combination does not itself establish identity in every detail with every use of "new souls of Atzilus" in the writings on reincarnation. Conversely, separating the questions does not prove that they are unrelated. This preserves the positive content of the Rebbe Rayatz's testimony without anticipating chapter 8's conclusion.

3. Sefer HaSichos 5705, pp. 127-130, the first source in the Kuntres' note. Grok Bot reported the supplementary check; it must not be credited backward to a reviewer who had not yet read the scan.

8. The Central Inquiry: The Alter Rebbe's Soul and Adam's Totality

The General Statement and Its Application to a Person

Claim 8 · map The Shabbos Vayeishev 5720 talk, section 13, Toras Menachem, volume 27, p. 252, states that even souls called new in the present era were included in Adam, while truly new souls will come in the future. The wording cited in this research is: "Even when new souls are sometimes spoken of, the reference is to souls that were included in Adam's soul; only in the future will there be truly new souls." Immediately afterward comes the need for "a foretaste of the future revelation" in the present. This is a talk after the maamar, not the maamar's conclusion; p. 251 notes that what follows is recorded only in outline. Its wording should neither be dismissed on that account nor assigned the status of a personal statement about the Alter Rebbe, who is not named there.

Hemshech 5672, volume 3, p. 1297, describes souls drawn down at special times that were included in Adam but have not yet been drawn into the world. In Shemos 5720, Toras Menachem, volume 27, p. 273, section 2, the Alter Rebbe's soul is contrasted with souls returning through reincarnation. Combining the sources supports a reading that his newness includes a first individual entry. Assigning his soul to this general category has the advantage of continuity between the wordings. Nevertheless, contrast with reincarnation does not prove that this definition exhausts the personal description's content; establishing correspondence of scope and meaning is a further step in the argument.

The Edited Reference and Other Uses of the Same Page

Claim 9 · map In Inyanah Shel Toras HaChassidus, section 6, essential vitality is drawn into the world through the "new soul," the Alter Rebbe. Note 45 in the Kuntres, numbered 48 in the

integrated text, refers to Sefer HaSichos 5705, p. 127 onward, and Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 50a, "for the meaning of new souls." The reference itself is certain; the question is which qualities of the source it explains in his description.

Claude showed that Likkutei Torah 50a also serves elsewhere as a reference for new and old souls: in Vayeishev 5720, Shemos 5720, and other sources. The page presents two groups and crowns; the phrase "for the meaning" does not by itself explicitly select one group. Conversely, the Kuntres' content, the choice of an explanation of the future, and the connection in Shavuot 5715 to a sign of ingathering give the reference substantive weight. It should not be emptied into a merely technical citation.

The corrected pagination is also preserved: the Kuntres cites 50a. The explicit explanation of the inward dimension of Atik and non-inclusion appears on 51c. In round three, Claude found that Simchas Torah 5740, Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat, volume 1, p. 219, note 63, refers to both places. This is evidence for comparing citation practice, not a proven rule that every reference to 50a alone excludes what follows.

What Rabbi Yoel Kahn Says

In its chapter on the Rebbe's influence after Gimmel Tammuz, BeDarkei HaChassidim first describes, on p. 107, the Baal Shem Tov's joy at the coming descent of a new soul, adjoining an explanation of souls not included in Adam. Page 110 presents a disagreement between understanding the term as absence of previous reincarnation and understanding it "along the lines of" Likkutei Torah. The response reported in the Rebbe's name is conveyed in substance, not through a photograph of a written response.⁴

4. BeDarkei HaChassidim, pp. 107 and 110-112, from Rabbi Yoel Kahn's teaching, edited by his students. The text's status and the reported response are discussed in the body.

Page 111 notes that the Rebbe referred to Likkutei Torah when editing the talk, and explains Chassidus' connection to the future revelation. The paragraph concludes by speaking of souls belonging to that future revelation. Claude is therefore right that the final words should not be isolated and replaced by a personal statement they do not print. Equally, the ending should not be isolated from p. 107's introduction and p. 111's explicit interpretation of the reference. The substantive reading is stronger than the general claim that every revelation of G-dliness recalls the future. It is an identified Chabad interpretation of the description and the reference.

The book was edited by students. The publisher states that Rabbi Yoel did not adequately review it and that responsibility for the wording rests with the editors. The chapter does not discuss Vayeishev 5720, the 5731 maamar, or Hemshech 5672. These two limitations restrict treating it as an explicit resolution of the tension, without cancelling its weight as an explanation from his teaching. Note 54's reference to 5702, p. 127, differs from the Kuntres' reference to 5705, p. 127. The discrepancy was documented; it should not be declared a printing error before the parallel in 5702 is examined.

The Rebbe's Note in 5708 After the Supplementary Check

Claude first located copies of the Rebbe's note to Sefer HaMaamarim 5708 in several later printings. After round three, Grok Bot, according to his report, read the note and its continuation from a scan of the printing. This supports the core reconstruction and raises its status from evidence based on copied extracts to testimony of reading the printing itself. The editor incorporates the report without claiming an inspection he did not perform.⁵

⁵. Sefer HaMaamarim 5708, pp. 240-241, the Rebbe's note 6. The supplementary report states that the printing was read, beyond the earlier reconstruction from copies.

The note distinguishes special care in a mitzvah lacking in an earlier reincarnation from special care by a new soul according to where it is attached within Adam. Both explanations of "In which mitzvah was your father especially careful?" can hold. The continuation also discusses old souls and a change in their point of attachment, alongside completing the missing mitzvah; special care in two mitzvos is therefore possible. This substantially expands the explanation beyond a short contrast between new and old souls.

The Alter Rebbe is not named in the note. It verifies a general use of newness connected to Adam's totality, but neither says that this exhausts every meaning of the term nor personally identifies his soul within it. Earlier copies gave varying names for the section of Etz Chaim to which the note refers; the name must not be reconstructed by guesswork. The direct reference for this discussion is the note in Sefer HaMaamarim itself.

Multiple copies helped locate and identify the wording's core, but did not amount to several independent primary witnesses. Reading the printing adds a different kind of check. Even afterward, applying the general statement to a particular person remains a separate interpretive step.

Three Steps from the General Statement to the Person

Following Grok Bot's suggestion, we distinguish the general statement, membership, and meaning. The statement describes a group of souls and a quality. Membership shows that the person under discussion belongs to that group. Examining meaning establishes that the quality is used in the same sense in both places. Three separate sentences are unnecessary: a shared context may establish several steps together. Nor must every individual be named in the general statement; an argument showing that the application fits is required.

Here there are general statements relevant to both directions, alongside explicit personal descriptions of the Alter Rebbe. The

question is exactly what is transferred to the personal description: first entry, a particular meaning of inclusion, or a quality of the future level. The absence of a statement naming him does not rule against all inference; it directs attention to the quality of the connection.

Where the Readings Fit Together and Where They Differ

The shared starting point is newness, Atzilus, revelation in a body, and a general mission of drawing down vitality and opening the wellsprings. The contrast with returning souls supports a first personal entry. All this can be combined with a substantive connection to redemption. The disagreement begins with the extent of belonging to the level of future new souls and the meaning of inclusion in Adam.

The first reading combines Vayeishev 5720's general statement, Hemshech 5672, the personal contrast with reincarnation in Shemos 5720, and the general note of 5708. It proposes that the Alter Rebbe's soul belongs to present new souls within Adam's totality, while the quality of its revelation and mission explains its connection to the future. Its advantage is a shared framework without assuming an unstated exception. What requires support is application of the general statement to the personal description in the same sense. Even proof of first entry does not establish that it exhausts the meaning of newness.

The second reading combines the Kuntres' essential vitality, the edited reference, the Shavuot talk, and Rabbi Yoel's interpretation. It understands the description as conveying future revelation beyond absence of reincarnation. Its advantage is explaining the reference's role within a personal account. What requires support is which defined quality of the future level is attributed to his soul. To argue non-inclusion in a particular sense, one must show that the reference carries precisely that meaning and how it accords with the contrast between present

new souls and truly new future souls. Identity in every quality need not first be proved to examine one quality.

The Shavuot talk belongs to both arguments: "a sign of the ingathering of the exiles" emphasizes a real connection that does not itself require full identity; the story's placement after discussion of future new souls strengthens the substantive reading. The disagreement concerns the force of the same context. Introduction 7, describing descent of an entirely new soul and attainment of Atzilus, also provides real evidence relevant to the second reading. Introduction 6 and Bnei Aharon require it to be accompanied by an examination of time and levels within levels. Attainment reaching Atzilus and a personal description as being of Atzilus do not identify themselves automatically.

What Bnei Aharon Changes and What Remains Difficult

Bnei Aharon limits an argument from automatic contradiction. Earlier presence can be understood as incomplete initial coming into being; a further explanation examines addition as distinct from a fundamental component. "Included" and "not included" are therefore insufficient by themselves to exclude every combination of descriptions. Yet Vayeishev also distinguishes present from future. Understanding inclusion does not cancel that distinction's weight, and the commentary does not identify the Alter Rebbe's soul here.

In the improvement round, Claude proposed a possible correspondence: perhaps "included" describes presence in a broad sense, while non-inclusion describes absence of full belonging in a narrower sense. Both could then coexist in one case. This is our proposal for study following his suggestion. It requires showing that the two sources actually use these meanings, particularly explaining the strength of "not included at all" in Likkutei Torah. Bnei Aharon permits the question to be

asked; he does not prove that the distinction applies to these particular discourses or to the Alter Rebbe.

Dot's distinction between establishing a quality and establishing an exhaustive account helps here. First entry is a quality, and does not itself exhaust the description; connection to the future is another quality, and does not itself establish full identification of level. Qualities already established can be combined, while the disputed quality is examined separately.

What "A Foretaste" Means in Practice

In these sources, connection to the future is expressed through new vitality, revelation of the inward dimension of Torah, opening the wellsprings, and a sign of redemption. This is positive content extending beyond personal history. "A foretaste" alone does not define the soul's source or the sense of its inclusion. Expressions such as "foretaste" and "example" also occur in the general sources; their direct connection to the Alter Rebbe is given especially in the Kuntres and Shavuos talk, and explained by Rabbi Yoel. Each word should not be attributed to every source as though each personally said it about him.

Proposals Examined and the Editorial Preference

Distinguishing levels, an exceptional early appearance, and distinctions between root, investiture, and revelation remain part of the inquiry's history. The Rebbe Rayatz's wording establishes investiture and revelation; it does not say that the root of the soul is outside Adam while its investiture is within him. A commentator's ability to reconcile statements also does not determine an individual resolution. In round three, Claude withdrew "the inevitable conclusion" and "settled"; in the improvement round, Grok joined the preference for the first reading as a starting point without declaring it necessary.

The first reading is preferred here as an interpretive starting point because it combines an explicit general statement with a

personal contrast to reincarnation. This is a reasoned preference subject to examining correspondence of meaning; it does not prove that all the content of newness has been exhausted. The second reading retains its full force as an identified interpretation of a substantive connection, with a defined question about its extent. There is no artificial equivalence among all proposals, and no personal determination beyond the step that has been established. The shared positive conclusion is broader than the detail remaining open.

9. Did New Souls Appear Only in the Alter Rebbe?

Once the meaning is clarified, uniqueness can be examined. Anyone saying "only he" must define "like him"; anyone adding names must establish the relevant meaning. Three questions must be distinguished: whether the term describes other people, whether new souls can be drawn down during exile, and whether someone else has been identified with exactly the same level and mission.

As noted, introduction 39 names Rabbi Chaim Vital as relatively new with respect to Cain and Abel. Mikeitz, Zos Chanukah 5713, Toras Menachem, volume 7, p. 259, calls the appearance of new souls rare while allowing exceptional individuals and special times. This gives no basis for excluding every other possibility during exile.

Yud Shevat 5719, sections 11-13, Toras Menachem, volume 25, pp. 26-28, describes the birth of new souls through the union accompanying a tzaddik's passing, although this is not the usual order in exile. Section 13 also restricts the term hillula to exceptional individuals. The distinction between a tzaddik drawing down souls and a determination that his own soul is new must be preserved. The first does not prove the second.

A list of names should not be assembled from related descriptions such as a soul of Atzilus, a general yechidah, or revelation of G-dliness. There is currently no verified list of individuals of exactly the same level. One can answer that this is not uniqueness in every sense of the term; one still cannot answer that all great tzaddikim are equal in it.

10. What Was Found in Existing Discussions

He'aros U'Biurim

Two articles by Rabbi Menachem Mendel Elishavitz were read: "A Woman Will Give Birth Every Day - In Which Period?" issue 999, Shavuos 5770; and "Why a Woman Will Give Birth Every Day, and the Souls to Be Born in the Future," issue 1000, Gimmel Tammuz 5770. They explicitly address the periods and the souls' source. The first compares different traditions concerning birth and warns against automatically equating their timetables.

The second distinguishes reasons for shortened gestation, incorporates Iggeres HaKodesh 7 and the Rebbe's note, and proposes including reincarnations for Temple mitzvos. It also cites Bnei Aharon on voluntary descent for refinement, as distinct from falling because of sin. These are his proposals and readings, not the Arizal's own words in every detail. The passage in introduction 16 and the note on Iggeres HaKodesh 7 were checked separately; the other references serve as a program for examination. The discussion adds questions and does not permit the times to be settled through an oversimplified table.

Forums

The forum search found a copy of Inyanah Shel Toras HaChassidus, discussions of kinds of newness, and claims about other individuals. The copy helps locate wording but is not another independent witness. Claims about Rabbi Nosson or other tzaddikim lacking an identified source read here were not added to the verified list. In this search, forums served mainly as

an index; identified articles and primary sources provided the research contribution.

Status of Checks in AI Databases

The project contains no documented response attributable to Chabad.AI or NotebookLM. A planned search or an access difficulty is not a research finding. Databases were not reopened during the improvement round, in accordance with the instruction to work from the material already collected.

11. The First Research Round

What the First Round Resolved

The most important result was locating Tosafos' question itself. This spared an attempt to invent an independent answer to a contradiction already discussed by the Rishonim. It also became clear that moving to a new treasury does not require one uniform definition for every later use of "new souls."

Dot presented a focused answer in the Rishonim, Zohar, and Chassidus, and reported reading scans of the Mitteler Rebbe's maamar in Bamidbar, volume 1, p. 238, and letter 54 of the Rebbe Maharash, p. 100. His contribution also included distinguishing Tosafos quoted inside a letter from a further independent answer. Most of the report addressed the original question about births; its score should not be lowered for not already completing the entire inquiry into the Alter Rebbe's soul, which developed later. Grok gave a short, clear structure: the earlier treasury is not the end of every possibility of drawing down souls. His wording excluding all new souls since the Destruction was, however, too broad. The general reference to Torah Or and the inference from every future birth to a single higher level also fell short of the precision needed in a research booklet.

Grok Bot expanded the discussion to commentators on the relevant passages and distinguished types of evidence. He

identified what he had read and what was a secondary quotation. Distinguishing births completing the treasury before redemption from births afterward was an important contribution. Conversely, the claim that all future souls need no refinement did not yet rest on sufficient reading of the central sources in the first report.

Claude supplied a broad map of sources, including the Rebbe's talks on the rarity of new souls and the ingathering of exiles. He disclosed his access limitations. Numerous text-recognition results did not equal reading full pages; the wording identifying exhaustion of the treasury exclusively with reincarnated souls also needed correction.

What the Editor Added Before Round Two

A distinction was developed among personal entry, the history of rectification, Adam's totality, the manner of being drawn down, and mission. Likkutei Torah, the Rebbe Rayatz's tradition, the Kuntres' reference, and the talks of 5720 and 5731 were examined. The focus shifted from a question already answered in Tosafos to the meaning of newness in the Alter Rebbe.

The interim text also had real shortcomings: misidentifying the 5720 passage as a maamar, an insufficiently precise account of the seventh millennium, and an overly speculative proposal concerning root and investiture. The page error was corrected, but changing the number was insufficient. These were corrections of content and framing, beyond verbal polishing.

12. The Second Round's Contribution and Disagreements

Dot: Mapping the Concepts and Examining Inference

The decisive addition was reading introduction 39 against introductions 6 and 7 and bringing Rabbi Yoel Kahn's interpretation. This challenged two assumptions: that the three kinds of newness necessarily describe separate populations, and

that no identified interpreter supported the substantive reading of the Rebbe's reference. The report also corrected the identification of the 5720 source and separated the description of investiture from an unstated resolution.

Its strength is posing a question that can genuinely be examined: non-inclusion in Adam. The weakness of the recommendation to close was an assessment of further checking's usefulness, not a source error. Once Claude's report concluded differently on the same question, leaving the question open did not replace confronting the arguments. This justified another focused round.

Grok Bot: Sources Concerning Birth

His principal contribution was reading scans of Likkutei HaShas and Biurei HaZohar. He clarified the explanation's three components for shortened gestation, the wording about ready-made loaves, and the difference between a tzaddik's own soul and his power to draw down others. He corrected the impression that Ginta in Biurei HaZohar was necessarily separate from the printing in Sefer HaHishtachus, identifying the reference connecting them.

The report carefully limits identification of individuals. Nevertheless, "no additional person was found" must remain restricted to "the same level," after Dot found the relative example of Rabbi Chaim Vital. Its recommendation to close was also conditional on other reviewers leaving no central disagreement. That condition was not met.

Claude: Broad Synthesis and a Sharp Argument Requiring a Countertest

The report adds Hemshech 5672, volume 3, p. 1297, Shemos 5720, and the Rebbe's letter to Rabbi Hutner. It rightly emphasizes crowns and the connecting expressions "foretaste," "example," and "sign," and verifies the distinction between

modes of birth in Vayeitzei 5726. It also corrects generalizations from its own first round.

The conclusion that the Alter Rebbe's soul was included in Adam is not quoted as an explicit personal statement; it is built by combining sources. The argument deserves examination, but "inevitable" and "settled" are too strong before answering Rabbi Yoel's interpretation. Hemshech 5672 also defines a group without naming the Alter Rebbe. Further precision was needed about the page and section discussing the inward dimension of Atik, and the kind of question in Tosafos to which the publisher's note in the letter to Rabbi Hutner refers.

We therefore accepted the sources and the argument's strength without presenting it as an explicit personal source ending the discussion. Rejecting useful material and limiting the conclusion drawn from it are different things.

Grok: A Useful Framework, Limited Verification

The report formulates the tension well and presents three possible resolutions. It acknowledges not reading several decisive sources in full. That transparency matters, while also limiting the weight of its recommendation to close. Preferring a combination of two hypotheses is not additional evidence that they interpret the sources correctly.

The proposed wording about a first entry from Atzilus connects findings with different levels of verification. The discussion is useful as an interim synthesis, but does not override detailed primary readings or an identified interpretation added to the research. It remains part of the inquiry's history without being presented as a proven resolution.

13. The Third Round: What Was Found and Corrected

Dot: From a Wording Question to an Existing Commentary

This was the round's decisive research addition. Rather than leaving introductions 7 and 39 as statements still needing reconciliation, it identified a commentator who sets them out and explains them. The report identified introduction 7, section 1, and introduction 6, sections 3 and 5, beyond sections 9-12 already proposed in the packet. Shaar HaMitzvos, on which the explanation rests, was also read. This preserved the distinction between a commentator's explanation and the primary source he quotes.

The report added the distinctions between incomplete coming into being and its completion, addition and a fundamental component, and voluntary descent for refinement and falling because of a blemish. It also corrected wording from an earlier update of its own: "by way of passage" was not stated in the passage examined. The correction matters because adding a familiar concept cannot replace a book's wording.

The contribution's limit remains: it was not established that all Chassidic discourses adopt every detail of the account, and Bnei Aharon supplied no personal identification of the Alter Rebbe. The editor independently located OCR passages supporting the two central places, but did not read their scans in full. The sources table distinguishes this check from Dot's testimony of reading.

Grok Bot: The Siddur Discourse and the Map of Times

The report adds reading a scan of Or HaTorah, Siddur, pp. 103-104. This corrected the research status: refinement and the nine hours can be read in the discourse itself even when the Yahel Or supplements are inaccessible. The parallel with Yahel

Or rests on the publisher's note, not reading both copies. The report carefully avoids attributing a division into periods to the Tzemach Tzedek where this discourse does not contain it.

Two inferences must be limited alongside this contribution. Understanding Tosafos as new souls outside the treasury but within Adam is a possibility, not wording that was found. Assigning reincarnations to the first period does not follow from needing birth, since birth is described in both modes. The narrower conclusion remains: actual reincarnation takes place after the Temple's building, and different sources discuss modes of birth and levels of souls.

Claude: From Necessity to Preference, and Presenting the Countercase

The third report opens by explicitly correcting its earlier conclusion. Applying the general rule about present new souls to the Alter Rebbe is now its preferred argument, rather than a discovered personal statement or a logical necessity. It gives renewed weight to introduction 7, the Shavuot context, and the distinction that first entry does not exclude another quality. This improves the presentation of counterevidence even while preserving its final preference.

Its main addition is locating copies of the 5708 note and comparing Rabbi Yoel's wording and the uses of the reference to Likkutei Torah in detail. The verification weakness was disclosed: the 5708 note was reconstructed from OCR extracts, and Rabbi Yoel's chapter was read through a tool supplying paraphrase and short quotations. The editor's check confirmed the wording's structure on pp. 107 and 110-111, preventing both excessive weakening of the substantive connection and conversion of it into an original personal statement.

Even the corrected text required limits on absolute claims: for example, that whenever the Rebbe explains the term he exhausts it in non-reincarnation, or that "a foretaste" alone determines the

type of soul. These are interpretations based on the examples examined. Numerous copies of the note do not equal independent primary printings. The findings were incorporated, while the preference remained attributed to the report rather than becoming an editorial ruling.

Grok: Defining the Tension Without Completing the Decisive Source

Grok's report restates the distinction between a reference and personal identification, proposing that the question remain open without a decisive source. The same text was received twice and counted once.

It did not read Sefer HaSichos 5705, p. 127. Its statement that the story contains no assertion of non-inclusion was therefore not accepted as a negative finding: one may say that no such statement was found in the quotations read, but cannot infer the contents of an unread page. Its repeated reference to 50a for the inward dimension of Atik also requires the correction to 51c already established. The report helps with framing and limits, but does not fulfill its task's main verification objective.

Supplementary Source Checks After Round Three

Grok Bot completed two checks defined in chapter 16: Sefer HaSichos 5705, pp. 127-130, and the Rebbe's note in Sefer HaMaamarim 5708, pp. 240-241. The first confirms the preparation and explicit connection to the Alter Rebbe, without adding a denial of inclusion on those pages. The second supports the copies' wording and expands the explanation of particular care in mitzvos, without personally mentioning the Alter Rebbe. Two major documentation gaps were thus removed, without turning the findings into an unstated personal determination.

The report also identified the end of Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 4, in the Frankfurt 5444 printing, but supplied no full transcription.

The check of 5702, p. 127, was not completed. Locating a scan, reading its contents, and providing a full transcription must be distinguished. The correction is bibliographic as well: the first source is Sefer HaSichos 5705; 5444 is the old printing date mentioned in the report, not 5744.

The Cumulative Change Across Three Rounds

Round one located the question in Tosafos. Round two established the term's several meanings and found an identified Chabad interpretation of the Kuntres' reference. Round three found a commentator reconciling the writings on reincarnation, presented the personal arguments by one standard, and verified the parallel Siddur discourse's content. Progress was more than an accumulating source count: each stage changed a judgment that had previously appeared straightforward.

The limited disagreement did not disappear, but was redefined. Asking whether the soul was ever present in Adam is insufficient; one must identify the meanings of inclusion and newness involved. A general reconciliation in the writings on reincarnation and personal application to the Alter Rebbe are different achievements; only the first was closed through an explicit commentary.

The First Improvement Round: Four Contributions and a Corrected Standard

Grok read the text and disclosed not examining the PDF. He sharpened the cost of moving from a general rule to an individual, sought different evidentiary weights for the two readings, and noted that "a foretaste" does not replace explaining the relationship. He also changed his earlier preference for combining root, investiture, and revelation, now preferring the first reading as a starting point. The clarification of weight and expansion on Bnei Aharon were adopted. The difference between Bnei Aharon's two explanations remains: they should not be

merged into a claim that every non-inclusion necessarily means absence of fundamental inclusion.

According to his declaration, Dot read the text and visually inspected every page. His principal contribution corrected the standard: an inference about a person should not be rejected merely because no statement names him. Correspondence of scope and meaning must be examined. He distinguished a quality from an exhaustive account, added a continuous method of study and two test cases, and showed that birth, reincarnation, and a crown are not three alternatives. These proposals were incorporated in chapters 3, 5, 6, and 8. His correction does not itself establish the personal connection, but removes an unjustified barrier to considering the argument.

Grok Bot read the text, viewed every page, and checked arithmetic and links with tools. He identified navigation pointing to a chapter's start rather than the relevant passage, inconsistent names, small notes, duplication, directionality, and an unstated rounding rule. The three-step proposal was incorporated in chapter 8. He expressly withdrew the inference that actual reincarnation belongs to the first period because it requires birth: birth occurs in the second mode too. That proposal was removed from the conclusion and preserved in the history of revisions. A link area split across lines is not itself a broken link; necessary destinations and labels were corrected and checked separately from layout.

Claude read the text and PDF extraction without claiming visual examination of fonts and layout. He proposed placing the birth chapter before the personal inquiry, presenting the readings positively, explaining a crown, and adding a qualified possible correspondence through the meanings of inclusion. The reordered structure and additions grounded in existing material were adopted. The proposed separation of "new" and "of Atzilus" was limited: it distinguishes questions without establishing their

independence. "Drawn down" likewise does not establish every detail of birth, and the time map does not assign Temple reincarnations to the first period without a source.

The editor corrects his own errors here: an excessive demand for a named statement, the comprehensive burden of proof imposed on the substantive reading, page references to chapter openings, and a scoring justification based on an unassigned task. A later correction must not be credited to an earlier report's scope of reading. The model names in the edited text are Dot, Grok Bot, Grok, and Claude; a naming change alters neither the historical output nor responsibility for its claims.

14. Comparison and Assessment of the Reports

The scores are editorial judgments of particular reports on this task. They measure neither general model capability nor a vote determining the interpretation of Chassidus. Each report is assessed against the assignment it actually received. Neither a source count nor merely declaring that a scan was read determines the score.

Each parameter is scored from 1 to 10. The weights are: accuracy of sources and references, 25%; distinction between source and inference, 20%; independent checking and depth, 20%; contribution to the assigned question, 15%; clarity and synthesis, 10%; transparency about reading coverage, 10%. The weighted score is rounded to one decimal place, with five hundredths rounded up. The assessment concerns the report and its assignment, not the truth of whichever position attracted more supporters. Earlier scores remain historical assessments of the material then available. Bot's first-round arithmetic was corrected from 8.3 to 8.4 without changing any parameter score; corrections are explained without erasing the history of checking.

Report	Accuracy	Inference limits	Depth	Contribution	Clarity	Transparency	Weighted score
Dot, round 1	9	9	8	9	9	9	8.8
Grok Bot, round 1	8	9	7	9	8	10	8.4
Claude, round 1	7	7	7	9	8	9	7.6
Grok, round 1	6	5	4	7	8	5	5.7
Dot, round 2	9	10	9	10	9	10	9.5
Grok Bot, round 2	9	9	9	10	9	10	9.3
Claude, round 2	8	6	9	10	9	9	8.3
Grok, round 2	7	7	4	7	9	9	6.8
Dot, round 3	10	10	9	10	9	10	9.7
Claude, round 3	9	8	8	10	9	10	8.9
Grok Bot, round 3	9	8	8	9	9	10	8.7
Grok Bot, supplementary assignment; scored in V5	9	9	9	9	9	10	9.1
Grok, round 3	7	6	4	5	8	8	6.1
Editor's text before round 2	7	8	8	8	8	9	7.9

Reasons for the Scores and Comparison

Dot's first-round score was high for resolving the assigned question, retaining the tentative wording, and distinguishing times. Round two added actual reading that changed the conceptual vocabulary, an important interpretive source, and focused corrections of inference. The score does not automatically endorse the recommendation to close.

Grok Bot began with a broad source list and high transparency. The second-round improvement moved from secondary quotation to reading the birth sources themselves, producing actual changes in the text. This is improvement in evidence, beyond a longer report.

Claude improved in identifying connections and constructing an explanation. His contribution score is high because he supplied sources not previously present. The inference-limits score drops in round two because a personal conclusion is presented as necessary before addressing a contrary interpretive source.

Separating the scores allows the findings to be used without accepting the entire conclusion.

Grok remained clear and accessible, and was more transparent in round two. Verification depth remained limited by his own account. A high checking score should not be awarded for attractively formulating the three possibilities already included in the packet.

In round three, Dot scored highly for identifying the precise commentary, reading its underlying source, and distinguishing a general resolution from personal application. The depth score of 9 remains part of the historical assessment. The previous justification, that manuscripts were not compared and the editor did not perform a second check, does not justify a deduction for a task that did not require them. We lack a sufficiently documented reason for the exact gap between 9 and 10; one must not be invented afterward.

Bot scored highly for reading the Siddur discourse and producing a useful time map. His inference-limits score of 8 reflects the tendency to assign reincarnation to a particular period from the fact of birth and the need to retain several comparisons as secondary. Inaccessibility of Yahel Or is not itself an error, and the parallel content he read is a real addition.

Claude improved the presentation of counterevidence and acknowledged the earlier conclusion's limit. His contribution is high for locating copies and comparing references. Checking depth is limited when a decisive source is read through paraphrase or OCR reconstruction. Criticism of inference limits concerns absolute statements needing qualification, not a properly presented preference for a systematic reading. The same standard applies to a preference in either direction.

Grok disclosed his access limitation but did not read his task's central source. A negative claim about an unread page and repetition of an inaccurate page reference impair accuracy and

inference limits. The report is clear; its new contribution is smaller than those of the other reports.

Bot's supplementary checks were assessed separately from the third report. They answered two real documentation questions and distinguished what was read from what was merely located. The 9.1 score gives no certainty beyond the reading declaration and extracts supplied; in particular, there is no full transcription of the end of chapter 4 and no personal resolution following from the checks alone.

The editor is included in the criticism. The interim text organized the problem and located important sources, but misidentified a type of source and left differences of time unclear. Corrections have been incorporated into the booklet. No additional self-score is assigned to later texts. They underwent criticism, and errors found in the improvement round are documented in chapter 13; incorporating corrections is not itself proof of success.

Completing the comparison using the series' ten criteria. The historical table retains the six parameters and weights established for this research. Alongside it is a supplementary assessment of the four third-round reports under the series' ten criteria. This does not retroactively change earlier scores. To avoid presenting two different averages for one report, only parameter scores from 1 to 10 are given, without another overall score. Bot's later supplementary checks are a separate assignment and are not credited backward to the third report.

Series criterion	Dot	Claude	Grok Bot	Grok
Accuracy of content	10	9	9	7
Attribution and contextual reading	10	8	8	6
Separating explicit wording from inference	10	9	8	6
Finding new evidence	10	8	8	4

Series criterion	Dot	Claude	Grok Bot	Grok
Verification and transparency	10	9	10	8
Logic and depth of argument	10	9	9	7
Retracting and correcting error	9	10	8	Not rated
Quality of peer criticism	9	9	8	6
Clarity and usefulness	9	9	9	8
Precision and limits of the conclusion	10	9	8	7

Separate criteria reveal differences hidden by an average. Dot's new evidence resolves his assigned question while retaining the personal limit; lack of manuscript comparison is no defect in a task that did not require it. Claude's move from necessity to a reasoned preference is an achievement distinct from his lack of direct inspection of some sources. Bot's high transparency about obstacles coexists with several placements in time still based on inference. Grok retains a qualified conclusion, but that does not justify high scores for finding or personally applying an unread source. Retraction was not rated in his report because it documented no specific correction to his earlier position; missing documentation is not a zero score.

Price, speed, translation, and design are not scored because comparable data or outputs were not supplied. Nor does one model's completion of a source demonstrate its general superiority. The comparison shows what kind of work advanced the inquiry and what kind of weakness required correction.

"Improvement in capability" should not be calculated by simply subtracting scores across rounds: the assignments and available material expanded. Improvements in documentation, sources, and precision can be identified as explained for each report.

How to Read the Two Scoring Systems

The six-parameter table is the historical comparison tool and provides an overall score. The ten third-round criteria detail differences hidden by that average; no further average should be

calculated from them. "Retracting and correcting error" measures how a required change of position is presented. It does not reward the error itself, and "not rated" does not penalize someone who needed no change. Grok Bot's supplementary assignment is separate from his third report; its 9.1 score was first assigned in the fifth text.

Related criteria are also distinct. Good transparency honestly describes reading coverage; it does not verify unread content. Separating source and inference examines local attribution, while the conclusion's limits concern the final claim's scope. Depth is judged against the assigned task. Grok's access limitations in earlier reports do not permanently determine his contribution in the improvement round. Rows for the same model are not a time series of general capability.

Comparing the First Improvement Round

The task was analysis and additions from the existing project, not fresh verification. "New evidence" in this table therefore means an argumentative contribution from existing material. The following scores are the editor's assessment of the improvement reports alone, from 1 to 10, without an overall score competing with the historical research score. Visual checking is assessed only within the scope a report undertook; a declared failure to open a PDF does not itself lower an argument's score.

Improvement-round criterion	Dot	Claude	Grok Bot	Grok
Accuracy in analyzing the text	10	8	9	9
Attribution and status of claims	10	9	9	9
Separating explicit wording from proposals	10	9	10	9
Useful argumentative addition	10	10	9	8
Transparency about checking coverage	10	10	10	10
Logic and depth of argument	10	9	9	9
Presenting a changed position	10	10	10	10

Improvement-round criterion	Dot	Claude	Grok Bot	Grok
Criticism and fairness of comparison	10	9	9	9
Clarity and editorial usefulness	9	9	10	9
Precision and limits of the conclusion	10	9	9	9

Dot's advantage is correcting the rule of inference and connecting the concepts, while openly criticizing the reasons for his own scores. Claude added structural changes and a possible correspondence; some formulations needed limits so that separating descriptions or assigning times would not serve as proof. Grok Bot supplied mechanical checks and useful corrections, but splitting link rectangles does not by itself establish a faulty destination, and the actual body font size differed from his stated figure. Grok gave clear countertests and a revised preference; his two tests mainly sharpen distinctions already in the booklet. All four reports acknowledged limits and presented changes of position. These explain score differences, rather than an overall ranking of models.

15. Claims That Changed During the Research

The question initially appeared binary: included in Adam or not. The inquiry separated newness into several relationships; the identified commentary showed that inclusion too requires interpretation. The improvement round sharpened a further step: absence of a personal statement is insufficient to keep a conclusion open, while a shared word is insufficient to apply a general rule. Correspondence of group, quality, and meaning must be shown. The table records both rejected claims and reformulated questions.

Earlier claim	Status after checking	Reason for the change
The answer about new souls is our later proposal	Rejected	The question and answer are in Tosafos themselves.

Earlier claim	Status after checking	Reason for the change
Every new soul was never included in Adam	Rejected as a uniform definition	Introductions 7 and 39 and Hemshech 5672 use the term in several contexts.
No new souls exist in any sense since the Destruction	Rejected	Introduction 6 and the 5713 and 5719 talks distinguish the usual order from other possibilities.
The three types of newness do not overlap	Corrected	Sefer HaGilgulim discusses inclusion alongside the descent of Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah.
Toras Menachem, volume 27, p. 252, is the end of a maamar	Corrected	It is an outline of a talk after the maamar.
No Chabad commentator supports the substantive reading of the Kuntres' reference	Corrected	Rabbi Yoel Kahn's interpretation was found in BeDarkei HaChassidim.
Hemshech 5672 names and proves the location of the Alter Rebbe's soul	Not accepted	The source defines a type; applying it personally requires a step connecting the type to his soul's description.
All messianic souls will be new in the same sense	Not accepted	An explicit source also describes reincarnations for Temple mitzvos.
Every future birth belongs to the first period	Rejected	Vayeitzei 5726 also describes a second mode of birth.
All future new souls are additional children	Rejected	Crowning and additions to existing souls also occur.
A tzaddik drawing down new souls is himself a new soul	Not accepted	Drawing down souls and the history of the tzaddik's own soul are different questions.
The remaining disagreement is merely verbal	Rejected	A decisive step in personal identification remains unsupported, and the meaning of inclusion must be defined.
No identified commentary reconciles introductions 7 and 39	Corrected in round three	Bnei Aharon presents and answers the difficulty through Shaar HaMitzvos and an additional explanation of his own.
Descent to kelipos proves a personal blemish	Rejected as a generalization	Bnei Aharon distinguishes voluntary descent for refinement from falling because of sin.

Earlier claim	Status after checking	Reason for the change
Inclusion and non-inclusion always contradict	Corrected	Addition versus a fundamental component, and incomplete coming into being versus completion, convey different meanings in the identified commentary.
The inward dimension of Atik is in Likkutei Torah 50a, section 5	Corrected	50a is the discourse; the precise wording is in the explanation on 51c.
The 5708 note had already been read in the original printing	Not accepted in round three; updated after the supplementary check	Initially there were OCR copies; later, reading of the printing was reported. Claude's historical coverage must not be rewritten.
Shortened gestation requires all births to involve new souls of one level	Not accepted	Refinement's explanation does not classify every soul; introduction 16 adds returning souls.
Absence of a name invalidates a conclusion about a person	Corrected in the improvement round	Inference from combined sources is possible when correspondence of scope and meaning is established.
Proving one quality exhausts the description	Not accepted	First entry, level, and mission can coexist; each further inference needs its evidence.
Birth, reincarnation, and a crown are separate populations	Corrected	They answer different questions and may overlap without unifying their times.
Lack of manuscript comparison justifies a deduction here	Scoring justification withdrawn	The assignment did not require it; the historical score and its explanatory limit are retained.

16. Closing the Rounds and Developing the Booklet

A fourth general round of source searching and verification is unnecessary. An identified reconciliation of the writings on reincarnation was found, the personal arguments were assessed by one standard, and the birth map was expanded without forcing

a uniform timetable on the sources. The two principal source checks listed in the previous text were then completed.

The four improvement reports were incorporated into this edition. The birth chapter was moved before the personal inquiry; study tools, test cases, relationships among the phenomena, and analysis of the steps of inference were added. Scoring reasons, names, references, and layout were corrected. This used material already collected, without reexamining the books. A possible correspondence between the readings is marked as a proposal, together with the assumptions still requiring support.

Status of the Defined Supplementary Checks

Check	Reported status	Significance for the booklet
Sefer HaSichos 5705, pp. 127-130	The supplementary report states that scans were read	Preparation and its connection to birth were verified; these pages do not deny inclusion.
Sefer HaMaamarim 5708, pp. 240-241, note 6	The supplementary report states that the printing was read	The copies' wording is supported; the explanation is general and does not mention the Alter Rebbe.
Sefer HaSichos 5702, p. 127	The parallel was not located in the reported check	The bibliographic discrepancy remains; a printing error must not be guessed.
Sefer HaGilgulim, end of chapter 4	The ending was located, without a full transcription	Rabbi Elishavitz's broader quotation remains secondary; introduction 16 establishes the reincarnation route itself.

The two remaining supplementary items are not the basis of the established answers. They remain limits of documentation; they need neither delay the booklet nor be reassigned to every reviewer. Should an explicit text changing the conclusion arrive later, a focused correction will be made and its reason documented.

From the Research Booklet to the Reader Booklet

This research booklet is the basis for Reader Booklet (22), developed from it in the Daily Tanya Study series. The reader

booklet explains Tosafos' question, kinds of newness, the meaning of inclusion, the Alter Rebbe's soul, and modes of birth accessibly, with chapter and page references to the research. [Both booklets are available in the shared folder](#). Simplifying the explanation preserves the distinctions and the limit of personal identification.

The research edition preserves the full inquiry; the reader booklet provides a continuous path to understanding it. The series owner assigned number 22. The assessment rests on reading the sources and distinguishing what they state from what is explained on their basis.

A Focused Conclusion to the Improvement Stage

The limited personal question remains open: in which sense of inclusion and newness the Alter Rebbe's soul should be classified. Its remaining open does not itself require another general improvement round. This edition's integration check concerns consistency of argument, marking illustrations as illustrations, agreement of maps and conclusion, and layout. A future argument or source supplying the missing step will be examined as a defined update; repetition of the term "new soul" alone is insufficient.

Map of Claims and Conclusions

Each number leads to the paragraph developing the argument, with a return link to this map. Rabbi Yoel's interpretation accompanies the reference discussion in chapter 8. Page numbers follow the final layout.

Claim	Research status	Page
1. New treasury	Tosafos' answer, expressed as a suggestion	5
2. First personal entry	May follow earlier inclusion	9
3. Incomplete formation and completion	Bnei Aharon, drawing on Shaar HaMitzvos	10

Claim	Research status	Page
4. Addition and fundamental inclusion	A further explanation of belonging	<u>11</u>
5. Voluntary descent for refinement	Distinct from a fall and from prior individual life	<u>12</u>
6. New souls as a crown	Added elevation within existing souls	<u>15</u>
7. The Alter Rebbe's soul	Newness, Atzilus, and revelation in a body	<u>22</u>
8. Present new souls: the general statement	Personal application requires matching scope and meaning	<u>24</u>
9. The reference and Rabbi Yoel's interpretation	Substantive future connection; its extent needs examination	<u>24</u>
10. Two modes of birth	Mode alone does not identify an individual soul's level	<u>16</u>
11. Reincarnations for mitzvos	An explicit route after the Temple is built	<u>18</u>
12. The research answer	What is established and what remains open	<u>53</u>

17. Answers to the Basic Questions Within the Sources' Limits

Where the Souls of Future Births Come From

Claim 12 · map Tosafos ask about the treasury's exhaustion and propose "a new Guf and new souls." There is thus an explicit answer to the question of births, expressed as "perhaps." Tosafos do not define the souls' level here; the material examined contains no explicit classification of the level of everyone born at the start of the messianic era. Iggeres HaKodesh 26 and Vayeitzei 5726 describe

birth from one union in the first period, while another source adds reincarnations for mitzvos after the Temple's building. Shortened gestation does not itself classify the souls, and reincarnations do not cancel the possibility of a new treasury.

What Becomes New in a Soul

The term can describe a first personal entry, renewal in the manner of being drawn down, or a level beyond the earlier totality. "Inclusion" also requires interpretation: Bnei Aharon explains incomplete initial coming into being and, in another explanation, addition as distinct from a fundamental component. Descent for refinement need not be a fall because of a blemish. Crowns taught us that new souls also add elevation to existing souls. These dimensions can coexist; each use for one group must not become a synonym for all the others.

What Is Stated About the Alter Rebbe, and What Remains to Be Examined

Positive descriptions have accumulated: newness, Atzilus, revelation in a body, exceptional preparation, and a general drawing down of vitality through opening the wellsprings. The contrast with reincarnation supports a first personal entry. The Kuntres, the Shavuot talk, and Rabbi Yoel's interpretation establish a substantive connection to redemption and future revelation. These dimensions can be combined without settling the entire question of inclusion through them alone.

Combining the general statement about present new souls with the personal descriptions favors the first

reading as an interpretive starting point; it does not itself exhaust the description's meaning. The substantive reading has an edited context and an identified interpreter; it requires defining which quality of the future level is attributed to his soul. What remains open is the extent of belonging to that level and the meaning of inclusion. The material before us has not established a decisive connecting step. The absence of a personal statement limits direct evidence; it is not a rule invalidating every conclusion from combined sources.

Is This Unique to Him?

Not in every sense. The writings on reincarnation and Chassidic sources allow new souls during exile, and Rabbi Chaim Vital is named in a description of relative newness. A tzaddik drawing down new souls must be distinguished from the history of his own soul. No list was established here of individuals at the Alter Rebbe's same level and mission; related terms are insufficient for that comparison.

Birth taught us to ask where souls come from; reincarnation, that future birth may also belong to a route of returning souls; and crowns, that renewal also elevates existing souls. Distinguishing meanings of newness and inclusion lets us describe what has become clear and isolate the remaining point of study. Tosafos' answer, the kabbalistic and Chassidic additions, and the personal connection to redemption can thus stand together, each within its evidence.

18. Sources for Further Study

This selection is intended for study inside the sources. It follows the periods of works and authors and, for later dated sources, the time of delivery. Each entry points to a question worth examining. The history of verification remains in the research chapters and archive, and does not replace studying the source.

[Shabbos 30b; Avodah Zarah 5a, Rashi and Tosafos, s.v. Ein Ben David](#). Study the question about births and the tentative "perhaps," distinguishing the treasury of souls from the child's physical body.

[Avodas HaKodesh, part 2, chapter 37](#). Examine the completion of refinement and the transition to the emergence of new souls.

[Netzach Yisrael, chapter 32](#). Examine the relationship between the souls' level and the body, and what this explanation adds beyond counting the treasury's souls.

Shaar HaGilgulim: [introduction 6](#), [introduction 7](#), [introduction 39](#). Compare personal entry, a changed manner of being drawn down, and inclusion in Adam, without assuming one test defines every "new" soul.

[Shaar HaGilgulim, introduction 16](#). Distinguish actual reincarnation from ibur for a mitzvah, and a mitzvah left unfulfilled from one that could not have been fulfilled.

[Shaar HaMitzvos, Ki Seitzei, 57b-58a, Jerusalem 5665 printing](#). Examine why an initial coming into being is not counted as a complete appearance, and the conditions of the renewal following it.

Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 7. Examine the relation among non-inclusion, parts of Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah, Atzilus, and crowning in the seventh millennium. This is not introduction 7 of Shaar HaGilgulim.

The Arizal's Likkutei HaShas, Livorno 5550, 14b, among the teachings on Sanhedrin. Study the reason for shortened gestation and its relation to refinement, without attributing an unstated division into periods to the source.

Tanya, Iggeres HaKodesh 26, alongside Iggeres HaKodesh 7. Compare the laws of future birth with "until Mashiach's coming, inclusive."

Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 50a, Ki KaAsher HaShamayim HaChadashim, section 4, and the explanation on 51c. Distinguish the souls' crowning from the explanation of their being drawn from the inward dimension of Atik, and the discourse's sections from its explanation's sections. Also study Derushim LiShemini Atzeres 89a on the crown for the souls of the righteous.

Likkutei Torah, Tzav 7c, VaAchaltem Achol. Examine how future souls add elevation to existing ones, and why every newness should not be equated with another child's birth.

The Tzemach Tzedek's Biurei HaZohar, volume 2, Ginta, pp. 818-828, especially 827-828; Or HaTorah, Siddur, Hashem Hoshiah, pp. 103-104. Compare the reasons for shortened gestation and the worlds' condition, without attributing an unstated division into periods to the discourse.

Bnei Aharon, introduction 6, sections 3, 5, and 9-12; introduction 7, section 1. Study the reconciliation of inclusion, addition as distinct from a fundamental component, and voluntary descent as distinct from falling.

This is an identified commentary; applying it to a particular soul is a further question.

[Hemshech 5672, volume 3, p. 1297](#), alongside volume 2, p. 771. Distinguish souls included in Adam that have not yet descended from new souls of the level discussed for the future; the author does not name the Alter Rebbe here.

[Sefer HaSichos 5705, pp. 127-130](#); [Sefer HaSichos 5706, p. 22](#); [5707, pp. 150-151](#); and [5708, p. 157](#). Bring the preparation story together with the descriptions of Atzilus, investiture, and revelation, without supplying an unstated sentence about inclusion.

[Sefer HaMaamarim 5708, pp. 240-241, the Rebbe's note 6](#). Study the two reasons for special care in a mitzvah, distinguishing a general use of the term from personal identification.

[Toras Menachem, volume 5, p. 184, Shabbos Shemini 5712](#); [volume 7, p. 259, Zos Chanukah 5713](#). Compare a general drawing down through the Alter Rebbe's soul with the possibility of new souls during exile, retaining each statement's scope.

[Toras Menachem, volume 14, p. 123, Shavuos 5715, section 18](#); [volume 16, p. 277, Im BeChukosai 5716](#); [volume 25, pp. 26-28, Yud Shevat 5719, sections 11-13](#). Study a new soul as a sign of redemption, added elevation and crowns, and a tzaddik's power to draw down new souls. Each source teaches a different aspect of newness.

[Toras Menachem, volume 27, p. 252, Vayeishev 5720, section 13](#), and, in the same volume, [p. 273, Shemos 5720, section 2](#). Examine the general statement about present

new souls alongside the Alter Rebbe's description, defining where the interpretive combination begins.

Toras Menachem, volume 45, p. 183, Vayeitzei Yaakov 5726, section 7; Inyanah Shel Toras HaChassidus, section 6 and note 45, or 48 in the integrated text. Study the distinction between modes of birth alongside the reference explaining the Alter Rebbe's description.

Igros Kodesh, volume 25, letter 9394, 12 Marcheshvan 5728; Likkutei Sichos, volume 39, p. 408. Study the distinction between the source from which souls are drawn and the treasury "Guf," and the suggested explanation of "from the beginning." The letter does not classify all future children.

VaYomer Lo Yehonasan 5731, Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat, volume 1, p. 343, opening. Examine the relationship among the present example of renewal, its true form in the future, and crowns.

Rabbi M. M. Elishavitz, He'aros U'Biurim, issue 999, Shavuos 5770; issue 1000, Gimmel Tammuz 5770.

Examine attempts to map the periods and the distinction between a quoted source and the author's proposal.

BeDarkei HaChassidim, from the teachings of Rabbi Yoel Kahn, pp. 107 and 110-112. Read the introduction, the reported disagreement, and the explanation of the reference continuously. Retain its status as an edited later interpretation and distinguish it from a photographed original response.