YeshivahAI · B”H

Tanya — Iggeret HaKodesh 20
The Research Book

Edited by topic, with expanded documentation

Volume III of three

An edited edition based on the existing collection · September 2026

Guide to This Volume

Pagination is continuous across the three volumes. For the foreword and an explanation of this edition's status, see Volume I. Historical documentation does not automatically endorse its conclusions.

Contents of This Volume

Topic or section	Page
16 · The Earth That Produces Growth and the Power of Bringing into Being	1863
17 · The End of the Kav, Returning Light, and the Order of Investment	2011
18 · Sowing, Water, Raising Mayin Nukvin, and Humanity's Purpose	2065
19 · Food and Knowledge: The Higher Receiving from the Lower	2145
20 · Sacrifice, the Mitzvot, and the Revelation of Light Below	2382
Methodological Dossiers and Cross-Cutting Questions	2838
Cross-Cutting Comparison and Research on the Research	2861
Reading the Decisive Sources	2909
Examples from Or HaTorah	2920

Added in this edition

Concluding chapter — Comparing the Models' Editorial Work · 2924

16 · The Earth That Produces Growth and the Power of Bringing into Being

It is specifically earth, the lowest of the elements, that becomes a conspicuous locus for the revelation of the power of bringing into being. Understanding this does not require claiming that the vitality invested in it is greater than that of a human being or an animal. The question of the measure of vitality and the question of the power discernible in coming into being itself are not the same question.

This brings us back to the parentheses concerning the mazal. The Epistle distinguishes between the plant's actual coming into being and the action of "Grow!" upon a blade of grass that has already sprouted. The Pinchas research added a source that connects, within the same sentence, the vegetative power in the earth with the action of the mazal. This connection prevented the two factors from being presented as mutually contradictory alternatives.

This precision does not decide in advance who determines every detail of the plant. Nor does the distinction prove that every description of "causing to grow" in another source concerns precisely the same action. The advance lies in being able to identify different explanatory domains without turning them into a competition over a single source.

Fruits and plants are not merely a negligible example of a cosmic process. They return the question to tangible reality: how does the physical thing, which is not a graded continuation of spirituality, come into being and renew itself? This will subsequently also make it possible to understand the higher realm's dependence on nourishment from the lower.

The Wording of the Epistle — Source Units

W13-01 · 1–13

And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above, a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above,

W13-02 · 14–24

shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force

W13-03 · 25–33

than in the elements higher than it, and even than in the hosts of heaven, which do not have the strength and ability

W13-04 · 34–46

to bring forth something from nothing continually, as does the element of earth, which continually causes something to grow from nothing, namely grasses and trees

W13-05 · 47–55

(and the mazal that strikes and says, “Grow!” does so after the grass has already sprouted,

W13-06 · 56–66

and does not tell it to sprout from nothing into something, but to grow from small to large and to bear fruit,

W13-07 · 67–71

each and every species in its particular details.

W13-08 · 72–84

But before it sprouts, to whom would each individual mazal speak, for each individual blade of grass in its particular details?)

W13-09 · 85–92

from the vegetative power within it, which is ayin and spiritual, whereas they are physical.

The word ranges preserve the local count in the earlier division of the source; W identifiers are fixed. Word count of the working text: 1,640 words.

Mapping the Question and Its Clarification

How does the vegetative power in the earth reveal a power absent from the hosts of heaven, and what does the mazal add after the grass has already sprouted?

The Epistle now adds an advantage visible in the earth's activity: it produces grasses, trees, and fruits. This does not mean that earth understands Divinity more than the angels do, but that a power to bring forth physical growth is actually revealed in it. The creature's level and the height of its apprehension are not the sole measure of the intensity of the power revealed through it. The lowest element specifically becomes a locus of an activity that the higher beings do not bring about through their own power.

Here, too, one must not leap from the spiritual to the physical as though the difference between them were merely a degree of refinement. The vegetative power is spiritual, whereas the grass is physical. Thus, describing the spiritual power alone does not explain physical coming into being; the Epistle attributes it to the power of Ein Sof shining through the order of the vessels. The vegetative power itself must not be turned into the Essence, and the sovev must not be reduced to an inactive background.

The mazal that tells the grass to grow does not replace the power that causes it to sprout. In the Epistle's wording, its action comes after the grass has already sprouted: it adds growth to an existing thing. The distinction is between the plant's actual appearance and its development. One must not infer from it that the mazal has no connection to the plant's characteristics, just as one must not extend it into a detailed system of taste, color, and species without a further source.

Sowing does not make everything that comes into being yesh mi-yesh in a sense that negates its novelty. The physical seed arouses the vegetative power, but the size and quality of the result are not explained merely as an enlargement of the seed's matter. This is an analogy for the role of an awakening from below: human action is necessary for a certain addition, but the power that produces it is not created by the human being. The continuation will distinguish between growth it-

self and the superiority of fruits produced through sowing and planting.

The Plant's Appearance versus Its Development

The earth research examined the claim that the mazal is the cause of growth. The difficulty is that the Epistle itself leaves it a real action, but places that action after the grass has sprouted. Both eliminating the mazal from the explanation and presenting it as the initial creator were therefore rejected. Parallel passages that speak of the vegetative power and the mazal together do not in themselves contradict this division of roles. The details of species and taste are not settled by the general division.

Infinity in Repeated Action

"Continually," growth "every year," and renewal of the light are not three identical descriptions. "Continually" indicates an enduring capacity and activity; "every year" indicates its repeated appearance; renewal adds a distinction concerning the light drawn down. One must not infer that infinitely many years have already elapsed, or replace "a likeness of" Ein Sof with complete identity. The reference to Epistle 14 helps us see renewal within continuity, but does not eliminate the difference between the Epistles.

Status of the Questions after the Fourth Round of Clarification

This is a documented register of conclusions from dossier 0570; the term "supported" denotes the conclusion of that investigation within its limits.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E01	The opening: “and furthermore” / “beyond” / “all the above”	Partial interpretation	An added revelation of power in the earth; the precise significance of the duplication remains in need of further study.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E02	The subject of “it” and the threefold radiance	Partial	The radiance and all the above as the subject; no complete syntactic determination.
E03	Immense revelation versus tzimtzum	Supported interpretation	Revelation of power in action; the question of the vegetative power in Tanya 38 is separate.
E04	Ayin and spiritual	Supported	The power–product relation; spirituality in itself is not the power of creation.
E05	Mazal, growth, and fruit	Partial	Source and intermediary coexist; the allocation of species and taste remains open.
E06	“Before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?”	Supported in its essentials	An existing individual addressee; the seed-decay argument was withdrawn.
E07	Why earth?	Partial interpretation	Fits the lowest realm and the endpoint; comparison of all the elements has not been exhausted.

The Topic’s Conclusion: Earth’s Advantage Is an Advantage in the Appearance of a Particular Power

It is unnecessary to attribute more knowledge or more revealed vitality to earth than to the human being in order to understand its advantage here. The Epistle points to the capacity that continually produces growth. The question is where the power of bringing into being is discernible, not who stands at the top of the scale of manifest qualities.

The parentheses concerning the mazal establish a distinction between the plant's actual appearance and the enlargement of what has already sprouted. The mazal therefore is not an answer that replaces the vegetative power. The parallel found in the Pinchas discourses combines the earth's power and the mazal's activity; it does not authorize erasing the distinction in the Epistle. Two factors can participate in one process without performing the same role.

Precision is also needed in the expressions of infinity. The Epistle says "a likeness of" and makes the continuity conditional on the world's existence. It does not claim that an infinite number of plants or years has actually been produced. The power is described as not exhausted by a single realization, and as continuing to operate under the conditions described. This distinction prevents the analogy from being used as a mathematical claim that was never made.

The progression of the discussion can now be understood: after seeing the action in the earth, we ask why the power is discernible specifically there. The answer will return us to the endpoint of the kav and to returning light. It adds an explanation of this particular advantage without changing the fact that earth is low in the revealed order.

The Research Questions in This Topic

The wording of the questions is preserved so that the completeness of the discussion can be checked. The mere appearance of a question in the register does not constitute a decision about it; the investigation and the limit of its conclusion must be read. The identifiers here form the edited map of questions and are not an automatic merger with the earlier numbering of other reports.

E01 — What is added by "And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above": further evidence, another level, or the revelation of a power already described? Why have expressions of addition accumulated,

and why does “all the above” recur? The Rebbe’s “requires further study” concerning the wording and the subject must be preserved.

E02 — What is included in “a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above,” and what is the subject of “it shows its strength”? Are the kav and the sovev included in the radiance, or enumerated alongside it? This must not be decided solely by the nearest noun.

E03 — How does “in an immense revelation” here accord with the concealment of the light at the third level, and with Tanya 48, which describes the scant vitality of the inanimate and vegetative orders? Is the revelation of power in action different from the revelation of the light or its apprehension?

E04 — What is the “ayin” in the vegetative power: spirituality, non-apprehension, lack of commensurability, or absolute nothingness? How does the local use connect to the definition of yesh me-ayin at the beginning of the Epistle?

E05 — What does the mazal do after sprouting: size alone, the details of species, taste, and fruit? If bearing fruit is attributed to the mazal and later mentioned as an example of yesh me-ayin, how is the activity divided between it and the vegetative power?

E06 — How does the argument “before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?” work? Why is a general influence on the vegetative power or on the seed insufficient? Examine Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. קצו and תשפו, without identifying page numbers in the absence of an edition.

E07 — Why is the advantage attributed to inanimate earth even though the product is vegetative? Does the evidence concern the level of the receiving source, the product, or the relation between them? How do water and the other conditions of growth fit in?

The Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism, and Alternatives

The dossiers are arranged here by family of investigation and round, within the topic. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Designations such as PASS, SEALED, and the like are historical determinations by the dossier's author; they are not an independent endorsement by the editor. English passages were preserved in their own language so as not to replace original evidence with a conjectural translation. Document identifiers make it possible to return to the archive.

Dossier 0074 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [30]

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Plain Explanation

Earth produces the vegetative order. The vegetative order becomes a source of food for the animal order. The animal order supplies matter and vitality to the speaking human, and in the human being this vitality can rise into thought, speech, and action in the service of G-d.

Thus the lower is not merely a recipient. It also becomes a source for the level above it.

Earth appears to be the lowest matter, yet precisely in it the vegetative power is revealed: a power that is not visible as a body within the earth, and nevertheless brings life and form out of it. The inanimate is therefore not disconnected from the vegetative, and the vegetative

[30] Document 0074: E1.4 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 18-21 md.וסיום [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 18–21 and Conclusion]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

is not disconnected from the animal; rather, each level becomes the basis for the next drawing down.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — The Station's Function

This station applies the idea of returning light to the actual world. Vitality does not descend only from above downward; it also passes through an order in which the lower nourishes and elevates the higher.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — What Does the Station Clarify?

It explains why the Epistle presents the element of earth as a central example. This is not only because earth is low, but because it reveals how a new reality grows out of a source that is not visible in it.

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Station 19 — Elevating Vitality in Human Divine Service

The human being is not merely nature's highest link. The human being is also the one who can return everything received to its source.

When a person eats, uses the inanimate and vegetative, and lives through their power, physical things become part of human power. When that power is used for Torah study, prayer, and the performance of a mitzvah, the person elevates the vitality that lay within the lower levels.

This is the context in which the Epistle speaks of sacrifices and the vitality in an animal. It does not mean that the animal becomes Divinity. It means that the Divine vitality animating it can be elevated through human Divine service, when the person uses physicality in the service of G-d.

This connects the end of the Epistle to its beginning:

At the beginning, the question was how limited vessels can be Divinity.

At the end, it becomes clear how limited physicality can become a vessel for the revelation of the power of Ein Sof.

Physicality does not become spirituality by itself. It becomes a vessel when the human being acts within it in accordance with G-d's command.

Dossier 0239 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [4]

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — The Epistle's Wording

«And shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation.»

And subsequently:

«From the vegetative power within it, which is ayin and spiritual, whereas they are physical; and this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah.»

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — Plain Explanation

After the Epistle has spoken of vessels, lines, and radiances, it seeks a place where the power of creation is visible to the eye. It finds this in the element of earth and the vegetative power.

[4] Document 0239: E1.3 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 12-17.md [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 12–17]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The vegetative power itself is not visible as a physical body. It is a spiritual power that brings a physical plant forth from the earth. Precisely because the source and its effect are so different, the Epistle sees here an "immense revelation" of the power of creation.

This does not mean denying the physical conditions that the plant requires. The Epistle points to the power of growth itself, the power to bring living form forth from the earth, as an example of yesh me-ayin.

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — The Station's Function

This is the point of connection between the higher orders and physical nature. What was said about the power of Ein Sof does not remain in the realm of concepts; it is presented through the example of growth.

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — What Does the Station Clarify?

It explains why the Epistle returns once again to the lower realm. Precisely there, the difference between a spiritual source and a physical result is most apparent.

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Interim Summary

The continuation of the Epistle added to the structure already built:

- The parsa separates, but does not prevent the passage of the radiance.
- The kav is described within vessels and at the endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon.
- The radiance descends through three levels to the created beings.

- The Ein Sof light encompasses everything equally, but inward vitality operates through the kav and the vessels.
- The element of earth reveals the power of growth as a spiritual power that produces the physical.
- From the lowest endpoint, returning light shines from below upward.

The next stages will continue with the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders; the drawing of vitality from the vegetative to the animal and the speaking; the example of sacrifices; and the Epistle's conclusion concerning the purpose of the souls' descent and the advantage of practical mitzvot.

Dossier 0608 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [401]

From the Lower to the Higher — The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20

Four editions: a reader's booklet in Hebrew (32 pp.) and English (46 pp.); a study booklet in Hebrew (218 pp.) and English (258 pp.).

Scope: the concluding unit from "And from this it will be well understood" to "Thus far we have found," with the necessary context from the earth unit and the body of the Epistle. Forty questions, a continuous explanation, the five rounds of investigation, 18 hypothesis dossiers, follow-up questions, corrections and retractions, sources and printed witnesses. 96 enlarged source plates are based on 27 source pages.

[401] Document 0608: 00-START-HERE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Each PDF is accompanied by text for editing and searching. 02-Research-Archive.zip includes the available research, source files, photographs, bilingual editorial materials, and production code. This is not a complete export of all correspondence; omissions and the difference between an original report and a reworking are marked in the archive and the booklet.

The four Review-Prompt files are separate instructions for Grok, Grok Bot, Claude, and Gemini. The independent review packages are supplied separately, each containing the four books and the archive. The requested review is in writing only; the packages have not been sent to the models.

Group-Summary-HE/EN are ready to copy to the group. QA-REPORT and the release manifest document the checks, page counts, and file identities. The original R1–R5 files have been preserved without being overwritten.

From the Lower to the Higher

Four editions of the concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: Hebrew reader (32 pages), English reader (46), Hebrew research (218), English research (258). The research editions include forty dossiers, five rounds, eighteen hypothesis files, corrections and retractions, and 96 enlarged source plates from 27 original pages.

The archive preserves all available original research files and the bilingual editorial record. It is not a complete conversation export. Photographic source witnesses remain in Hebrew; analysis, history and key readings are provided in both languages. Review packages are ready for manual upload and have not been sent to any model.

Dossier 0610 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [402]

B”H. From the Lower to the Higher — The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, YeshivahAI, under rabbinic supervision.

Why does the animal feed on the vegetative, and why does the human being receive knowledge as well from food? The explanation begins with the advantage of the lowest point and the kav’s returning light, following the earth unit. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, explains water–vegetative, fire–animal, and air–speaking; the relation to Etz Chaim remains a proposed reconciliation. “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six days you shall eat matzot”) combines grain and meat and explains an addition of intellect from the root of the food. Emor and Kuntres Acharon add the axis of refinement and Tohu/Sag, without identifying it with the kav. The sacrifice returns the spirit of the animal and the bird and explains the pleasure of the face of the ox and the face of the eagle. From this follows the advantage of the practical mitzvah in physicality, through command, without an absolute ranking of action above Torah. Forty questions, a continuous explanation, and the five research rounds appear in the reader’s and study editions, in Hebrew and English. Corrections and retractions, source photographs, and open questions have also been preserved: “elsewhere,” the attribution of references, and the details of grain and meat. “Thus far we have found” attests to the limit of transmission; it does not prove how the author intended to conclude.

[402] Document 0610: Group-Summary-HE.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0294 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or testimony from the history of the research [10]

R10-BATCH-04 — Sefirot, Divinity, and Prayer — R10-BATCH-04 — Universal Prompt for Claude and Grok

1. Open Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah, sections 1–3 and 46, and state explicitly what is the Tzemach Tzedek's own text and what is a later explanation.
2. Examine the sentences about the names of G-d, the sefirot, the Shechinah, Atzilut, and the vessels: do they describe intention in prayer, the nature of the sefirot, or a halachic ruling?
3. Look for a primary source for "And you knew that G-d is greater than all the gods" in the context of sefirot/angels/idolatry.
4. Distinguish between: prayer to the Creator through names and revelations; addressing a sefirah as a Divine power; addressing an angel or a soul as a created being; and addressing the Creator's Essence.
5. In parallel, examine section 46 on a drop, the vegetative power, nine/seven months of gestation, Atik, and Imma Ila'ah. Compare it to Iggeret HaKodesh 20 without rewriting it.
6. Return quotations, URL, provenance, what is/is not proved, criticism of B04, Delta R09→R10, a new R10-T##, unresolved, and the next step.

[10] Document 0294: 46 — R10 ACTIVE — Extended Questions, Integrated Commentary Plan, Universal Prompt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0012 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [134]

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.1 What Admur says

«And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above, a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above, shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force than in the elements higher than it, and even than in the hosts of heaven, which do not have the strength and ability to bring forth something from nothing continually, as does the element of earth, which continually causes something to grow from nothing…»

«And this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds, without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone.»

«And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light… and their beginning is embedded in their end.»

«And likewise at the endpoint of the kav… it shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity…»

«And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim, this radiance is first invested… in the light of Atzilut within Asiyah… and through this there is strength and force in the endpoint of the vessel of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah within

[134] Document 0012: 154 — R17-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

the element of earth, and this is the utterance “Let the earth sprout”… continually, forever and ever.»

(bracket: infinite-mode growth vs six-days mayim/chayah; chesed chinam without mayin nukvin in Sheshat Yemei Bereishit)

planted/seeded growth still «like yesh me-ayin»; fruits via mayin nukvin superior → mashal for hamshachot of man.

Locus:

«And furthermore, beyond this» through «as written elsewhere» · [E]

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.3 Link

- From 13’s equal sovev + kelim-power → why earth outstrips higher elements.
- To 15: same or chozer explains the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking paradox, angelic nourishment from korbanot, and supremacy of operational mitzvot.

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.4 Plain terms

- יסוד העפר: physical earth-element; here the site of continuous vegetative yesh me’ayin.
- אור חוזר: light returning from below upward; Admur ties it to Malchut-as-Keter pattern and to the kav’s terminus at AK feet.
- עיגולי א”ק: circular scheme of AK; here only noted as the small interruption between AK feet and sovev under them — not a full EC lesson.
- מל’ דמל’ דעשיה: lowest malchut within Asiyah; its neshamah-light = Elokut mamash (from chitzoniyut of Malchut Atzilut kelim).

- זריעה / מ"נ [mayin nukvin / sowing]: elevation of "feminine waters" via sowing; still "like" yesh me'ayin; superior produce → mashal for human drawing of orot.

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.6 Implicit Qs

- Precise Gilgulim 20 wording vs Admur's summary — full page [U] if needed later.
- How "without a great interruption… only the igulim of Adam Kadmon" squares with equal sovev — [P]/[U] for R17-D.
- Q42/Q70/NHYM: not closed.

Dossier 0031 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [135]

157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md — Dedup vs sealed T01–T15 and prior rounds

Proposed	Comparator	Same claim?	QC
T16 two kav loci	T15 parsa-pierce «just as in Atzilut itself»	No — T15=path A; T16 adds path B + open identity	NEW
T17 three haarah	T01–T15 / R14–R16	No twin	NEW
T18–T19 sovev / inner-kav	sealed set	No twin	NEW
T20–T21 earth / or chozer / Gilgulim	T08 נעוץ [embedded] structural · T13 נעוץ [embedded] teleology	Same lemma family at bottom, different claim (earth mechanism)	NEW (not FOLD)

[135] Document 0031: 157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Proposed	Comparator	Same claim?	QC
T22 דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking]	sealed set	No twin	NEW
T23 Merkavah / Zohar	R14 angel taxonomies	No — or-chozer nourishment, not taxonomy remint	NEW
T24 מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] telos	T13 / T14	Related theme, different claim (descent telos post-or-chozer vs kingship /shelaya)	NEW (not FOLD)
(not proposed) Q42 / Q70 / Moses / A≡B sealed	HOLDs / forever-OPEN	Correctly out of propose	complied

FOLD required? None.

Dossier 0103 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [140]

14 — The Element of Earth / Returning Light — 2) Plain peshat

Physical earth uniquely continuous yesh me'ayin growth. Reason: AK feet end under Asiyah; under feet sovev with only AK iggulim interrupting; Kav at that end radiates or chozer upward → neshamah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah. Gilgulim 20 chain powers «Let [the earth] sprout» forever. Planted (mayin nukvin) fruit superior → mashal for human hamshachot.

[140] Document 0103: 155 — R17 SCOUT יא–טו CORROBORATE-ONLY.md [sections 11–15]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

14 — The Element of Earth / Returning Light — 4) Open Qs

- Gilgulim/BR apparatus beyond Admur cite [U]
- Q42/Q70 HOLD — growth/or chozer ≠ MICRO / ≠ measure

Dossier 0538 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [28]

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — The Epistle's Wording

«A radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above, shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force than in the elements higher than it, from the vegetative power within it, which is ayin and spiritual, whereas they are physical, which continually causes something to grow from nothing; and this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah.»

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — Plain Explanation

The vegetative power itself is not visible as a physical body. It is an aspect of ayin: a power hidden from the category of matter, and spiritual, which brings forth a physical plant from the earth. Precisely because the source and its effect are so different, the Epistle sees here an "immense revelation" of the power of creation.

[28] Document 0538: E1.6-HY1-Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Station 16 — The Element of Earth: Yesh Me-Ayin Revealed — Which Question Does the Station Resolve?

It explains why the Epistle returns once again to the lower realm. Precisely there, the difference between a spiritual source and a physical result is most apparent.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Terms

דצח"מ denotes the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders. Here the Epistle parallels these levels with earth, water, fire, and air, and stresses that the higher level receives vitality from the lower.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Plain Explanation

The Epistle does not describe only a ladder on which the higher is above the lower. It adds that the animal feeds on the vegetative, and the speaking receives vitality from the animal and the vegetative. There is therefore also a movement from below upward: the lower becomes a source of vitality for the higher.

The Epistle gives the examples of tasting grain and meat. There is no need to turn the examples into a medical discussion; they illustrate that the lower level's vitality becomes a condition for the higher level's development.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Which Question Does the Station Resolve?

It explains why the Epistle returns to the actual world: specifically within physical levels one can see how the lower not only receives, but also nourishes and sustains the higher.

Dossier 0609 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [403]

B”H From the Lower to the Higher — the conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, YeshivahAI, under rabbinic supervision. Why are animals nourished by plants, and why does food add to human understanding? The explanation begins with the lowest level and the kav’s returning light, following the earth passage. Likkutei Torah in Pinchas explains plant/water, animal/fire and human/spirit; reconciliation with Etz Chaim remains proposed. Sheshet Yamim joins grain and meat, explaining intellectual addition through the root of food. Emor and Kuntres Acharon add refinement and Tohu/Sag without identifying them with the kav. The offering returns the animal’s or bird’s spirit and explains the benefit of the ox and eagle faces. Practical mitzvot act in physical reality by command, without an absolute ranking of action above Torah. Forty questions, a continuous exposition and five research rounds appear in reader and research editions in both languages. Corrections, retractions, source scans and open questions are preserved, including unidentified references and details of the food examples. “Thus far we found” marks the boundary of transmission; it does not establish the author’s intended ending.

Dossier 0539 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Combined dossier: findings must be distinguished from the follow-up brief [404]

[403] Document 0609: Group-Summary-EN.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[404] Document 0539: IGK20-Earth-R1_00_README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package

The penultimate passage of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: the element of earth, returning light, growth, and mayin nukvin. September 23, 2026.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package — What Has Been Done

An initial independent study of digital sources; a register of 41 questions; a register of sources read and targets not yet read; three independent prompts. The package is ready to transfer. No R1 responses have yet been received from the models, and there is no claim here that prompts were actually sent to them.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package — What to Transfer

- To Grok: 05_Prompt_Grok — the entire text in the file.
- To Claude: 06_Prompt_Claude — the entire text in the file.
- To Grok Bot: 07_Prompt_Grok_Bot — the entire text in the file.

The ZIP may also be attached for each. Each prompt includes the passage, map of questions, and sources, so that opening the attachment is not a prerequisite. The independent research report is an opening position for examination, not an instruction to arrive at its conclusions.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package — Contents

- 01_Independent_Research.md — findings, proposals, counterevidence, and limits.
- 02_Questions.md — E01–E41, including the source of each question.
- 03_Sources.md — S01–S15 were read to the extent indicated; T01–T05 are targets.

- 04_Passage.md — the working passage supplied by the user, without vowel points; a summary of his comments.
- 05/06/07 — three prompts to copy.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package — Framework for the Rounds

1. R1: independent findings and completion of focused sources, according to the division of responsibilities.
2. When the reports arrive: every new claim will be checked against the source and recorded under the question's identifier.
3. R2 will open only for questions on which a substantive disagreement remains or a new target has been identified. We will not send the same body of reading again to produce a determination not found in it.
4. Statuses: explicit; supported interpretation; preferred inference; open; not examined. An access barrier is not a determination about content.
5. A new report will not erase an earlier error: a log of what was replaced and why is preserved. We do not decide by a majority of models.
6. The concluding passage will be studied separately. The booklet is on hold; the conclusion may be used only for the context of the present unit.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — First-Round Package — Missing Input That Does Not Block Progress

The list of corrections mentioned by the user was not attached to the visible input; it should be added when available. The package does not claim to have examined it. Photographs of Sefer HaGilgulim and the Rebbe's glosses have also not yet been read in this independent study.

Working folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ptqHOycgA--ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk

Dossier 0540 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Combined dossier: findings must be distinguished from the follow-up brief [405]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position

September 23, 2026. The passage: “And furthermore” through “the purpose of the creation of the human being.” This is a new round, not a numbered continuation of F10. The booklet is on hold.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — The Result So Far

There is already a basis for explaining the passage’s progression and some of its connections, but not yet a supported solution for all its details. The omission of Atik, the meaning of the small interruption, the correspondence with the Etz Chaim map, the order of the returning light and its investment, and six versus seven remain genuine research questions. We will not resolve them with a general explanation that sounds suitable.

41 principal questions were recorded, including the user’s questions and additions arising from the sources. Identifying a reference, proposing an interpretation, and resolving a difficulty are three different results; one will not be marked in place of another. Links and the reading status of each source are in the source register.

[405] Document 0540: IGK20-Earth-R1_01_Independent_Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 1. Map of the Progression — Initial Reading of the Supplied Text

Unit	Apparent function	What still requires proof
And furthermore… shows its strength	Adding the revelation of power in actual activity in the lower realm	Why all the expressions of addition and repetition are necessary

Unit	Apparent function	What still requires proof
Grasses and trees; the mazal in parentheses	Distinguishing actual sprouting from growth and its details	The status of fruit on both sides; the domain of the mazal's action
Adam Kadmon's feet and the sovev	Explaining the advantage of the endpoint	The meaning of the interruption and the map of the igulim
And also the kav; the analogy of Atzilut	An additional explanation through returning light	Its relation to the explanation through the sovev, and why Atik is not mentioned
And likewise… the neshamah-light	Returning from the analogy to its referent and specifying the recipient	What returns, and from where; which light ascends
And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim	Detailing the order of investment	How this order accords with the ascent described
Strength and force; "Let [the earth] sprout"	Attributing the activity to the vessel in the element of earth	Distinguishing light, vessel, utterance, and vegetative power
Continually; six/seven; every year	Distinguishing a recurring pattern of action from initial creation	Six/seven; annual renewal; a likeness of Ein Sof
Sowing and mayin nukvin; superior	Transition to growth dependent on the lower realm's action and to its advantage	What sowing contributes and why the fruit is superior

Unit	Apparent function	What still requires proof
From this we can understand; humanity's purpose	Applying the analogy to Divine service	What is new here in relation to the purpose of a dwelling in the lower realms

The table is our proposed reading. It is not an automatic answer to the Rebbe's comment on the opening. The light's direction in the text is from below upward; the reversal stated once in an oral question does not establish a new difficulty.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 2. What Is the Addition, and What Is the Revelation?

The supplied text indicates an emphasis on the power of bringing into being, revealed specifically in the lower realm, and on the continuity of its action. There is no necessity to understand that the third radiance ceases to be third, or that earth apprehends Divinity more than the higher beings do. Preferred proposal: the level of the light received, the revelation of its power in the result, and the recipient's apprehension are not one thing. On this account, "an immense revelation" here need not be the same type of revelation discussed earlier in "just as in Atzilut itself."

This is an interpretive distinction requiring reinforcement. Tanya chapter 48, S10, rejects a spatial interpretation of sovev, describes concealment even when the light is present, and distinguishes a large number from limitlessness. It supplies a test of our explanation, not an explicit solution to this paragraph. The claim rejected in earlier rounds must not be imported here again: that the light's nature or intensity remains identical through every transition.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 3. The Sovev, the Igulim, and the Kav — What Can Already Be Said

In the working text, sovev and igulim are not the same name: the igulim of Adam Kadmon are the thing mentioned between the endpoint and the sovev. The kav is mentioned afterward with “and also” and in relation to returning light. There are thus at least two distinct statements in the paragraph; this does not yet prove two independent routes or two causes with no dependence between them.

“Without a great interruption” is not a physical distance. S10 precludes such an interpretation. But this statement is insufficient: it is still necessary to identify the spiritual interruption, what its smallness means, and why it does not contradict the extreme concealment in Asiyah.

I found genuine counterevidence for study: S08, Etz Chaim I, branch 4. It arranges the igulim and yosher, describes the maximal remoteness of the vessels of Asiyah, and also describes the endpoint of Adam Kadmon’s feet in relation to the igulim of Atik. The same passage stresses that the kav does not connect to Ein Sof from the lower side. There are also separate comments there on the position of the feet. These are data to examine, not a ready-made diagram of Iggeret HaKodesh.

The Epistle may be speaking of the end of yosher, while the account of remoteness in Etz Chaim speaks of the order of investment. No sentence has yet been found applying this distinction to the Epistle. Two new questions, E10–E11, therefore entered the first round. We will not draw circles and arrows as though the correspondence had already been proved.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 4. The Omission of Atik and the Repetitions

The difficulty is stronger than a general familiarity with the order of the partzufim: earlier in Iggeret HaKodesh 20 itself, Arich and Atik are mentioned together in the context of drawing down for union; here Arich is listed without Atik. This is evidence of a change in the list, not evidence for the reason for that change. The possibilities — a particular enumeration of the partzufim of Atzilut, reference to the emanated aspect of Keter, or the scope of returning light — will be examined only as competing hypotheses.

For the repetitions about the end of the kav, there is currently a plausible syntactic division: establishing the bottom of Asiyah; adding the kav's return; an analogy in Atzilut; returning to the referent with identification of the receiving neshamah-light; detailing the investment. This division shows that not all the sentences are identical, but does not yet prove why all the duplication is necessary. "Their beginning is embedded in their end" is not a substitute for explaining the mechanism of returning light.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 5. Real Progress on "Cited in Likkutei Amarim"

The supplied note 53 refers to the gloss in chapter 6, chapter 18, and the ends of chapters 51–52. I checked all four places (S04–S07). The gloss in chapter 6 does indeed explicitly mention Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20. This is already a clear anchor for the reference, beyond a merely thematic parallel. The end of chapter 51 is particularly relevant to Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah; chapters 18 and 52 supply additional types of investment.

The limit matters: this does not show that each of the chapters states the precise chain of returning light through ABYA within Asiyah. The

text of Sefer HaGilgulim still requires examination. The textual note at the end of chapter 51 also requires verification and attribution in its own right; it must not be turned into an emendation of the text of Epistle 20.

The user's question here is preserved on two levels: where the matter is cited in Tanya, and why the detail of investment is needed in the present progression. Progress on the first does not resolve the second.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 6. The Neshamah-Light, the Vessel, and the Pronoun "She-hu"

On a plain reading, "the neshamah-light" allows a masculine pronoun because of or, "light." This is a real syntactic possibility; there is no need to invent a rule that Divinity necessarily requires the masculine. Conversely, syntax alone does not explain the repeated emphasis "actual Divinity."

A substantive proposal: the emphasis preserves the distinction between the Divine light in the chain and the created recipient and the result of growth, so that an independent power of creation is not attributed to earth. The basis for this is the Epistle's progression, but no sentence was found explaining the repetition itself. "It shows" (היא מראה), "from it" (ממנה), "from them" (מהן), "and it is the utterance" (והוא מאמר), and "which is the purpose" (שהוא תכלית) should be examined separately.

Not finding a correction in the list is not proof of the author's intent. The specific list of corrections mentioned by the user was not visible in the input, so no claim is made that it was examined.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 7. Continually, a Likeness of Ein Sof, and Six versus Seven

“A likeness of” does not require saying that the Epistle sets a finite number for the years of the world. The sentence is formulated as a condition on its continued existence and presents a power that acts repeatedly. The minimal reading: growth each year is a limited manifestation; the power is not described as having a quota of growths that runs out. This is not yet a claim about an infinity of events that have actually occurred.

A further direction, beyond the seasons, was found for “continually, year after year”: S11, Iggeret HaKodesh 14, describes a continual drawing down that does not remain at the same level, but renews itself from year to year. This is the parallel to which note 58 refers. We will need to clarify how much of it applies here, rather than automatically copying all the details of Rosh Hashanah to growth.

The six days of Creation and the seven days of Creation both appear in the supplied text and in the digital transcription. Proposal: the former indicates the time of the acts of creation, and the latter the first week as the span of governance through gratuitous kindness, including Shabbat. In this round I did not find a direct explanation confirming that this is the author’s intent. The status remains open; there is no textual emendation and no established contradiction.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 8. Why Earth Rather Than Human and Animal Reproduction?

The relative number of seeds or sperm cells is not by itself the measure set out by the Epistle. One must distinguish a quantitative disparity, a transition from spiritual power to physical product, repro-

duction from an already existing species, and the repeated revelation of power in the lowest realm. The Epistle itself contrasts “Let [the earth] sprout” with “Let [the waters] swarm” and “Let [the earth] bring forth” at the beginning of creation.

Preferred partial answer: the example was chosen for the advantage revealed at the bottom and for repeated growth from the earth, not to rank the magnitude of the wonder in all forms of reproduction. This does not deny the advantage of reproduction or the power of Ein Sof in it; it remains necessary to show how growth from seed, which also involves continuity from an existing species, differs in this respect.

The user’s difficulty is therefore not erased but sharpened. No unverified numbers about a human being or a pig should be built upon it, and one must not assume that a plant’s seed is not alive. A biological investigation, if required, will be a separate, substantiated dossier, not a substitute for interpreting the Epistle’s terms.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 9. Three Uses That Must Be Distinguished

In the working text: a spiritual vegetative power versus a physical plant; seeds and plantings described as “like yesh me-ayin”; an enduring power of action described as “a likeness of the aspect of Ein Sof.” These are not necessarily the same argument. The strong definition of yesh me-ayin is also already present at the beginning of the Epistle.

“Like” may indicate the existence of a prior seed and the incommensurability between it and the product. An explanation is still required of how quantitative multiplicity, which is some numerical relation, joins the incommensurability stated here. The enumeration of fruit/tree/branches/seeds/straw is not ornamental; it may establish several

distinct aspects. The discussion must not be replaced by a claim that a plant is produced without matter.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 11. A Small Correction That Must Be Preserved

Note 56 on the English website gives Genesis 1:10. Checking S15 shows that "Let the waters swarm" is 1:20. This is a correction to the website's reference, not to the Epistle's wording. No emendation of six/seven or hu/hi may be inferred from it.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 12. Limits of the Round and Handover of the Work

- Verification: the reference to Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20, in the gloss in chapter 6; the parallel in Iggeret HaKodesh 8; the location of the erroneous biblical reference.
- Preferred but unsettled interpretation: the structure of the repetitions; distinguishing revelation of power from revelation of light; humanity's purpose through the activity of mitzvot; a recurring power not bounded by a number of events.
- Open, high priority: Atik, the interruption and the diagram, the order of returning light versus investment, six/seven, the precise Gilgulim source.
- The union of ZON of BYA versus section 47 must not be reopened merely because a similar term appeared. F10 remains within its limit: explicit local attribution; reconciliation of the negation has not been proved.
- There is no "closure" on the strength of model agreement. There is no booklet and no final explanation for publication in this round.

Tasks are divided three ways: Grok — structure and drawing down; Claude — growth, time, mayin nukvin, purpose, and criticism of the inferences; Grok Bot — textual witnesses and photographed sources.

Each receives the questions of the entire dossier, with a different responsibility for in-depth work. In the next round we will check what was actually added, and only then choose further targets.

Dossier 0541 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [406]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register

September 23, 2026. Forty-one principal questions; subquestions are preserved within each identifier. The source of the question is marked: user / research addition / combination. Opening status: open, unless the independent report defined a specific verification.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E01 — Opening

Source: user.

What is added by “And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above”: further evidence, another level, or the revelation of a power already described? Why have expressions of addition accumulated, and why does “all the above” recur? The Rebbe’s “requires further study” concerning the wording and the subject must be preserved.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E02 — Syntax

Source: user and expansion.

What is included in “a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above,” and what is the subject of “it shows its strength”? Are the kav and the sovev included in the radiance, or enumerated alongside it? This must not be decided solely by the nearest noun.

[406] Document 0541: IGK20-Earth-R1_02_Questions.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E03 — Revelation

Source: research addition.

How does “in an immense revelation” here accord with the concealment of the light at the third level, and with Tanya 48, which describes the scant vitality of the inanimate and vegetative orders? Is the revelation of power in action different from the revelation of the light or its apprehension?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E04 — Ayin and Yesh

Source: user.

What is the “ayin” in the vegetative power: spirituality, non-apprehension, lack of commensurability, or absolute nothingness? How does the local use connect to the definition of yesh me-ayin at the beginning of the Epistle?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E05 — Mazal

Source: user and expansion.

What does the mazal do after sprouting: size alone, the details of species, taste, and fruit? If bearing fruit is attributed to the mazal and later mentioned as an example of yesh me-ayin, how is the activity divided between it and the vegetative power?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E06 — Mazal

Source: research addition.

How does the argument “before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?” work? Why is a general influence on the vegetative power or on the seed insufficient? Examine Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. קצו and תשפו, without identifying page numbers in the absence of an edition.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E07 — Earth

Source: user.

Why is the advantage attributed to inanimate earth even though the product is vegetative? Does the evidence concern the level of the receiving source, the product, or the relation between them? How do water and the other conditions of growth fit in?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — Recording Answers and Continuing

For each identifier: proposed answer; source read; what is explicit; the inferential step; a strong alternative; what remains open; a specific source that could change the conclusion. New questions will be added from E42 onward, without deletion or renumbering.

Dossier 0542 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [407]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register

Opened on September 23, 2026. S = source read to the extent indicated; T = target not yet verified. Digital is not photographic. No claim is made here of textual independence between websites.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — T01 — Sefer HaGilgulim, Chapter 20, HB23822

https://hebrewbooks.org/23822

Mode: target; its text has not been read in the present study.

[407] Document 0542: IGK20-Earth-R1_03_Sources.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Scope and limit: in the previous record: Frankfurt 5444, not Shaar HaGilgulim. A printed page, chapter heading, and suitable paragraph in a photograph are required; do not approve on the basis of a previous report.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — T02 — Glosses and Corrections to Tanya; the List of Corrections

https://chabadlibrary.org/books

Mode: target only.

Scope and limit: notes 48, 53, 58, 59 in a Hebrew source; six/seven, hu/hi; the user's list was not attached. This address is an entry point for locating material, not evidence for particular content.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — T03 — Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, קצו and תשפו

https://chabadlibrary.org/books

Mode: reference from Lessons; the target texts have not been read.

Scope and limit: for the mazal and the vegetative power. Identify volume/edition and check the Hebrew number against the English number; do not invent a discourse incipit.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — T04 — Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od" ("The Land Is Very, Very Good")

https://chabadlibrary.org/books

Mode: reference from the Rebbe's note in translation; the text has not been read.

Scope and limit: for “very, very superior” and human Divine service. An exact location is required, not automatic identification on the basis of keywords.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — T05 — Genesis 2 and the Midrash/Talmudic Discussion on Adam’s Prayer and Growth

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_תישארב

Mode: new target for examination, not read in this round.

Scope and limit: only if genuinely relevant to the scope of “without any raising of mayin nukvin at all”; no contradiction has been declared.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — Searches That Yielded No Determination

Focused searches on the omission of Atik, a great interruption, and six/seven did not produce a verifiable direct interpretation in this round. We do not infer that there is no interpretation. They should not be repeated without a new target or access method.

Dossier 0543 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [408]

The Working Passage — According to the Text Supplied by the User

Vowel points were removed for searching; the paragraph divisions here are editorial. This is the working text supplied in the conversation, not an independent transcription from a photograph or a criti-

[408] Document 0543: IGK20-Earth-R1_04_Passage.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

cal edition. No syntactic determination should be inferred from the punctuation.

And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the aforementioned, a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the aforementioned, shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force than in the elements higher than it, and even than in the hosts of heaven, which do not have the strength and ability to bring forth something from nothing continually, as does the element of earth, which continually causes something to grow from nothing, namely grasses and trees

(and the mazal that strikes and says "Grow!" does so after the grass has already sprouted, and does not tell it to sprout from nothing into something, but to grow from small to large, and to bear fruit, each and every species in its particular details. But before it sprouts, to whom would each individual mazal speak, for each individual blade of grass in its particular details?)

from the vegetative power within it, which is ayin and spiritual, whereas they are physical.

And this is only because the feet of "Adam Kadmon" end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds, without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of "Adam Kadmon" alone.

And the "kav" from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of "Adam Kadmon's" feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of "returning light," just as that which is invested in "Arich Anpin," "Abba and Imma," and "Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva" of Atzilut shines in returning light from Malchut of Atzilut, and Malchut of Atzilut is the aspect of Keter from below upward, and "their beginning is embedded in their end."

And likewise at the endpoint of the "kav" of the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of the "yosher" of "Adam Kadmon's" feet, it shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity, from the outer dimension of the vessels of Malchut of Atzilut.

And according to what is written in "Sefer HaGilgulim," chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim, this radiance of the "kav" of the Ein Sof light is first invested in the light of Atzilut within Asiyah, and from it into Beriah and Yetzirah within Asiyah, and from them into the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah,

and through this there is strength and force in the endpoint of the vessel of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah within the element of earth, and this is the utterance "Let the earth sprout, etc.," to be active within the earth continually, forever and ever

(an aspect of Ein Sof, and not only during the six days of Creation, like the utterance "Let the waters swarm" and the utterance "Let the earth bring forth a living soul," from Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, for during the seven days of Creation a radiance of the Ein Sof light shone in this world through "gratuitous kindness," without any raising of "mayin nukvin" at all),

to cause grasses, trees, and fruits to grow from nothing into something continually, year after year, which is a likeness of the aspect of "Ein Sof," for if this world were to endure for many myriads of years, they would grow year after year.

Except that some of them come through the raising of "mayin nukvin," namely those that are sown and planted; nevertheless, they are like something from nothing, for the planted seed is utterly incommensurate with the fruit, and also with the entire tree with its branches and leaves; likewise with varieties of seeds and vegetables, and also with varieties of grain, for hundreds of kernels to come in-

to being from one kernel is like something from nothing, and all the more so the straw and the ears of grain.

Now, the fruits produced through raising "mayin nukvin," namely sowing and planting, are very, very superior to those that grow on their own from the vegetative power in the earth alone. From this we can understand the drawing down of supernal lights into Atzilut –Beriah–Yetzirah–Asiyah (which is the purpose of the creation of the human being), as explained elsewhere.

Dossier 0544 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [409]

The Working Passage — According to the Text Supplied by the User — Notes Supplied with the Passage

Notes 48–60 arrived in the English wording of Lessons in Tanya. The following is a working summary in Hebrew, not an official Hebrew transcription of the Rebbe's glosses:

The list of corrections mentioned by the user is not attached to the visible input. Do not claim to have examined it.

Shared map of questions — identifiers must be preserved; "not examined" may be indicated:

E01 [user; opening]: What is added by "And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above": further evidence, another level, or the revelation of a power already described? Why have expressions of addition accumulated, and why does "all the above" recur? The Rebbe's "re-

[409] Document 0544: IGK20-Earth-R1_05_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

quires further study” concerning the wording and the subject must be preserved.

E02 [user and expansion; syntax]: What is included in “a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above,” and what is the subject of “it shows its strength”? Are the kav and the sovev included in the radiance, or enumerated alongside it? This must not be decided solely by the nearest noun.

E03 [research addition; revelation]: How does “in an immense revelation” here accord with the concealment of the light at the third level, and with Tanya 48, which describes the scant vitality of the inanimate and vegetative orders? Is the revelation of power in action different from the revelation of the light or its apprehension?

E04 [user; ayin and yesh]: What is the “ayin” in the vegetative power: spirituality, non-apprehension, lack of commensurability, or absolute nothingness? How does the local use connect to the definition of yesh me-ayin at the beginning of the Epistle?

E05 [user and expansion; mazal]: What does the mazal do after sprouting: size alone, the details of species, taste, and fruit? If bearing fruit is attributed to the mazal and later mentioned as an example of yesh me-ayin, how is the activity divided between it and the vegetative power?

E06 [research addition; mazal]: How does the argument “before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?” work? Why is a general influence on the vegetative power or on the seed insufficient? Examine Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. קצו and תשפו, without identifying page numbers in the absence of an edition.

E07 [user; earth]: Why is the advantage attributed to inanimate earth even though the product is vegetative? Does the evidence concern the level of the receiving source, the product, or the relation between them? How do water and the other conditions of growth fit in?

E08 [user; sovev and igulim]: Distinguish between the encompassing Ein Sof light, the igulim of Adam Kadmon, the yosher of Adam Kadmon, and the kav within it. Does “only the igulim of Adam Kadmon” indicate mediation, interruption, or both? Igulim and the general sovev must not be automatically identified.

E09 [user; interruption]: What are “beneath his feet” and “without a great interruption between them” when there is no place in spirituality? What do proximity and interruption measure, and between which two things? Why is the smallness of the interruption decisive specifically here?

E10 [research addition; opposing parallel]: Etz Chaim, gate 1, branch 4, describes the vessels of Asiyah as most remote from both the internal light and the sovev. How does this accord with the small interruption here? Examine whether the axis of comparison changes: the order of investment versus the endpoint of yosher.

E11 [research addition; Adam Kadmon’s feet]: In the same branch of Etz Chaim, the endpoint of Adam Kadmon’s feet is described in relation to the igulim of Atik, and a gloss discusses its relation to Radla. How is this mapped to the bottom of Asiyah? Separate the main text, R. Chaim Vital’s gloss, and R. Tzemach’s note; proximity must not be turned into a reconciliation.

E12 [user; returning light]: What returns, from where and to where, and why does the return add power? Is the source of the addition the kav, the sovev, or the embedding of the beginning in the end? Which details are explicit, and which come from a later analogy?

E13 [user; Atik]: Why are Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and ZON enumerated, but not Atik? Earlier in the same Epistle, Arich Anpin and Atik Yomin appear together. Examine the scope of the enumeration, intermediary/emanated, and the inner/outer dimensions of Keter; do not choose one without local evidence.

E14 [user; Keter]: In what sense is Malchut Keter from below upward? Does this concern an order of enumeration, the advantage of a source, the function of returning light, or all of these? What does “their beginning is embedded in their end” prove, and what does it not prove?

E15 [user; repetitions]: Map the repetitions about the endpoint of the kav and Adam Kadmon’s feet: identifying the location, adding returning light, the analogy of Atzilut, returning to the referent, and the destination of investment. Does each repetition add a datum? The direction in the text is from below upward.

E16 [research addition; two ascents]: Are returning light and raising mayin nukvin the same thing? The passage first describes an activity in spontaneous growth and subsequently an activity through sowing; two ascents must not be identified merely because both begin below.

E17 [user; actual Divinity]: Why is “which is actual Divinity” emphasized again concerning the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? What is the subject of “which is” (שהוא)? What distinguishes this neshamah-light from the vessel, the vegetative power, and the physical plant?

E18 [user and expansion; pronouns and wording]: Map hu/hi/zo/m immenah/mehen/al yedei zeh (הוא/היא/זו/ממנה/מהן/על ידי זה) throughout the unit. The absence of a correction in the list is not proof of kabbalistic intent. The list of corrections mentioned by the user was not actually attached to this round’s package.

E19 [user; Sefer HaGilgulim]: Verify the cited matter in the text of Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20; distinguish it from Shaar HaGilgulim. What are the book’s title, edition, printed folio, scan number, and extent of correspondence? HB23822 is a target for examination, not a witness read in this round.

E20 [user; cited in Likkutei Amarim]: The gloss in Tanya 6 explicitly mentions Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20; note 53 also refers to chapter 18, the end of chapter 51, and the end of chapter 52. What does each chapter supply? Identify the reference without claiming that the entire chain of returning light appears there.

E21 [user; ABYA within Asiyah]: Why is the precision of Atzilut, Beriah, and Yetzirah within Asiyah needed? What is their relation to the general worlds? What is the place of Asiyah within Asiyah and of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? Do not assume these are synonyms.

E22 [user and expansion; order of investment]: How is light ascending from the endpoint of the kav "first" invested in Atzilut within Asiyah and then in Beriah and Yetzirah within it? Is this the same returning light, a detailing of it, or an additional route? What changes with "and according to what is written"?

E23 [user; agent and vessel]: Map: kav → neshamah-light → endpoint of the vessel → the utterance "Let [the earth] sprout" → vegetative power → plant. Which arrows were stated and which were supplied? What does "and it is the utterance" refer back to, and how does "strength and force" relate to the preceding paragraph about the sovev?

E24 [research addition; Chochmah and Malchut]: Why are "Let [the waters] swarm" / "Let [the earth] bring forth" attributed to Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, while "Let [the earth] sprout" is discussed at the endpoint of the vessel? What exactly refers to Chochmah, and does the change of level explain the difference in the time of the activity?

E25 [user; six and seven]: Why do the same parentheses mention the six days of Creation and then the seven days of Creation? Distinguish the time of the acts of creation from the scope of gratuitous kindness.

This is only a proposed reading until a source is found; do not emend ז׳ to ו׳ without a witness.

E26 [user and expansion; gratuitous kindness]: What does "without any raising of mayin nukvin at all" mean in the first creation, and what remains gratuitous now? Is spontaneous growth an exception? How would Adam's prayer for growth in the sources of Genesis 2 / the Sages fit in, if it concerns the same claim?

E27 [user; continually and year]: What is the difference between "continually, forever and ever" and "continually, year after year"? Note 58 points to Iggeret HaKodesh 14: examine annual renewal of the light, and do not be satisfied with the existence of seasons.

E28 [user; a likeness of Ein Sof]: What does the condition "for if [this world] were to endure… many myriads of years" prove? Is it an inexhaustible power, repetition without a fixed limit, or an actual infinity? Why first "an aspect of Ein Sof" and subsequently "a likeness of"? No fixed finite duration of the world may be inferred from this.

E29 [user; reproduction]: Why is growth chosen rather than animal and human reproduction? Distinguish yesh me-ayin itself, matter versus spiritual power, reproduction from an existing species, continual renewal, and the advantage of the lowest recipient. Do not categorically deny revelation of Ein Sof in reproduction.

E30 [user; yesh me-ayin and "like"]: Why are those sown and planted described as "like yesh me-ayin"? Is the qualification present only in their case, and what is its relation to "absolute nothingness and naught" earlier? What does the seed nevertheless do, and what does it not supply?

E31 [user; incommensurability]: Why the details of fruit, tree, branches, leaves, hundreds of kernels, straw, and ears of grain? Distinguish quality, quantity, and difference of level. A large number

alone is not mathematical incommensurability; how does the evidence work here?

E32 [user and expansion; analogy and nature]: What is the scope of “grow on their own,” and what is the role of seed decay in the explanations? This must not be translated into the absence of all matter or a botanical rule the author did not formulate. Scientific questions should be marked separately and must not replace linguistic clarification.

E33 [user; mayin nukvin]: What ascends in sowing and planting, who is the Nukva, what arouses the power, and what is drawn down in response? Is mayin nukvin a sufficient cause, a vessel, a refinement, or an awakening? How is an addition received that exceeds the measure of the action?

E34 [user; very, very superior]: In what respect are the fruits superior, what is the role of the doubled “very,” and what is the scope of the generalization? Examine note 59 and the parallel “Tovah ha-aretz me’od me’od”; do not present all cultivated produce as superior in every respect.

E35 [user; charity and drawing down]: How does “from this we can understand” lead to human Divine service? Iggeret HaKodesh 8 is a direct parallel for the analogy of sowing, charity, and prayer. Which detail in the analogy corresponds to action, mayin nukvin, source, light, and fruit?

E36 [research addition; parallel in Epistle 8]: In Iggeret HaKodesh 8, the description of the vegetative power within the analogy is conditional on a seed; in Epistle 20 there is also spontaneous growth. Is the discussion in Epistle 8 limited to a sown type, or is another reconciliation required? Do not apply a sentence from the analogy to all growth without its context.

E37 [user; humanity's purpose]: What do the parentheses "which is the purpose of the creation of the human being" add, and what does "which is" (שהוא) refer back to? What is the relation to a dwelling in the lower realms, knowledge of G-d, and revelation of His powers? Distinguish purpose, manner of realization, and result, without declaring in advance that all formulations are identical.

E38 [research addition; ABYA and purpose]: Why draw down into all of ABYA if chapter 36 emphasizes that the purpose is not for the higher worlds? Examine chapters 36–37; preserve the continuation of the Epistle on the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders and practical mitzvot as context, rather than now opening up the whole of tomorrow's passage.

E39 [user and expansion; glosses and references]: Verify the Rebbe's glosses, the list of corrections, and notes 48, 53, 58, 59. At the end of chapter 51 there is a textual note about Malchut of Yetzirah; attribute it to the correct editor. Note 56 on the English website refers to Genesis 1:10, but "Let [the waters] swarm" is 1:20; this is a correction of a reference, not of the Epistle's wording.

E40 [user and expansion; comparison of the examples]: Preserve the user's difficulty from the tiny seed and reproduction, without building on unverified numbers of sperm cells or crop yields. What is the relevant measure for the plain meaning: size, matter, vitality, species, continuity, or the level of the source?

E41 [research addition; sovev and returning light]: At the end of the Epistle the sovev and the kav appear together near the aspect of returning light. Is the return also attributed to the sovev, or only to the kav? The present passage explicitly formulates it in the kav. Examine the scope of the description without anticipating the entire study of the next passage.

Dossier 0546 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [410]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Prompt for Grok_Bot

Task: new research into the penultimate passage of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, from "And furthermore" to "the purpose of the creation of the human being." Dossier opening date: September 23, 2026. Do not write a booklet. This is R1 in the Earth dossier, not F11 in the dossier on the union of ZON.

Your role: verification of sources and wording. Your goal is to supply checkable witnesses, not to decide the entire kabbalistic mechanism.

Mandatory order of priority (so that everything does not remain at the search stage):

1. A photograph of the Tanya passage, located by the anchor words. Verify "And furthermore" / "all the above," hu/hi, Arich Anpin without Atik Yomin, six/seven, Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut, continually/year/a likeness of, and the parentheses. State printed folio + PDF page. Verify the Rebbe's glosses and corrections pertaining to notes 48, 53, 58, 59 and an identified list of corrections. The absence of an entry in the list does not determine the author's intent. The user's own list is not attached here.
2. Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20: target HB23822, Frankfurt 5444 edition according to the previous record. Check title page, chapter, folio, and relevant paragraph; do not substitute Shaar HaGilgulim. Verify whether the book states the local order Atzilut–Beriah–Yetzirah within Asiyah, and whether it mentions kav/

[410] Document 0546: IGK20-Earth-R1_07_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

returning light/Adam Kadmon's feet here, or only investment. The absence of a word in a passage does not prove its absence from the entire book. Combine the gloss in Tanya 6 and the ends of 51–52: "cited in Likkutei Amarim," and the pronouns of investment. The gloss at the end of 51 requires correct attribution.

3. Etz Chaim I, branch 4: a focused transcription

and photograph of the order of the worlds' investment, the remoteness of the vessels of Asiyah, the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, the igulim of Atik, and the notes. Separate main text / R. Chaim Vital / R. Tzemach. This is intended for clarifying E08–E13; do not construct a conceptual correspondence in place of the researching models.

4. If 1–3 have been completed or blocked after a substantive attempt: Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. קצו and תשפו, according to notes 51–52 on the mazal; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od," according to note 59. Identify edition/volume/discourse incipit before photographing. No "Op. cit." without identifying the work.

For each target supply: source/edition, stable address, printed page, PDF page/image number, readable photographic file, focused transcription with uncertainty, and one sentence on what the witness verifies and one sentence on what it does not verify. Do not rewrite a photograph using digital text without marking the supplementation. Do not create a screenshot of a transcription and call it a facsimile of print.

A specific correction already available for checking: in Lessons in Tanya, note 56 refers to Genesis 1:10, whereas "Let the waters swarm" is in 1:20. Preserve the separation between an erroneous reference and the Epistle's wording. Check independently.

Deliverable: IGK20-Earth-R1-Bot, a short correspondence table, a folder of images and transcriptions, and a ZIP. Save deliverables in

a new subfolder of the round's folder listed below if you have access. If Drive is inaccessible, provide files here that can be attached for the models; do not stop merely because uploading is blocked. No changes to previous files and no sending messages.

Round folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ptqHOycgA--ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk

Everything needed to begin the work also appears later in this prompt. If a link is blocked, do not claim that the files were read, and there is no need to wait for them.

Dossier 0547 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [411]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections"

New source S16: a photograph supplied by the user after preparation of the R1 package; at its top are "Notes and Corrections" and page number 414. The photograph displayed in the conversation itself was read. No local HEIC file was read or reconstructed here. The book's title page, edition details, and adjacent pages do not appear in the image.

The update is added to the research and prompts already supplied. The historical statement in the R1 package that the user's list had not yet been attached no longer describes the current input: one page of the list has now been received and read. Do not infer that the entire list was read. The previous ZIP does not include this update.

[411] Document 0547: IGK20-Earth-R1_08_Corrections_Photo_Addendum.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — The List's Structure and the Status of the Notes

The page's headings specify folio, side, line beginning with the word, printed text, and "tentative note." The distinction between a proposed correction, a question about the wording, and a proposed relocation must therefore be preserved. Not all the entries may be presented as settled emendations to the Epistle's text.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — Entries Relevant to the Study

Location according to the list	Anchor / printed text	Note as read in the photograph	Implication for the research
131b; line beginning "דהארה" ("of a radiance")	"וכו" ("etc.")	"It requires further study what this includes."	Clarify the scope of "etc." in the chain of radiances; do not read it as merely stylistic filler. Relevant to the preceding context and E02.
131b; line beginning "יתר" ("beyond")	".. הנ"ל הארה הנ"ל" ("the above, a radiance .. the above")	"The wording and the intent require further study."	Photographic verification of the difficulty in the opening, E01–E02. A proposed structural analysis does not negate the need for further study.
132a; line beginning "אבל" ("but")	"אבל .. יאמר" ("but .. would speak")	"Seemingly these words belong earlier, after the word 'the grass.' Or later, after the word 'particular details.' "	A new datum for E05–E06: examine the sentence order concerning the mazal under both proposed placements. Do not silently change the working text or expand the range of words moved without examination.

The two-dot signs ".." preserve the abbreviation of the span in the list; they are not missing words supplied from memory. To construct a text for each of the two relocation alternatives, a photograph of the main text of 132a, in the same edition if possible, should be set alongside the list. At this stage the relocation proposal has been verified; neither alternative has been decided upon, nor has its punctuation been determined.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — Hu/Hi — What the Page Proves

The present photograph does not contain an entry correcting "שהוא אלקות" (masculine "which is Divinity") to "שהיא אלקות" (feminine "which is Divinity"), nor an entry on the six/seven days of Creation. This is a statement about the visible page alone, not about all the glosses or all editions.

Alongside this, at the beginning of the page there is a visible entry for 129b: the printed "אצלו" and the proposed "אצלה" (masculine to feminine "with it"). The page therefore also includes a proposal to change a masculine/feminine pronoun. This reinforces the importance of accurately recording the absence of a parallel correction in the lines we are examining, but does not turn that absence into proof that the pronoun points to a particular kabbalistic level.

E17–E18 remain under syntactic and substantive investigation. E25, six/seven, is not closed by the photograph. The sweeping claim "there are no masculine/feminine corrections in the list" is also incorrect for this page; the user pointed to the absence of the particular hu/hi corrections and did not make that sweeping claim.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — Other Entries Visible in the Image

For the source register, without reopening dossiers:

- 129a, in the line beginning "דמעשה" ("of action"): "תמונת" → "תמונות" ("form of" → "forms").
- 131a, in the line beginning "ללולב" ("for the lulav"): "שנתהפכה" → "שנהפכה" (a change in the Hebrew verbal form meaning "that was transformed").
- 132b, in the line beginning "יודע" ("knows"): on "וכו" ("etc.") — "Seemingly superfluous."
- 132b, in the line beginning "ועדיין" ("and still"): "ועדיין .. דתורא" ("and still .. of the ox") — a note on a change of wording from the Talmud, Bava Kamma 72a. Primarily relevant to the concluding passage, which will be studied separately.
- 133b, in the line beginning "פרטיות": "פרטיות" → "פרטית" (plural to singular "particular"). Outside the present unit.

The photograph alone does not verify a Talmudic source or the identity of the book's edition; these are the list's entries as visible.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — Short Addition to Transfer to All Three Models

Source S16 has been received: a photograph of p. 414, "Notes and Corrections," whose heading reads "tentative note." The input status must be updated: this page has been read by the compiler, but not the entire list. On 131b, "הנ"ל הארה .. הנ"ל": "The wording and the intent require further study." On "וכו" in the line beginning "דהארה": "It requires further study what this includes." On 132a, "יאמר .. אבל": two relocations are proposed, after "העשב" ("the grass") or after "פרטיות" ("particular details"). Examine the syntax against a photograph of

the text, and explain whether the change affects the scope of the argument about the mazal. This is not an instruction to emend the text or choose one of the alternatives. This page contains no hu/hi correction in our passage and no six/seven correction; an etzlo/etzlah correction appears elsewhere on the page. The absence of an entry is not proof of kabbalistic intent. R2 has not opened: this is an evidence update within R1.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Update Following the Photograph of "Notes and Corrections" — Division of the Examination

- Grok: the implications of "requires further study" for analysis of the opening and the scope of "all the above"; the status of the pronouns.
- Claude: the two proposed placements of "אבל .. יאמר" and their implications for the mazal argument; distinguishing syntactic improvement from a change of content.
- Grok Bot: verify the edition of the list and photograph the text of 131b–132a; examine the range of words in each proposal. There is no need to search again to see whether the supplied photograph really says "The wording and the intent require further study"; this has already been read.

Dossier 0548 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [412]

[412] Document 0548: IGK20-Earth-R2_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2

September 23, 2026 | Compiler: Codex | Research only; the booklet is on hold

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — The Result

R1 advanced the mapping and identification of witnesses, but several answers were presented with greater confidence than the evidence warranted. R2 is needed for focused clarification, not to declare that all 41 questions have been resolved. The earlier union dossier is not being reopened; Grok's wording "the union dossier is closed" is to be understood as the end of that research round, not as a resolution of the difficulty.

Input: the Grok and Claude reports as supplied by the user; the Bot summary and files opened in its folder; the original E01–E41 map; the supplementary photograph of p. 414 already read. A report is a claim to be checked, not an independent witness for the source quoted in it.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — 1. What Remains from the Round

- The distinction between the manifestation of the power of bringing into being and the measure of invested vitality is a good proposal for the plain meaning of "shows its strength and ability." It must not be turned into proof that no revelation of light is involved.
- Sovev, the igulim of Adam Kadmon, the yosher of Adam Kadmon, and the kav are not four names for one thing. The relations of mediation require explanation.
- Grok's map of the repetitions is useful: location of the endpoint; activity of returning light; the analogy of Atzilut; returning to the

referent with a destination; detailing the investment. A reason for the precise features of the enumeration is still required.
- The reference in the gloss in Tanya 6 to Sefer HaGilgulim 20 is a finding; its applicability to the entire route of returning light is not a finding.
- Bot advanced the location of Sefer HaGilgulim to identified photographs. Its transcription is a partial, qualified account, not a continuous transcription of chapter 20.
- The distinction between returning light and mayin nukvin gains support from the order of the discussion. Complete conceptual separation must not be inferred from it.
- Iggeret HaKodesh 8 and 14 are useful parallels. The questions of the analogy's scope in 8 and of the transition from renewal of the light to renewal of growth remain questions.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — 2. Mandatory Corrections before Any Interpretation

Claim in the report	Correction and status
"The list of corrections was not attached" — all three reports	The photograph of p. 414 was received and read by the compiler. This update replaces the description of the input's availability, without attributing to the models viewing they did not perform.
Claude: note 48 assists the discussion of six/seven	The note refers to the opening "And furthermore." It must not be transferred to six/seven. The photograph of the list also identifies the location.

Claim in the report	Correction and status
Claude: "It does not even contain the vegetative power" in chapter 48	The sentence is in chapter 38. Chapter 48 concerns the scant vitality of the inanimate and vegetative. Both parallels are useful, but different.

Claim in the report	Correction and status
Claude E46: “strength and might” in the preceding paragraph	The expression in the working text is “strength and force,” as in our unit. Do not build a question on a variant that was not found.
Bot: E01–E41 table	The numbers in its table were reassigned to other topics. Do not merge statuses by number. Bot’s table is preserved as a historical witness; the original map governs.
Grok E21: Malchut of Malchut = the point of Asiyah within Asiyah	This is a proposed location requiring support, not an explicit identification. The report itself subsequently warns against automatic identification.
Grok E23: destination nefesh–ruach–neshamah → ABYA within Asiyah → destination again	The order of presenting an explanation is not a new order of passage. The Epistle first gives a destination and then a detailed order ending at it. Do not insert the destination before “first” in a single diagram and mark everything explicit.
Claude: Epistle 8 is “explicitly limited” to the sown	It contains a sowing analogy and a strongly limiting sentence. Restricting its applicability to the sown type is a possible contextual interpretation, not an explicitly written qualification concerning those that grow on their own.
Claude: “without any raising of mayin nukvin at all” directly describes those growing on their own now	The explicit wording occurs in the parentheses concerning the days of Creation. Later it says that some plants come through mayin nukvin and that they are superior to those growing on their own. A connection between the two places is plausible; the inference must be marked.
Claude: purpose/mitzvot “proved,” then “I did not locate a verifying sentence”	The parallels support the connection but do not prove the entire formulation reconciling ABYA with the purpose of the lower realms. A marked interpretation is preserved, not closure.

3. What My Independent Examination Added — A. Likkutei Torah: There Is a Real and Useful Target

I opened and read the discourse beginning “Vayomru el kol adat go’ tovah v’go”’ on the Kehot/Chabad website, especially section 4: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887

This is the text of a discourse explaining the doubled “very, very,” the spies’ argument, and the advantage of action. It connects action below with supernal drawings down and the embedding of the beginning in the end, and even discusses the inner dimension of Keter. It must therefore not be left as “a related discourse” without reading its continuation. Its correspondence to the reference in note 59 is strong in content; a printed folio number and a complete bibliographical match have not yet been verified.

What is not proved by this: the identity of the reference “as written elsewhere”; that the Epistle intends two kinds of worlds every time “very, very” appears; the reason for Atik’s omission from the list of the kav’s garments. The very mention here of the inner dimension of Keter requires caution before suggesting that Atik’s omission expresses an absence of its activity.

3. What My Independent Examination Added — B. Chapter 38 Adds a Different Difficulty from Chapter 48

The relevant text of chapter 38 was read, as was chapter 48. In 38 the comparison is between levels of vitality in the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders; in 48 it is between the invested radiance and encompassing influence. The issues must therefore be divided: 1. How the power of bringing into being is discernible when the light is concealed — E03. 2. How earth produces growth, in contrast to the description of the inanimate as lacking vegetative power — E45-Claude. A distinction between the matter’s own growth and a power

to make something else grow is a candidate for examination, not an answer proved by the sentence alone. There is no need to reclassify earth as vegetative without a source.

3. What My Independent Examination Added — C. The Mazal: Even the Source of the Secondary Report Requires Precision

In Lessons, the explanation beside note 51 describes the arousal of the power of growth in the grass or tree. Claude replaced this with a finding beginning with a power already in the earth. This difference bears precisely on whether the influence is directed to a plant already in existence or to its source in the earth. I have not read the two pages of Or HaTorah themselves. The two teachings of the Tzemach Tzedek have therefore not yet been verified here as primary findings, and the identities of the volumes supplied by the subagent are unverified. A focused web search did not supply a useful new text. There is no conclusion that no source exists.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — 5. Photograph of the Notes — An Update Applying to All

Photograph of p. 414, heading "Notes and Corrections," column "tentative note":

- 131b, "דהארה" / "וכו": "It requires further study what this includes."
- 131b, "יתר" / "הנ"ל .. הנ"ל הארה": "The wording and the intent require further study."
- 132a, "אבל" / "יאמר .. אבל": proposed placements after "העשב" ("the grass") or after "פרטיות" ("particular details").
- This page contains no entry on hu/hi at our location and no entry on six/seven. There is an etzlo→etzlah entry elsewhere. The whole list was not examined; the edition is not identifiable from the image alone. Do not emend the working text. Every model must s-

tate whether it saw the photograph or only received the compiler's transcription.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — 6. Managing Identifiers and Evidence

E01–E41 remain as established in R1. "Examined" describes work performed, not a degree of proof. Statuses from now on: explicit in the source; later explanation; reasoned interpretation; open; not examined. Do not delete new questions found to overlap:

- E42-Grok and E46-Claude → expansions of E23/E41; in the former, preserve the comparison "strength and force."
- E42-Claude → expansion of E05–E06.
- E43-Claude → expansion of E24.
- E44-Claude → expansion of E37–E38.
- E45-Claude → expansion of E03/E07, with the correction of 38 in place of 48.
- E42-Bot → witness task E19–E20; E43-Bot → E19; E44-Bot → E05–E06; E45-Bot → E34.

These are tagged aliases, not alternative numbers for the original questions.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — 7. Division of R2 and Limiting Repeated Work

Grok: proximity/remoteness and the order of returning light; a short critique of the omission of Atik. At most two in-depth dossiers. Claude: the mazal and gratuitousness versus awakening; Likkutei Torah and humanity's purpose; correction of 38/48 and a focused examination of the vegetative power. Bot: witnesses of Or HaTorah and Likkutei Torah, a clean Gilgulim paragraph, and then a photograph

of the glosses alongside the text of 132a. Do not regenerate a conceptual summary.

Do not require every model to read all the questions in depth again. The map is attached so that questions are not lost. We will advance toward a determination only where there is source text, an argument, and a scope of applicability; if there is no new bridge, we leave it open and move on.

IGK20-Earth — Review of R1 and Opening R2 — Package Files

00 — this report. 01 — sources, verification limits, and a Bot-identifier conversion table. 02–04 — full prompts for the three models, including the working passage and question map. 05 — the original canonical map with input-status updates. ZIP — all six files. It does not contain photographs that were not successfully transferred; there are links to Bot's witnesses and the supplementary user photograph.

Dossier 0549 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [413]

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits

September 23, 2026

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — Sources Reopened by Codex

All readings here are digital; Bot's photographs were not read by Codex in this round. Wikisource witnesses are marked "not checked."

[413] Document 0549: IGK20-Earth-R2_01_Source_Update.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Source	Link	Extent of reading and use
Iggeret HaKodesh 20	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקדש_כ_ד	The unit, the paragraph before it, and the limited conclusion: examination of syntax, “strength and force,” six/seven
Tanya 38	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקדש_א_חל	The paragraphs on the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking; here the inanimate is denied vegetative power
Tanya 48	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקדש_א_חמ	Limit, commensurability, revelation and concealment, the inanimate and vegetative; a different source from 38
Lessons, 11 Tishrei	https://www.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026	Explanation of the mazal and the passage’s structure; notes 48, 53, 58, 59. Later explanation and translated notes, not the Alter Rebbe’s text
Iggeret HaKodesh 8	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקדש_ח_ד	Analogy of sowing and mayin nukvin; the extent of its applicability remains under examination
Iggeret HaKodesh 14	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקדש_י_ד	Continual drawing down and annual renewal; not by itself a theory of infinity in time
Rashi on Genesis 2:5	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רש%22י_על_בראשית_ב_ה	Standing at the opening of the ground, Adam’s prayer, rain, and growth. This is the source examined here; do not attribute to me a reading of all of Bereishit Rabbah 13 or Ramban
Likkutei Torah, Shelach, “Vayomru el kol adat go’ tovah v’go”’	https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887	Digital text, especially section 4. The continuation of the discourse was read, not only its opening; printed page unverified
Etz Chaim I, branch 4	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים_שער_ענף_ד/א	Further examination of the opening description of Adam Kadmon, the igulim, and the endpoint of yosher; the rest of the discussion was recorded in R1 research. No newly verified bridge

Source	Link	Extent of reading and use
Tanya 36–37	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_ולא ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_זלא	Comparative witnesses concerning purpose and human Divine service; the location of “as written elsewhere” was not identified from them

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — What Must Be Read in Likkutei Torah

Section 4 contains an answer to the spies’ argument about spiritual service versus action in the land; a continuation concerning the two instances of “very” and the drawing down of the inner dimension of Keter. This is a strong substantive correspondence to note 59. Folio/column and edition must be verified, and the discourse’s text distinguished from the marked editorial additions. Do not claim that the discourse identifies the Epistle’s “elsewhere” or resolves the omission of Atik. A short search anchor: “ב’ פעמים מאד הם כנגד עלמין סתימין דלא אתגלין” (“The two instances of ‘very’ correspond to concealed worlds that are not revealed”). There is no need to begin again with a general search for the title.

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — Bot’s Witnesses — Focused Links

Folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Ht9JICBliI6zijzh5xKkkWNpAivM6iq0

ZIP:

Description of the reading of Sefer HaGilgulim, which I read as text:

Photographs of Sefer HaGilgulim, HB23822, according to Bot’s filenames:

- Scan 30, end of 19 and beginning of 20: https://drive.google.com/file/d/12jdifGI8HNYzGH5rgjQ7h06g-Rim4H7a/view
- Scan 31, folio 17, 20–21: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VLrXjd5Vz2GgHrrPkqpLUxsdfKHjjn6-/view
- Title page: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1v94mgrRdS9qojjvQojwUhSh5aIfkKJ2c/view

Photographs of Tanya, HB19791, according to Bot's filenames:

- Scan 64: https://drive.google.com/file/d/13e4LxyxjouWQNAyUROmB4AELyulvDyGV/view
- Scan 65, 132: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tN_DBRpy35EnmpP19FMz8pJ6Vp3yZU0C/view
- Scan 66: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1n7YxpshhvPFHqPtwtOKrkErs7ObFPHfa/view

Etz Chaim, HB37654, according to Bot's filenames:

- Scan 26: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qwgwDdKzAXFXGlO_3mhYHZRrTd9bvxdK/view
- Scan 27: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yKlvVhJ9tKPE0X7i4Fc8XztGx9NyJYga/view
- Scan 28: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cqJa3eu4rpH6CjykqcJq8o9IFn288K3q/view

Do not mark "I saw a photograph" on the basis of these links. The transfer of two Gilgulim PNGs failed on my side; I do not confirm their descriptions from sight. The claim that kav/returning light were not verified in them is the limit of Bot's reading, not evidence of their absence from the entire chapter.

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — Bot's Identifier Corruption — Content-Based Crosswalk

Source file read:

The first column is the number in Bot's table only. Do not silently correct it in the source file, and do not copy VW as a conceptual determination.

Bot	Topic recorded by Bot	Canonical identifier / treatment
E01	Opening of the passage in print	E01; wording verification only
E02	All the above / three radiances	E02; no determination of scope
E03	Parentheses	E39
E04	Hu/hi	E18
E05	Arich Anpin without Atik Yomin	E13
E06	Six/seven	E25
E07	Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut	E24
E08	Order of investment	E08–E11, according to the paragraph
E09	Remoteness of Asiyah	E10
E10	Endpoint of the feet	E11

Bot	Topic recorded by Bot	Canonical identifier / treatment
E11	Atik notes	E11
E12	Main text/commentator	Evidentiary rule; not an answer to E12
E13	Prohibition on building a map	Working instruction; not the Atik question
E14	Local ABYA in Gilgulim	E19/E21
E15	Kav in Gilgulim	E19/E22
E16	Returning light in Gilgulim	E19/E22
E17	Adam Kadmon's feet in Gilgulim	E19/E22
E18	Only investment in the chapter	E19; "only" cannot be proved from a partial reading
E19	Cited in Likkutei Amarim	E20
E20	Gloss in chapter 6	E20
E21	51–52	E20/E21
E22	Textual note at end of 51	E39
E23	Note 48	E01/E39
E24	Parentheses 49/55/60	E39
E25	Bereishit Rabbah 10:6	E05/E06
E26	Or HaTorah קצו/תשפו	E05/E06

Bot	Topic recorded by Bot	Canonical identifier / treatment
E27	Note 53	E20/E39
E28	“Let [the earth] sprout”	E23/E39
E29	Reference 56	E39
E30	“Let [the earth] bring forth”	E24/E39
E31	Note 58	E27/E28
E32	Note 59	E34
E33	Mazal	E05/E06
E34	Continually and a likeness of	E27/E28

Bot	Topic recorded by Bot	Canonical identifier / treatment
E35	Sown and spontaneous	E30/E32/E33/E36
E36	Purpose in parentheses	E37
E37	List	E18/E39
E38	Essence/sovev	Rule and expansion of E08; not a determination of E38
E39	Neshamah of sefirot/human being	E17; not E39
E40	Union closed	Previous dossier outside the task; not a determination of E40
E41	Numbers of sperm cells	E40; not a determination of E41

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — Status of Sources Not Completed

Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, קצו and תשפו: the explanation in Lessons was read; I did not read the source texts. The volume number and discourse incipit in Claude’s report are a report requiring verification. Gilgulim 20: witnesses were located by Bot; we do not yet have a clean transcription paragraph proving the Epistle’s chain. The Rebbe’s notes 53/58/59: their translation was examined here; the photograph of p. 414 does not include all of them. My focused search in Or Ha-

Torah did not yield a usable text. Do not infer that no source exists, and do not duplicate searches without a new target.

Dossier 0550 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [414]

Prompt for Grok: IGK20-Earth-R2-Grok

Two principal dossiers and a brief examination of Atik.

1. E08–E12: What does the small interruption mean in relation to the great remoteness? Your R1 proposed two axes: the vessels of Asiyah in the order of investment versus the endpoint of yosher. This is a good hypothesis, but a source applying it is still missing. Build a precise subject table for each sentence: what is remote,

from what, in what order/state, and what its source is. Separate the text of branch 4, R. Chaim Vital's note, R. Tzemach, and Chabad explanation. Do the igulim of Atik beneath the feet in the same account accord with "only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone"? The source about the endpoint in Radla does not itself map it to Asiyah. Look for a specific source interpreting the Epistle's wording, or a structural parallel that narrows the difficulty. Do not read all of branch 4 again without a focused question. Do not define "sovev begins here" spatially; do not say that sovev is "only background," because the Epistle includes it in the explanation. Do not invent that the sovev pushes the kav to return.

2. E19–E23, E42-Grok: the destination and the order. First correct the R1 diagram: it presented kav → neshamah-light → ABYA with-

[414] Document 0550: IGK20-Earth-R2_02_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

in Asiyah → neshamah-light again. The Epistle first gives a destination and then "first… and from it… and from them." Separate two statements from the text; do not turn the order of exposition into a double route. Examine whether the order of investment can mediate the same returning radiance without requiring a spatial journey. If "same" here rests only on the pronoun "this," say so. Sefer HaGilgulim may explain a general rule of investment applied in the Epistle to the kav; a verbatim quotation of every sentence of the Epistle need not be demanded for a substantive reference to be valid. Conversely, do not attribute to it kav/returning light that were not read. Analyze whether "strength and force" in the preceding paragraph and at the endpoint of the vessel is a local application of the same imparting of power or a different description. The mere recurrence of the expression does not prove the identity of the entire mechanism.

Dossier 0551 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [415]

Prompt for Claude: IGK20-Earth-R2-Claude

Two principal dossiers and a short correction. Your goal is to examine R1's interpretations, not defend them.

1. E05–E06, E26, E33–E36: On whom does the mazal act, and what counts as an awakening? A. In R1 you attributed to Or HaTorah קצו a vegetative power already in the earth. The explanation in Lessons describes a power in the grass/tree. This difference of

[415] Document 0551: IGK20-Earth-R2_03_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

object bears on “before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?” Read the text of Or HaTorah if accessible; give an exact URL and a paragraph in context. Do not present an agent’s report or a paraphrase from Lessons as the text of Or HaTorah. The identities of the volumes and the discourse at תשפו still require verification. B. Separate size, bearing fruit, the details of species, and actual coming into being. How can

fruit be attributed to the mazal and, in the same unit, described as yesh me-ayin from the vegetative power? Are there two activities in the same product? What does the source itself prove? C. The text “without any raising of mayin nukvin at all” explicitly refers to the days of Creation. Its transfer to current growth must be examined. In Rashi on Genesis 2:5 there is prayer and the emergence of plants after rain. The fact that “mayin nukvin” is not written there does not remove the difficulty concerning awakening. Is the distinction between actual creation, emergence/growth, or a type of influence? Set each alternative against Rashi’s chronology. Do not attribute to Rashi a sown/spontaneous distinction that was not stated. D. In Iggeret HaKodesh 8, the restriction “only if” occurs within a sowing analogy. “Therefore the analogy is explicitly limited to the sown” is a leap: restricting it to this type is a possible contextual reading. Examine whether an additional source supplies it or whether a difficulty remains. E. In the list’s note “אבל .. יאמר,” two relocation proposals appear. If you have a photograph of the text or a clear transcription, present two readings with the exact span of words and editorial punctuation marked. If there is insufficient basis to determine the span, stop there; do not arbitrarily move an entire paragraph.

2. E34–E38: Likkutei Torah and drawing down in ABYA. The compiler read the continuation of the discourse at aid/5898887, especially section 4. It explicitly discusses the doubled “very” and the

advantage of action in the land, not merely a general discussion of vessels. Read the sequence and distinguish between:

- An advantage attained through work over a gratuitous gift;
- The advantage of action over thought;
- Drawing down in all worlds;
- The purpose in the lower realms.

Which link is stated in Likkutei Torah, which in note 59, and which only in your proposal? Do not automatically copy Likkutei Torah's interpretation of "very, very" onto the fruit in the Epistle. Do not declare that this is the "as written elsewhere" without an additional reference. In R1 you wrote once that the purpose is drawing down in all ABYA and action is the manner of realization, and once that drawing down in the higher realms is merely a result and the purpose is below. Formulate the relationship consistently and show the limit of the proof. Tanya 36–37 are parallels, not permission to declare all purposes identical. Note 59 is a suggested connection; it is not "counterevidence" ruling out every explanation.

3. E03 / E45-Claude: a correction and short examination. The sentence about the inanimate having no vegetative power is in 38, not 48. Open both places, correct the register, and separate the difficulties. Examine the possibility "earth does not grow itself, but makes other things grow," or a distinction between the invested vitality and a power that is not on the same level; do not approve without a source. Do not turn earth into the vegetative to escape the question. E27–E28: a short update is enough. Annual renewal is not by itself proof of infinity, nor does it negate all continuity. Preserve three concepts: the activity's existence, renewal of the radiance, and the capacity for continuity conditional on the world's existence.

Questions E24–E25 remain open if no new source was found. The association of note 48 with six/seven must be removed. E46-Claude is

to be corrected to “strength and force”; it is an expansion of E23. Deliverable of up to approximately 2,000 words beyond necessary quotations, including a precise correction table. A new question raised by a new source may be introduced.

— Rules, updates, and sources —

— Working text —

Dossier 0552 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [416]

Prompt for Grok Bot: IGK20-Earth-R2-Bot

Verification of witnesses, without a conceptual determination. Work in the following order of priority; do not invest again in already satisfactory scans without a new question.

First, a short correction — identifiers: in R1’s MAPPING_TABLE.md , the E01–E41 numbers do not correspond to the supplied map. For example, canonical E03 is revelation of power/light, E13 is the omission of Atik, E25 is six/seven. Do not silently replace the source. Add an orderly crosswalk file and from now on use only the attached map. VW can verify words in a photograph, not answer a conceptual question. Your E42–E45 questions are preserved as E42-Bot, etc. Do not write that the union dossier “has been decided”: it is outside the current round.

Priority 1 — Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, קצו and תשפו (E05/E06). Find the edition and volume; photograph the printed number and the relevant paragraph. According to Lessons, notes 51–52, these are two places:

[416] Document 0552: IGK20-Earth-R2_04_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

one arouses the vegetative power in the grass/tree, and the other illuminates and draws down to the root. Claude's report spoke of a power already in the earth; do not decide from the paraphrases. A short continuous transcription is needed showing the object of the influence and when it operates. The identification of volumes I/III and the discourse beginning "Al ken yomru ha-moshlim" is a claim to be examined, not a binding datum.

Priority 2 — Likkutei Torah, Shelach (E34/E37/E38). A digital text of the discourse beginning "Vayomru el kol adat go' tovah v'go"' already exists: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887. Open section 4 in particular. Give book/edition/folio and column, and a photograph of the paragraphs on the doubled "very," action, and the inner dimension of Keter. Do not search again merely for the title. Separate the discourse's text from the marked additions. Verification of the location does not prove that this is Iggeret HaKodesh's "as written elsewhere."

Priority 3 — Sefer HaGilgulim 20 (E19–E22). You have photographs HB23822 PDF30–31. The T2 file from R1 is a qualified summary of what was seen, not a continuous transcription. Produce from the photograph a short clean paragraph on Atzilut within Asiyah and nef esh–ruach–neshamah/ABYA. Mark every uncertain word. State what begins/ends chapter 20 and which folio is visible. Do not force the Epistle's sentence about the kav to be found word for word; our goal is to know which rule originates in the book and what the Alter Rebbe adds. If the Rashi type is blurred, provide an enlarged crop or another identified printed witness. Do not rewrite corrupt OCR into the expected wording. Do not declare that kav/returning light are absent from the whole chapter without reading the entire chapter. If you manage only one paragraph, that is a useful result. The gloss in Tanya 6 has already been found digitally; a short photograph of it

would complete the evidence, but there is no need to search for the reference again.

Priority 4 — Photograph of the list against the Epistle's text (E01/E06 /E18/E25/E39). The user did attach a photograph of "Notes and Corrections," p. 414; the compiler's transcription appears in the rules. Correct the input availability. Try to identify the edition only on the basis of an additional witness, not a guess from p. 414. The focused task: the span of the words "אבל .. יאמר" and the two proposed placements, against 132a. Photograph the lines on both sides, without deciding which proposal to adopt. There is no need to reopen the reference error in note 56: "Let [the waters] swarm" is 1:20. Do not declare that the absence of a hu/hi or six/seven correction on the single page proves authorial intent.

Deliverable: short README; canonical correspondence table; for each target, a transcription file and 1–3 relevant photographs with clear identification. Book, edition, printed folio, column/lines, PDF page, URL, what you saw yourself and what others reported. Upload to Drive and prepare a ZIP with TXT/MD/PNG. Existing project folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ptqHOycgA--ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk. Create a separate Earth-R2-Bot folder; do not change R1. Links will be supplied to the user to transfer; do not send messages to other models. Completing all four priorities at the cost of an unreliable transcription is not required. Report accurately what was achieved and what remains.

— Rules, updates, and sources —

— Working text —

Dossier 0553 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [417]

IGK20-Earth-R2 — The Canonical Map and Further Treatment

September 23, 2026

E01–E41 below are copied from the R1 map to preserve questions and identifiers. This is not confirmation that the questions have been resolved. Input-status update: the photograph of "Notes and Corrections," p. 414, has already been read by the compiler; the historical "not attached" statements in the R1 map are not the current situation. Sefer HaGilgulim: Bot reported a partial reading of photographs, with a chapter heading and page; the compiler did not see those photographs. It should no longer be treated as an unlocated target, but no decisive transcription has been completed. Expansion of E03: Tanya 48 remains a source; the quotation "it does not even contain the vegetative power" is added from Tanya 38.

IGK20-Earth-R2 — The Canonical Map and Further Treatment — Summary Status by Areas of Work

Identifiers	Progress	Remaining
E01–E02	An intent to add power is plausible; the note in the list has been read	Duplication and the sentence's subject
E03–E07	Power/light and product/source distinguished; mazal in the text	Or HaTorah source, role of fruit, 38/48
E08–E12	Terminological map and tension identified	Bridge between proximity/remoteness and reason for the added power

[417] Document 0553: IGK20-Earth-R2_05_Canonical_Map.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Identifiers	Progress	Remaining
E13–E15	Repetitions mapped; Atik earlier in the Epistle	Reason for omission and meaning of Keter
E16	Returning light and mayin nukvin must not be identified on the strength of direction alone	Precise positive relation
E17–E18	Subject of Divinity and the pronouns discussed; list partially read	Precise syntax and authorial intent
E19–E23	Source photograph located by Bot; reference in chapter 6 identified	Clean paragraph, detailing and scope of the route

Identifiers	Progress	Remaining
E24–E26	Chochmah/endpoint, six/seven, and Adam's prayer identified	Reason and scope of gratuitous kindness
E27–E28	Note 58 and Epistle 14 support renewal	Precisely what is a likeness of infinity, and the distinction between "aspect of" / "a likeness of"
E29–E32	Axes of comparison preserved without seed numbers	Why specifically earth; incommensurability and "like"
E33–E36	The analogy in 8 and note 59; Likkutei Torah text located	Applicability of the seed, two instances of "very," and the analogy
E37–E38	Parallels for mitzvot and drawing down exist	Relationship between the purposes and identification of "elsewhere"
E39	Reference corrections and scope of note 48 are clear	Glosses in a Hebrew source and additional editions as needed
E40	The user's question preserved without unexamined data	Comparative criterion
E41	Returning light formulated in the kav; sovev participates in the explanation	Precise applicability of the conclusion

Dossier 0554 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [418]

IGK20-Earth-R3 — Review of R2 and Independent Findings

September 23, 2026. Unit: “And furthermore” through “the purpose of the creation of the human being.” Investigation, not text for a booklet. The union dossier remains on hold with the difficulties recorded; it has not been decided anew.

IGK20-Earth-R3 — Review of R2 and Independent Findings — The Result

R2 improved the analysis in the two structural dossiers: interruption and remoteness are measured between different pairs, and the Epistle presents a destination followed by the order of investment leading to it. This does not identify the igulim of Atik with the igulim of Adam Kadmon, and there is no proved explanation for the omission of Atik. There is now real progress in the mazal dossier, alongside two verification failures in the source package.

The Result — 1. The Vegetative Power and the Mazal: There Is a Source Connecting Them, Not Merely a Proposed Reconciliation

I read, in a digital text of Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the discourse beginning “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael,” the end of section 3 and its context. The decisive sentence: “The growth of the earth’s plant from the vegetative power in the earth is through the mazal.” The continuation

[418] Document 0554: IGK20-Earth-R3_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

distinguishes the physical plant's coming into being, attributed to the encompassing Ein Sof light, from the mazal's action.

Status of the witness: a transcription of the primary discourse on ChabadText and Ashuvah; not a photograph of printed 78b. The two websites are not necessarily independent witnesses. The Chabad Library page did not open. The reference 78b still requires matching to a photograph.

Limited conclusion: E47-Claude is not a contradiction simply because Epistle 8 attributes growth to the vegetative power and Epistle 20 attributes it to the mazal. Here the Alter Rebbe explicitly combines both attributions. One can explain: the power in the earth brings forth and causes growth, and the growth occurs through the mazal's influence. There is no need to present the two factors as competitors.

What remains unresolved: the allocation of fruit-bearing, the fruit's taste, and the particular species among the vegetative power, seed, and mazal; the rule "only through the seed" in Epistle 8 versus those growing on their own in Epistle 20; and the precise distinction between coming into being and growth in every occurrence of "growth." The Pinchas source does not say that the mazal alone determines every detail, and does not negate the seed's role.

A sharpened question for E04: in Pinchas, matter's coming into being from spirituality by way of cause and effect is denied, while in the Epistle the vegetative power is described as ayin and spiritual. The Epistle therefore must not be interpreted as though a power's mere spirituality were sufficient to enable it to create matter. The Epistle itself explains the power through the sovev and the kav's radiance. Aligning the two wordings is a contextually supported interpretation, not a replacement of "vegetative power" with the name "Essence."

The Result — 3. Or HaTorah תשפה–תשפו: Not All the Explanation Attributed to It Was Found Here

I read the two photographs PDF67–68: the headings Chukat, תשפה and תשפו. תשפה discusses the mazal, the source above it, and the additional light produced through Torah and mitzvot; תשפו begins with a summary and continues with an explanation of additional light in Gan Eden.

The passage read contains a useful distinction between influence in a fixed measure and additional light drawn down through Divine service. It is a substantive candidate for clarifying "drawing down supernal lights" and humanity's purpose. It is not an identification of "as written elsewhere" in the Epistle.

I did not verify in the pair of pages the full formulation in Lessons that the mazal illuminates the grass and arouses in it a drawing toward its root. This paraphrase must not be presented as a verified transcription of תשפו. It may rest on further context, and a precise location should be requested. The assignment of "Al ken yomru ha-moshlim" to these pages is unverified; the correction from the table of contents is currently Bot's testimony, not my own independent reading of the table of contents.

The Result — 4. Likkutei Torah, Shelach: P2 Does Not Verify the Requested Discourse

I personally opened photographs PDF111, 117, 128. In 111, מא is indeed printed and there is a section 4 about the spies; in 117, מד and a discussion of the garment of mitzvot; in 128 the visible number is 98, and the heading within the text is "Biur ha-devarim al pi Ve-atah yigdal na" ("Explanation of the Matters in Light of 'And Now, Let [the Power] Be Great' "). These are not the continuous text of the discourse

beginning “Vayomru el kol adat go’ tovah v’go”’ read on the Kehot website.

The difference is not merely a page number: the opening of section 4 and the sentences about “very, very” themselves differ. Bot’s claim of “a numbering contradiction between the contents and the running page” is therefore unproved. The initial explanation to examine is that other discourses in the same Torah portion were opened. The sentences themselves must be located; the subject words spies/very/Keter are insufficient.

Photograph 128 may be a useful separate source: it distinguishes different contexts of the inner and outer dimensions of Keter, and mentions the inner dimension of Atik and Gulgalta. Precisely for this reason, one must not take one sentence from it and identify the inner dimension of Keter everywhere with a single partzuf in the same sense. In the present reading, it contains no explanation for the omission of Atik from the Epistle’s kav analogy.

The correct discourse remains digitally verified on the Kehot website. Its discussion connects action, revelation, and the lower realm, but does not prove that every drawing down in the higher realms is only a means for the lower. Note 59 proposes a connection; the fact that it is a proposal is not evidence against the connection.

The Result — 6. The List of Corrections: Preserve Proposals Rather Than Producing a Definitive Text

The user’s photograph of p. 414 was read previously; I have now also read the photograph of the Epistle’s text on 132 in the package. “אבל יאמר ..” does indeed correspond to the phrase “אבל בטרם יצמח למי יאמר” (“But before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?”). The list tentatively proposes two locations.

Claude's reconstruction is not an authoritative corrected text: moving the phrase changes the syntax of "כל מזל ומזל לכל עשב ועשב בפרטי פרטיות" ("each individual mazal, for each individual blade of grass, in its particular details"), and the complete parentheses must be presented with explicitly proposed punctuation. One may examine fronting the subject or a parenthetical sentence; a sentence fragment must not be presented as a determination. The proposal "after 'particular details' " may refer to its second occurrence, but inferring the intent is not an explicit reading of wording in the list. There is no need for another photographic round on the same image in order to decide an intent it did not specify.

IGK20-Earth-R3 — Review of R2 and Independent Findings — What Is Accepted from R2 and What Remains Open

Dossier	Current determination	Limit
E08–E11: remote ness/interruption	Different pairs; no direct contradiction from the sentences alone	No identification of the igulim of Atik with the igulim of Adam Kadmon; "alone" requires explanation
E13: Atik	The "doubling Keter" explanation was rightly withdrawn	The reason for the omission was not found
E19–E22	Destination followed by the order leading to it; Gilgulim photograph now accessible	Erroneous transcription; no explicit bridge to the direction of returning light
E23	Imparting power to the vessel in both places	Repetition of "strength and force" does not prove identity of mechanism; correct "ובתארתו" to "ובהארתו" ("and through its radiance")
E05/E47-Claude	Pinchas connects growth from the earth's power with growth through the mazal	The details of fruit/species still require precision

Dossier	Current determination	Limit
E16/E26/E33	Another use of mayin nukvin occurs in the source read	It must not be transferred without examination to "on their own" or to returning light
E24–E25	No decisive progress	Chochmah/endpoint of the vessel and six/seven days remain open
E27–E28	The activity's existence, annual renewal, and conditional capacity for continuity are distinguished	Annual renewal alone is not proof of infinity
E37–E38	Shelach and Or HaTorah supply parallels for drawing down through Divine service	"Elsewhere" has not been identified; the purpose/means relationship throughout ABYA has not been proved

R2's proposal to include the igulim of Atik under the name igulim of Adam Kadmon is not accepted even as a preferred solution without a witness to this usage. It may be preserved as a hypothesis examined. Detailing the pairs reduces the contradiction; it does not resolve the structure of the igulim.

In the Adam's-prayer dossier, creation's precedence over prayer may distinguish actual coming into being from actual appearance. But prayer for rain is still a human condition for growth according to Rashi; changing the object of the prayer does not itself reconcile "without any mayin nukvin at all." There is no need to repeatedly change the formulation without an additional source.

IGK20-Earth-R3 — Review of R2 and Independent Findings — R3 Plan

Claude: Pinchas + Or HaTorah קצו, clarification of source/intermed iary, mayin nukvin, and the applicability of "growth." Grok: Or Ha-Torah תשפה–תשפו + the correct Shelach discourse, clarification of ad-ditional light and purpose; limited examination of the separate Keter

source, without inventing a reason for Atik's omission. Bot: focused correction of Shelach, Gilgulim, and Pinchas in print. No further general scan of the same branches of Etz Chaim.

If there is no new source for one of the difficulties, it remains open. R3's goal is to use the new witnesses and correct the erroneous ones, not to send every hypothesis through another round.

Source links and the reading register are in file 01. Three independent prompts are in files 02–04. The photographs examined are included in the ZIP in their original form, without recreating page images.

Dossier 0555 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [419]

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading

September 23, 2026. "Read" below indicates what the compiler personally saw in this round. A Bot transcription file is not equivalent to a photograph, and a photograph of a page does not verify every transcription accompanying it.

A. Digital Sources Opened — D2 — Likkutei Torah, Shelach, Discourse Beginning "Vayomru el kol adat go' tovah v'go"'

Kehot text on Chabad

The text was read continuously, with emphasis on sections 3–4. Section 4 begins "ואחר כל הנ"ל יובן ג"כ ענין המעשה דמרגלים" ("And after all the above, the matter of the spies' action will also be understood").

[419] Document 0555: IGK20-Earth-R3_01_Source_Update.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

This is the identification anchor. The discussion includes two kinds of worlds in its explanation of the doubled “very,” and action versus thought. The photograph of “ד ובזה יובן ענין המרגלים” (“4. And through this the matter of the spies will be understood”) on מא is not the same section. A numbering error must not be established before matching the text.

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading — B. Photographs from the R2-Bot Package Read Now

Source folder

Source ZIP The photographs examined are copied to evidence in the R3 package under their original filenames. HB and volume data are reported from Bot; numbers and headings indicated as read were seen in the images themselves. I did not examine all the title pages and tables of contents in this round.

File in the R3 package	Actually read	Unverified claim
R2_OHT_BamA_PDF-214.png	Heading “Discourses for Shavuot,” קצו; paragraph on “Let [the earth] sprout,” mazal, vegetative power, mayin duchrin and mayin nukvin	Exact title of the discourse from its beginning; edition details
R2_OHT_BamC_PDF-067.png	Chukat תשפה; fixed influence and the addition through Divine service, mazal and its source	Full wording of the Lessons paraphrase about drawing the grass to its root
R2_OHT_BamC_PDF-068.png	Chukat תשפו; summary followed by additional light through Divine service	That this is the Epistle’s “elsewhere”
R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png	מא; a different section 4 about the spies	That this is discourse D2; that it is a pagination change
R2_LT_Shelach_maad_PDF-117.png	מד; garment of mitzvot, tzitzit	That this is the doubled “very” in discourse D2

File in the R3 package	Actually read	Unverified claim
R2_LT_Shelach_keter_PDF-128.png	Number 98; “Biur ha-devarim al pi Ve-atah yigdal na”	The conjectured number /מט נ in Bot’s report; the reason for the omission of Atik
R2_Gilgulim_PDF 30_full.png	Chapter 20 in the right column; verbal focal points in the left column	A complete clean transcription of the chapter
R2_T2_p30_LEFT_enh_top_x2.png	Framework of garments of nefesh and entry into the inner dimension	Order of the kav or returning light
R2_T2_p30_LEFT_enh_mid_x2.png	“Outer dimension” at two points transcribed as “inner dimension”; nefesh of Atzilut within Asiyah	Erased/blurred words
R2_Tanya65_aval_paren_block_x2.png	132; text of the parentheses about the mazal and continuation concerning the interruption	Decisive emended wording in place of the list’s proposals

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading — C. Bot’s Sources Opened as Text, with Review Status

- P1 Or HaTorah: the main part of the paragraph on קצו was verified in a photograph; the heading “Al ken yomru” was not verified. “Governance in measure + root” on תשפו is not the entire Lessons paraphrase.
- P2 Likkutei Torah: witnesses to related subject matter; they do not verify D2. The claim of a pagination contradiction is not accepted as fact.
- P3 Gilgulim: outer/inner-dimension error and beginning of the chapter; not a clean transcription.
- P4 List: the Epistle’s text was verified photographically; Bot has only the compiler’s transcription of the list.

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading — D. The User's Photograph: An Existing Witness, No Need to Request It Again

The compiler saw p. 414 in the conversation: "Notes and Corrections," column "tentative note." Do not claim that the list was not supplied to the conversation. If an external model received only the prompt, it must say that it did not personally see the photograph.

"דהארה / וכו'" ("of a radiance / etc."): it requires further study what this includes. "יתר / הנ"ל הארה .. הנ"ל" ("beyond / the above, a radiance .. the above"): the wording and intent require further study. "אבל / אבל יאמר .." ("but / but .. would speak"): seemingly these words belong earlier after the word "העשב" ("the grass"), or later after "פרטיות" ("particular details"). This page contains no hu/hi or six/seven correction in the unit. Nothing about the whole list or the author's intent may be inferred from this.

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading — E. Limits and Question Identifications

E01–E41 remain as in the original map. E44-Grok is an expansion of E11; E47-Claude an expansion of E05. New for tracking: E48-Codex = mayin duchrin arousing mayin nukvin on קצו versus the mayin nukvin of sowing in the Epistle (related to E16/E26/E33); E49-Codex = the limitation on physicality coming into being from spirituality in Pinchas versus "ayin and spiritual" in Epistle 20 (expansion of E04). Do not import a status according to another model's new number.

The previous structure is preserved: sovev is not the igulim of Adam Kadmon; the igulim of Atik are not identified with it; the order of the destination is not a circular route; the neshamah-light of sefirot is not a human soul. No reason has been proved for Atik's omission, the relation of Chochmah/endpoint of the vessel, or six/seven days.

Dossier 0556 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [420]

Prompt for Grok — IGK20-Earth-R3-Grok

Two targets from the new photographs, without reopening a general survey of branch 4. The user's original questions are preserved in full at the end of the prompt.

1. E34/E37/E38: Read Or HaTorah, Chukat, תשפה–תשפו themselves (R 2_OHT_BamC_PDF-067/068.png), especially the paragraph after the summary on תשפו. Set against it Likkutei Torah, Shelach, discourse beginning "Vayomru el kol adat go' tovah v'go'," sections 3–4, Kehot text aid5898887, and "From this we can understand" / humanity's purpose in the Epistle. Is there now an explicit source for distinguishing fixed influence/existence from additional light through Divine service? In what respect does this explain the advantage of what comes through mayin nukvin, and in what respect does it not? Separate three claims: the superiority of Divine service over gratuitousness; the superiority of action over thought; the relation of drawings down in ABYA to the purpose in the lower realms. Do not turn them into three identical expressions. Can "the purpose of the creation of the human being" here describe human activity in all worlds without changing the purpose of hishtalshelut in Tanya 36? Give an interpretation and its limit, not an invented identification of "elsewhere."
2. E13: a limited examination in a genuinely new source. Photograph R2_LT_Shelach_keter_PDF-128.png is "Biur ha-devarim al

[420] Document 0556: IGK20-Earth-R3_02_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

pi Ve-atah yigdal na," visible number 98. It is not the discourse from target 1. Read the definition of the inner/outer dimensions of Keter throughout the page, including the places discussing the inner dimension of Atik. Can one infer from it at all that the enumeration of Arich Anpin exhausts Keter for purposes of the kav analogy? It apparently does not mention the kav; do not turn that into proof. If there is only an explanation of the multiple uses of "inner dimension of Keter," that is the result. The doubling-of-Keter explanation was withdrawn and remains withdrawn; a new explanation requires evidence.

Closing R2 precisely: I accept the table of two pairs of measurement and the destination/ladder correction. I do not accept as a preference the proposal to include the igulim of Atik under the name igulim of Adam Kadmon without explicit usage of that kind, especially in the face of "alone." There is no need to defend it or reread the same sentences. E10–E11 remain open unless you have found a specific new source. E24–E25, six/seven days, also remain visible in the record; note 48 must not be attributed to them. The union dossier is on hold, not "resolved."

Deliverable: up to approximately 1,700 words, up to four new findings. For each target: what was read, what is explicit, the inferential step, genuine counterevidence if any, and what is still missing. If no counterevidence was found, say so rather than turning absence of proof into counterevidence. Finish with a short explanatory paragraph understandable without hearing all the rounds. This is a research paragraph, not a booklet.

— Framework and evidence update —

B"H — Shared framework for Earth-R3. Unit: "And furthermore" through "the purpose of the creation of the human being." Investigation, not a booklet. The union dossier is on hold, unresolved. Write in

Hebrew and separate explicit / later explanation / reasoned interpretation / open. No determination by model agreement. You may disagree with the compiler with evidence. Do not say you read a text on the basis of a report or search excerpt. Report a barrier once; do not reconstruct an image from a transcription. The new ZIP includes real photographs read by the compiler. If you received only text, the distinction between “I read” and “I was told” remains mandatory. Do not assume you have a local file merely because its name appears in the register. Preserved corrections: note 48 concerns only the opening “And furthermore”; Tanya 38, not 48, for the sentence about having no vegetative power; “strength and force,” not “strength and might”; “without any mayin nukvin at all” in parentheses about the days of Creation; destination followed by ladder, not a loop; the doubling-of-Keter explanation for Atik’s omission has been withdrawn. Six/seven were not corrected in the user’s list on the page seen. E01–E41 are canonical and are not reassigned. Read the following evidence update before investigating. The compiler’s description of a reading does not dispense with your own reading when an image/text is accessible.

Earth-R3 — Witness Register and Update for Independent Reading — E. Limits and Question Identifications

— Working text —

Dossier 0557 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [421]

[421] Document 0557: IGK20-Earth-R3_03_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Prompt for Claude — IGK20-Earth-R3-Claude

Focused dossier: the mazal, vegetative power, and mayin nukvin. This time there is a text from Pinchas and photographs of Or HaTorah, not only a Lessons paraphrase. All the compiler's sources and their statuses appear below; if you did not receive the image ZIP, do not write that you saw a photograph.

1. E05/E06/E47-Claude: Read the end of section 3 in the discourse beginning "Tzav et Bnei Yisrael," Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, in the transcriptions linked below. The compiler read the sentence combining

growth from the vegetative power in the earth with growth through the mazal, and the continuation distinguishing physical coming into being. Does this remove the very claim of contradiction you proposed between "that causes growth" in Epistle 8 and the mazal in Epistle 20? Distinguish source of power, intermediary of influence, and individual recipient. Do not infer that there is no difficulty at all: taste/species/fruit and the seed still require mapping. Examine whether the two activities are only two points in time or also two aspects of the same product. Do not claim that all fruit-bearing is merely yesh mi-yesh, contrary to the Epistle's wording about fruits from nothing into something.

2. E48-Codex, related to E16/E26/E33: Read the photograph of Or HaTorah קצו, PDF214, continuously. After "Let [the earth] sprout" and the earth's vegetative power, the mazal arouses the vegetative power invested in the grass. The paragraph says that drawing down mayin duchrin arouses the raising of mayin nukvin, describes growth from the recipient, and adds rain. Thus "mayin nukvin = human sowing alone" is not an adequate definition for all the sources. But the page does not explicitly state that the plant grows on its own. Is this a general use of mayin nukvin, as against

the act of sowing defined as mayin nukvin in the Epistle? Show applicability, not merely "a relative term." Do not identify it with the kav's returning light. Also separate the question of gratuitous kindness at Creation from the classification of plants today.

3. E49-Codex, expansion of E04: In Pinchas, a spiritual cause-and-effect process does not explain physicality coming into being; in Epistle 20 plants come from an ayin, spiritual vegetative power, and the explanation is sovev and kav. Is "ayin and spiritual" a description of the power/product relation, rather than proof that every spiritual power creates? Present the continuation of the Epistle as the explanation, and do not replace the vegetative power with the Essence or sovev without a source.

Keep open: the "only if" in Epistle 8 versus that which grows on its own, and the relation to Adam's prayer. Prayer for rain can still be an awakening from below; merely identifying "for them" (עליהם) as referring to rains does not resolve the difficulty. There is no need for a new list of Rashi sources if there is no sentence that changes the understanding.

Only a short syntactic correction: the two relocations of "אבל...יאמר" in R2 are not authoritative wording. If you discuss them, present the complete parentheses with punctuation marked, and show the predicate of "each individual mazal, for each individual blade of grass." Do not determine the list's intent from a punctuation mark you added. There is no need to scan the same list again.

Deliverable: up to approximately 1,800 words; a factor/action/product/stage/witness table, up to four new findings, a reader's paragraph with degree of certainty. You may disagree with the compiler using evidence. Emphasize a substantive change from R2, not another "examined" label.

— Framework and evidence update —

Dossier 0558 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [422]

Prompt for Grok Bot — IGK20-Earth-R3-Bot

Focused correction of witnesses. No conceptual determination, no regenerating R1/R2, and no deleting files. Your ZIP from R2 was opened by the compiler and the images were read. There are two specific corrections.

T1 — Likkutei Torah, Shelach, the exact discourse. In P2 you linked three pages with related subject words. PDF111/מא begins "ד ובזה יובן ענין המרגלים" ("4. And through this the matter of the spies will be understood"); D2 on the Kehot website, aid5898887, opens section 4 with "ואחר כל הנ"ל יובן ג"כ ענין המעשה דמרגלים" ("And after all the above, the matter of the spies' action will also be understood"). PDF117/מד discusses a garment and tzitzit. PDF128 bears number 98 and the heading "Biur ha-devarim al pi Ve-atah yigdal na." There is currently no proof of a pagination change in the same discourse. Locate in print the discourse beginning "Vayomru el kol adat go' tovah v'go"' and the paragraph explaining "very, very" as corresponding to conc ealed/revealed worlds. Further anchors: the end of action arose first in thought; the inner dimension of Keter = reason and pleasure within will. Give the discourse's opening heading, folio/PDF page, and section 4 itself. Do not search for "very, very" alone. Preserve the three earlier pages as separate targets under their own names, not as witnesses to D2.

[422] Document 0558: IGK20-Earth-R3_04_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

T2 — Sefer HaGilgulim 20, correction of P3. In R2_T2_p30_LEFT_enh_mid_x2.png, the compiler reads at the beginning "כי תחלה קונה נפש חיצוניות עשיה" ("for first he acquires the nefesh of the outer dimension of Asiyah") and subsequently "רוח מחיצוניות היצירה" ("ruach from the outer dimension of Yetzirah"). P3 changed these to the inner dimension. Check against the image and give a short diplomatic transcription, only legible lines; do not call a reconstructed paragraph "clean." Mark deletions; do not supply content from the system. The full PDF30 shows the heading of chapter 20 in the right column; also correct the chapter boundary that was reported as being on the left. The anchor "nefesh of Atzilut within Asiyah" remains a positive target; give lines before and after and identify whether it concerns a person's acquisition of a level or the light of the sefirot. Do not attribute kav/returning light from the Epistle to this text. There is no need for the whole chapter if part of it is illegible; an accurate marked witness suffices.

T3 — Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, 78b. The compiler opened the text on ChabadText and Ashuvah, discourse beginning "Tzav et Bnei Yisrael," end of section 3. Locate a photograph of the printed paragraph that connects growth from the earth's power with mazal and denies that the physical plant comes into being through the mazal. Open a little before and a little after, through the reference to Iggeret HaKodesh beginning "Ihu ve-chayohi." Verify the number 78b and the discourse attribution. If a photograph is unavailable, report that without replacing a digital passage with an invented photograph.

Deliverable: three short target files, original images, correspondence table, and up to five findings. Indicate in each row: I read / reported / not read. Do not introduce a new canonical E number. T1=E34/E37/E38; T2=E19–E22; T3=E04–E06/E47-Claude/E49-Codex. Do not determine what "as written elsewhere" refers to on the basis of thematic resemblance.

There is no need to reopen list 414, no need to add a photograph of Tanya 6 in this round, and no expanding to dozens more discourses. The goal is correction of the precise witnesses and the new Pinchas page.

— Framework and evidence update —

Dossier 0559 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [423]

Earth-R3 — Continuity Map

The historical R2 map is preserved below. This update takes precedence over previous statuses and does not replace the questions.

- E44-Grok → E11: inclusion of the igulim of Atik within the igulim of Adam Kadmon; no witness.
- E47-Claude → E05: two attributions of growth; Pinchas connects them, the details of the activity remain.
- E48-Codex → E16/E26/E33: mayin duchrin arouses mayin nukvin in Or HaTorah קצו versus sowing.
- E49-Codex → E04: spiritual/physical in Pinchas versus the ayin, spiritual vegetative power.
- E19–E22: Gilgulim photograph partially read; “inner dimension” in the P3 transcription is replaced with “outer dimension” at the verified points, and the chapter begins in the right column.
- E34: the correct Shelach text is digitally verified; the P2 photographs are not witnesses to the same passage.
- E13/E24/E25: open, without a new solution.

— Preserved map from R2 — B”H

[423] Document 0559: IGK20-Earth-R3_05_Canonical_Map.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0560 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [424]

IGK20-Earth-R3

For the next round: prompt 02 for Grok, 03 for Claude, 04 for Bot. Attach the package ZIP for each model rather than relying solely on a Drive link. Each prompt includes the framework, source update, passage, and register of 41 questions, even if the other files are inaccessible.

00 — independent review of R2 and provisional conclusions. 01 — witness register, links to texts, and transcription corrections. 05 — continuity map and new identifiers. evidence — ten photographs from the R2-Bot package, opened by the compiler; copied unchanged. SHA256 documents file identity. The original list 414 is not here: the compiler's transcription and its scope are in file 01 and the prompts.

The package includes a correction to the Shelach witnesses and the Gilgulim transcription. This does not invalidate all of Bot's work; the positive evidence from Or HaTorah must also be preserved. There is no proved solution for Atik's omission, the igulim of Adam Kadmon/Atik, or six/seven days. There is no booklet and no opening of the union dossier.

R1/R2 files were not changed. A digital transcription is not a photograph, and a file that was opened is not necessarily a correct witness to the claim attributed to it.

[424] Document 0560: IGK20-Earth-R3_06_README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0561 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [425]

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation

September 23, 2026. Unit: “And furthermore” through “the purpose of the creation of the human being.” Compiler’s report, not a booklet. The union dossier is on hold and unresolved.

R3 advanced mainly in Pinchas: there is now a source sentence combining the two attributions of growth. By contrast, dividing mayin nukvin into two temporal stages was presented with greater confidence than the evidence warranted. The next round will examine two conceptual limits and one witness check; there is no need to repeat all forty-one questions.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 1. What Is Accepted

The vegetative power and the mazal are not alternative agents. I read the photograph of Pinchas bearing the heading עח [78], at the bottom of the left column, and its continuation at the top of the right column on the page marked 156. The photograph connects in the same sentence growth from the vegetative power in the earth with the action of the mazal. Before this, the production of physicality through spiritual hishtalshelut is rejected; afterward, physicality’s coming into being is attributed to the Divine power. The reference to Iggeret HaKodesh beginning “Ihu ve-chayohi” is at the beginning of the continuation page. I also read the complete digital text of Iggeret HaKodesh 8: the contrast there is between the nature of the seed and the earth’s pow-

[425] Document 0561: IGK20-Earth-R4_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

er, not between the earth's power and the mazal. E47-Claude as a claim of contradiction is therefore withdrawn. This does not resolve who determines every detail of species and fruit.

Three claims at the end of the analogy remain separate. Or Ha-Torah תשפה–תשפו [785–786] distinguishes the addition through the service of Torah and mitzvot from fixed influence; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, distinguishes action from thought; Tanya 36–37 establishes a dwelling in the lower realms as the purpose. One must not substitute one for another. Nevertheless, they need not be presented as contradictions: an action drawing light down in the higher realms as well can fit into a purpose realized below. This is a reasoned explanation, not identification of "elsewhere."

Atik. The explanation "so as not to double Keter" remains invalidated. The photograph of the explanation of "Ve-atah yigdal na" concerns various uses of the inner and outer dimensions of Keter; it gives no reason for omitting Atik from the list of the kav's garments. There is no new target justifying another round on the same photograph.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 3. Two Further Inferences That Need Narrowing

The seed is not an addressee? The fact that the seed decays in the analogy of Epistle 8 does not prove that it could not have received influence beforehand. Decay must not be used as an independent answer to "to whom would it speak?" In Epistle 20 itself, the addressee of "Grow!" is described as grass that has already sprouted; the distinction must be interpreted from this, not from botanical proof that was not supplied. "Grow on their own" is not a scientific statement that every wild plant comes into being without a seed.

The sovev — explanation or agent? In the unit, "and this is only because" is a formulation of explanation. It does not follow that the

sovev has no activity bringing into being in the Epistle: the preceding paragraph attributes to it the radiance of power in the vessels through the kav. The syntactic difference from Pinchas is not in itself a disagreement about the cause of coming into being. The distinction between the vegetative power, neshamah-light, vessel, kav, and sovev is preserved; they must not all be identified.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 5. Witness Review

Witness	What I saw	Limit
Pinchas, file marked PDF185	Heading עח [78]; mazal sentence at the bottom of the left column	Download source and PDF number according to Bot; content read directly
Pinchas, file marked PDF186	Heading 156; Iggeret HaKodesh reference at the top of the right column	Do not infer עח א/ב/ג/ד [78a/b/c/d] from the filename alone
R3_LT_p-103.png	Heading Emor, folio לז [37]	Not a witness to Shelach לז [37]; file identification requires clarification
R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png	Shelach מא [41]; a different discourse from D2	Not a witness to section 4 beginning “And after all the above”
R2_LT_Shelach_keter_PDF-128.png	Shelach, 98; explanation based on “Ve-atah yigdal na”	Not D2, and not a reason for omitting Atik
Or HaTorah ,[196] קצו תשפה–תשפו [785–786]	Headings and text read in photographs	Photographs supplied by Bot; not verification of a complete edition

Sefer HaGilgulim: Bot’s corrected report concerning the outer dimension and the column where the chapter begins is accepted; there is no new reading here of all of chapter 20. The claim that the chapter includes kav or returning light is not restored. Correcting the transcription is progress in the evidence, not resolution of the route.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 6. Limits and Stopping Conditions

- E10–E11: the relational pairs differ; there is no new bridge to the igulim of Atik/Adam Kadmon. The hypothesis of including Atik under the name Adam Kadmon is not a preference.
- E13: Atik's omission is open; do not read the same explanation again to produce a reason.
- E24–E25: Chochmah versus endpoint of the vessel and six/seven remain open. A focused search in this round yielded no useful explanation; this is not a claim to have exhausted the literature.
- E22: destination followed by details of the garments, not a route passing through the same destination twice; direction versus order of investment has not been decided beyond this.
- E36: the "only if" in Epistle 8 versus those growing on their own remains a difficulty of applicability. The restriction to the sown must not be called "explicit."
- E37–E38: a qualified substantive explanation can be formulated; "elsewhere" has not been identified.
- A third source is not needed to confirm every interpretive step. Such a step must be marked, and examined to see whether it preserves all the sources' wordings. The absence of an explicit sentence is not positive counterevidence.

Limited R4 round: Claude — the applicability of mayin nukvin in the continuous paragraph; Grok — purpose and action, with chapter 41 and Or HaTorah as anchors; Bot — correction of the source of the photographs and location of one D2 witness. After their responses, we will summarize what can be explained and what remains open; R5 is not being predetermined.

Dossier 0562 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [426]

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards

September 23, 2026. A quotation from a photograph below is the compiler's reading, not a claim that the reader personally saw the image. Three dots indicate a deliberate omission; words must not be supplied from it. The old sources have not disappeared, but these are the round's anchors.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S1 — Or HaTorah, Discourses for Shavuot, קצו [196]: First Paragraph

Photograph: evidence/OHT-196.png (copied unchanged from R2_OHT_BamA_PDF-214.png; HB31618/PDF214 according to Bot). The heading קצו [196] was read.

Compiler's transcription of the sequence of the first paragraph, whose opening continues from the previous page; punctuation and paragraph signs have not been added within the sequence:

"in the earth, in which is invested the Divine utterance 'Let the earth sprout grass,' etc., as written on the verse 'continually,' by the power of this Divine utterance it produces growth without measure or cessation, except that the earth has no power to bring forth its growth because the vegetative power within it requires an awakening from the higher bestower in the heavens above, namely the mazalot fixed in the heavens, and concerning this it said that you have no grass below on earth that does not have a mazal striking it and saying to it 'Grow,' and the meaning of this striking is that through this strik-

[426] Document 0562: IGK20-Earth-R4_01_Source_Cards.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ing it arouses the vegetative power invested in this grass to cause the grass to grow, and this is what is meant by 'and says to it Grow,' etc., and this is an analogy to introduce the aspect of drawing down mayin duchrin to arouse the raising of mayin nukvin, for growth from the vegetative power from below upward resembles the raising of mayin nukvin that rises from the recipient, and there must be a drawing down of mayin duchrin from the mazal to arouse this elevation, etc. (and so it is in physical union, where the male arouses the female to become warm so that she can emit seed first, etc., and as written elsewhere [the reference in parentheses was not deciphered here]), and likewise the matter of drawing rains into the earth is also to bring the vegetative power in the earth from concealment to revelation, as written concerning rains 'saturates the earth and causes it to give birth and to grow,' etc., and as written elsewhere, and the difference between the first mayin duchrin and the second mayin duchrin is that this comes in the aspect of the outer dimension and this comes in the aspect of the inner dimension, etc., and likewise it will be understood in every aspect of spiritual bestower and recipient above, such as the mazalot that receive from the dregs of the ofanim, and the ofanim and angels receive one from another by way of cause and effect, as is known, that is, when the angel receives its influence from one higher than it, it must first raise mayin nukvin to the one higher than it, for spirit brings spirit and draws spirit, as is the way of every bestower and recipient, but for the lower to be able to raise mayin nukvin, strength and force must first be drawn from the higher to the lower so that it can raise mayin nukvin, and these are the three levels mentioned above, mayin duchrin and mayin nukvin and mayin duchrin, etc., and so it is in every drawing down and imparting from cause to effect, to the highest levels."

Required examination: the local wording of a power invested in grass alongside a generalization to every bestower and recipient. The

source does not declare “this is only after germination,” and does not explicitly mention a plant growing on its own in this paragraph. The first mayin duchrin is not the second mayin duchrin. This is not a transcription of the entire discourse.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S2 — Or HaTorah, Chukat, תשפה–תשפו [785–786]

Photographs: evidence/OHT-785.png, OHT-786.png; HB31596/PDF 67–68 according to Bot; headings read.

On תשפה [785]: Gan Eden receives influence in measure and allotment; Divine service and Torah and mitzvot add light. The continuation distinguishes fixed influence from new light. This is an explicit distinction in this source; mapping it onto spontaneous/sown fruits in the Epistle is an interpretive step.

On תשפו [786], after the summary, anchors read in the photograph: “Regarding what was written in section 1, that through the mitzvot ‘to work it and to guard it,’ they add light in Gan Eden beyond the aspect of Gan Eden itself.” Later in the same paragraph: “And this drawing down from the aspect of ‘above Havayah’ is drawn through engagement in Torah and mitzvot below.” The continuation discusses the union of sovev and memale and the added revelation, with references to other discourses.

Three limits: the pages do not identify the Epistle’s “elsewhere”; this does not in itself explain the doubled “very” concerning the fruits; an addition in Gan Eden is not all of ABYA without a marked extension.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S3 — Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael,” End of Section 3 and Transition to Section 4

Photograph: evidence/Pinchas-185.png, Pinchas-186.png. The first has heading עח [78], the second 156. The assignment to HB58812/PDF185–186 is Bot’s report; the content was read by the compiler. The first: bottom of the left column, paragraph beginning “ופי’ הענין” (“and the meaning of the matter”). The second: beginning of the right column, before section 4. Anchor: “The growth of the earth’s plant from the vegetative power in the earth is through the mazal.” The same sequence distinguishes the physical thing’s coming into being from growth and attributes its coming into being to the Divine power; later there is a reference to Iggeret HaKodesh beginning “Ihu ve-chayohi.” Digital texts read in previous rounds:

https://ashoova.co.il/ask/ג’-סחנפ-הרות-יטוקל/

https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php?title=הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא%22ר_וקזה)/סחניפ

No further verification of the sentence itself is needed; precise page/column numbering is examined only within Bot’s assignment.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S4 — Epistle 8, Complete Text

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ח_ד_קלח_אינת

Read in full in the compiler’s current round. Anchor: “And the vegetative power in the earth itself [variant: itself, masculine] is what brings forth and causes the ear of grain and the tree and its fruits to grow” (“וכח הצומח שבארץ עצמה [נ”א עצמו] הוא המוציא והמגדל השבולת והאילן ופירותיו”). The context contrasts the product’s nature with the nature of the seed that decays; describes the actualization of the earth’s pow-

er through the seed and the seed as akin to raising mayin nukvin; the referent concerns charity and radiance in prayer. There is no negation of the intermediary of the mazal. The condition of a seed still stands in tension with spontaneous growth in Epistle 20.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S5 — Tanya 41 alongside 36–37

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אמ_א_קלח_אינת [41]

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/זל_א_קלח_אינת [37]

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ול_א_קלח_אינת

Chapter 41 was read, especially from the paragraph “But indeed, our Sages said” through the gloss and “and this is the supernal union in Atzilut”: a person’s intention in Divine service is connected to drawing down light and union above, brought about by engagement in Torah and mitzvot below. This is an explicit relation; it does not identify “elsewhere.” In chapter 37, the sentence Grok cited concerning humanity’s purpose being a dwelling in the lower realms was verified. A reconciliation therefore must not be built solely on the distinction between the words “humanity” and “hishtalshelut.”

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S6 — Likkutei Torah, Shelach: D2 Digitally Verified

https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887

Discourse beginning “Vayomru el kol adat go’ tovah v’go’.” Section 4, “And after all the above.” The Kehot text on the Chabad website was opened; action/thought, “embedded,” two aspects of worlds, and the doubled “very” are present in it. Do not replace it with another discourse about the same episode of the spies. Digital text is evidence even when the photograph has not yet been located.

Earth-R4 — Independent Source Cards — S7 — The Epistle's Wording and the User's Notes

Text: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת

In the unit: this is the distinction between those sown and planted and those growing on their own; do not turn it into a biological claim that every wild plant lacks a seed. "Without any raising of mayin nukvin at all" occurs in the parentheses concerning the days of Creation, not as a quotation about all present-day growth. The Rebbe's note 59 as supplied by the user: the connection concerning superior fruits requires explanation; a connection was proposed to the advantage of mitzvot that come at the end and to practical mitzvot. Even what is now given gratuitously is superior when it comes through a mitzvah or prayer; a comparison to Likkutei Torah, "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od." Wording of a proposal, not a binding interpretation of every detail. The user's list, p. 414: tentative notes; "אבל .. יאמר" ("but .. would speak") may move after "העשב" ("the grass") or after "פרטיות" ("particular details"). The same page contains no hu/hi or six/seven emendation. No corrected wording was adopted.

Dossier 0563 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [427]

[427] Document 0563: IGK20-Earth-R4_02_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Prompt for Grok — Earth-R4: Purpose, Action, and Locus of Revelation

Question E34/E37/E38 only. Your R3 rightly separated three claims; now a positive explanation must be given as far as the evidence allows, not merely the statement that a bridge sentence is missing.

1. Read Tanya 41 in the paragraphs on "for the sake of unification," including the gloss and "and this is the supernal union in Atzilut," alongside 36–37. Chapter 41 explicitly connects Divine service below and union above. Chapter 37 also calls a dwelling in the lower realms the purpose of humanity's creation: therefore a verbal distinction between humanity/hishtalshelut is insufficient. Does distinguishing human action in all worlds

from the purpose of its realization below provide a substantive explanation? Which parts are explicit and which are your combination? Is there any contradiction at all, or two levels of description that can be reconciled? Do not claim that chapter 41 proves every detail of ABYA.

2. Anchors from Or HaTorah תשפה–תשפו [785–786] are supplied here, including the continuation after the summary: the additional light is drawn through engagement in Torah and mitzvot below, followed by the union of sovev and memale. Read the context in the image if accessible; otherwise treat the anchors as the compiler's transcription. Does this strengthen only the connection between Divine service and addition, or also the below–above relationship? Do not say "I did not see it, so there is nothing to explain": build a conclusion conditional on the witness's status and state the condition.
3. Connect to the Epistle: fruits produced through mayin nukvin are superior, and from this we can understand drawings down of lights; what precisely is the referent learned from the analogy? Keep the doubled "very" in Likkutei Torah, Shelach, action/thought, and

Divine service/gratuitousness separate. Do not map “on their own” onto thought. “Elsewhere” is unidentified; it need not be identified to propose a coherent explanation. Do not present the parallels as identification.

The reason for Atik’s omission is not this round’s task: no new source was found, so it remains open. Do not replace the question with a general classification of Keter. Supply an explanatory paragraph that could be used in the future with precise qualifications.

B”H — IGK20-Earth-R4. Unit: Iggeret HaKodesh 20, “And furthermore” through “the purpose of the creation of the human being.” This is a limited round after R3, not a booklet. The union dossier is on hold and unresolved. Do not reopen it. Separate explicit / later explanation / reasoned interpretation / open. You may disagree with the compiler with evidence. Do not claim to have seen a photograph on the basis of a transcription. The compiler’s anchors are written here so you are not dependent on opening a ZIP; if the photograph is inaccessible, read them as marked testimony. There is no obligation to invent counterevidence: distinguish lack of evidence / limit of applicability from a positive contradiction. No new E numbers; add a subquestion by topic. The state established in R3: Pinchas connects the vegetative power and the intermediary of the mazal. E47 as a contradiction is withdrawn. The doubling-of-Keter explanation for Atik’s omission is withdrawn. The igulim of Atik are not identified with Adam Kadmon; E10–E11 are open. Six/seven and Chochm ah/endpoint of the vessel are open. General ABYA and ABYA within Asiyah are not identical. “Elsewhere” has not been identified. Focused deliverable: up to 1,200 words, what changed, a claim/source/inferential-step/limit table, an explanatory paragraph for the reader, and precisely what will remain open. No general list of books, and no repeating R1–R3 summaries. After the round, the compiler intends

to summarize; a further continuation only if a specific target is found that can change a conclusion.

Dossier 0564 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [428]

Prompt for Claude — Earth-R4: Applicability of Mayin Nukvin and Scope of the Claim "On Their Own"

Question E48-Codex/E53-Claude (expansion of E16/E26/E33/E36). R3 accepted Pinchas and rightly withdrew the contradiction concerning "that causes growth." There is no need to establish this again. Investigate the limit of the new conclusion.

1. Read S1 continuously: the transcription of the entire first paragraph on קצו [196], not just "invested in the grass." There is the earth's power requiring an awakening; mazal and power in grass; an analogy of mayin duchrin and mayin nukvin; rains; first, external mayin duchrin and second, internal mayin duchrin; a rule for every bestower and recipient. Is your claim "the mayin nukvin here is only after growth" written or inferred from Epistle 20? Examine whether there are three movements of influence–respons e–influence that need not be identified with three botanical moments. You may find a justified mapping; prove its applicability, not merely the existence of the distinction.
2. Set "the earth has no power to bring forth its growth" / the need for awakening on קצו [196] against "those growing on their own from the vegetative power alone" in 20 and "only if" in 8. What is

[428] Document 0564: IGK20-Earth-R4_03_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

"alone" opposed to in each sentence: seed, mazal, human work, every influence? Give a table of negations, not a forced uniform definition. We do not know that spontaneously growing plants are exempt from all mayin nukvin, and we do not know from here that a particular mayin nukvin does apply to them. Do not build a solution solely on the difference between lack of knowledge and negation.

3. Correct E06: the seed's decay does not prove that it cannot receive influence before decaying. If you retain the argument of an absent addressee, base it on the Epistle's wording and the meaning of "Grow!," not this argument. Do not present "grow on their own" as scientific evidence that there is no seed.
4. A short correction to E49: "the sovev is an explanation, not a direct agent" describes local syntax. The preceding paragraph in the Epistle attributes power in the vessels through the kav to the sovev. Must the conceptual contrast with Pinchas be withdrawn? Do not identify the vegetative power with the sovev, but neither create a disagreement from sentence order.

Keep Adam's prayer and the days of Creation separate; do not decide "without any mayin nukvin at all" through the seed/mazal distinction. The question of taste/species/fruit remains without a new mapping if there is no source. There is no repeated punctuation task in this round.

Dossier 0565 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [429]

[429] Document 0565: IGK20-Earth-R4_04_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Prompt for Grok Bot — Earth-R4: Source of the Photographs and an Exact Shelach Witness

Verification of witnesses only. No conceptual determination. One principal target and one short numbering check. Create a small package with pages read, not all the search photographs. Do not change or delete R1–R3.

P1. D2: Likkutei Torah, Shelach, discourse beginning “Vayomru el kol adat go’ tovah v’go”’; section 4, “And after all the above, the matter of the spies’ action will also be understood.” Verified Kehot digital text. Try to locate a photograph of the heading and section 4 in the same discourse. Do not be satisfied with “very, very” or the spies in a different discourse. A new problem seen by the compiler: in the R3 package, evidence/R3_LT_p-103.png has Emor לז [37] at the top of the page, whereas evidence/R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png is Shelach מא [41]. Do not establish from this alone that the file is forged, that an edition was changed, or that there is a fixed numbering error. Check the PDF file/address from which each was created, the one-based PDF page, heading, and printed folio. Supplying two named files does not verify that both came from the same PDF. This examination must precede calculation of an eight-page offset or further searching.

If the original PDF is available: state book identifier, section title/edition according to the title page, size and page count, SHA256; document the extraction command/method and page. If no source is available, say that the source was not verified and do not guess. Look for a focused new witness; there is no need to reconstruct dozens of wrong pages. Another properly identified printed witness may be used. Even if you fail, D2’s digital text remains evidence.

P2, short. Pinchas has already been read by the compiler: in file PDF185, the heading is עח [78], the sentence at the bottom of the left column; PDF186 has heading 156, the Iggeret HaKodesh reference

at the beginning of the right column. Verify the PDF source and the traditional mapping עח א/ב/ג/ד [78a/b/c/d] if possible. Do not write PDF186=עח ב [78b] merely because it is the second side: folio, side, column, and photograph numbering must be separated. There is no need for more OCR on the same sentence.

Do not reopen Gilgulim, the list of corrections, or the explanation concerning Atik. The outer-dimension and right-column corrections remain; they do not require a whole chapter in this round. If D2 verification remains incomplete, finish with a short report and a precise limit rather than an open target list.

Deliverable: witness / URL or file identifier / PDF page / printed heading / column / two anchor words / what was read table. Attach only necessary images and a README; small ZIP. No new E numbers.

Dossier 0566 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [430]

Earth-R4 — Continuity Map Update

This update takes precedence over previous statuses but does not change the questions or erase the history.

Identifier	Status after review of R3
E05/E47-Claude	The vegetative-power/mazal contradiction is withdrawn on the basis of Pinchas; allocation of the details of fruit remains open
E06	The addressee of “Grow!” is the grass in the Epistle’s text; the seed-decay argument as proof of an absent addressee is invalid
E16/E26/E33; E48-Codex	Or HaTorah קצו [196] describes mayin duchrin–mayin nukvin–mayin duchrin; no proved mapping to two stages before/after germination

[430] Document 0566: IGK20-Earth-R4_05_Continuity.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Identifier	Status after review of R3
E04/E49-Codex	Spirituality is not by itself the source of the power of creation; the sovev as an explanation must not be separated from its action on the strength of syntax
E34	Shelach D2 is valid digital text; a photograph of D2 has not yet been located in the package; the digital text's validity does not depend on a photograph
E37/E38	Tanya 41 added as a parallel for Divine service below and union in Atzilut; "as written elsewhere" unidentified

Identifier	Status after review of R3
E19–E22	Corrections of outer dimension and the chapter's opening column according to Bot are preserved; no claim that chapter 20 describes returning light
E10–E11/E13/E24–E25	Open; no new target in this round justifying rereading
E36	The seed condition in 8 versus spontaneous growth in 20 is open; restriction to the sown is a contextual interpretation

New aliases in Claude's report are not new principal questions:

Dossier 0567 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [431]

Earth-R4 — Handover Instructions

1. Read 00_Assessment first. It reviews R3 and explains what changed.
2. Give each model its prompt file in full. Every prompt includes the source cards, so lack of access to an image does not erase the textual input; the compiler's reading must be marked.

[431] Document 0567: IGK20-Earth-R4_06_README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

3. Attach the ZIP if possible. Its seven images are unedited copies of the originals. SHA256 accompanies them.
4. Grok: purpose and action; Claude: applicability of mayin nukvin; Bot: source of photographs and a D2 witness.
5. No booklet and no reopening of the union dossier. No commitment to another round: after R4's answers, consolidate an explanation and open questions.

Source of the Bot package examined: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1eGatHDimAWRCKS36XGr3bp706LdgHnYP

ZIP: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uVSdoCEn4lXeg8ymydjBJDRtCU66vKD3/view

Source of the compiler's R3 package, for the history: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1gd5B63yH6mOn2z1AM8prq09ar1g7PZiA The previous files were preserved. The continuity file includes all of E01–E41 and the alias map. The photographs do not verify the complete book edition or the PDF number beyond what is stated in the register.

Dossier 0568 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [399]

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Consolidation and Interim Determination

September 23, 2026. Iggeret HaKodesh 20: from "And furthermore" to "the purpose of the creation of the human being."

This is a consolidation after R4, not R5 and not a booklet. The union dossier remains on hold. The models' reports are proposals to exam-

[399] Document 0568: IGK20-Earth-R4_Consolidated.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ine; their agreement is not evidence. “Open” means undecided in the research performed, not that there is no answer in the literature.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 1. What Is Added in Earth

The preceding paragraph already describes the radiances of the kav and the imparting of power from the sovev. The addition here is the appearance of power in the lowest realm: even where the radiance is remote and contracted, the capacity to produce growth is revealed continuously. This explains the progression, but does not resolve all the syntactic duplication in the opening; the Rebbe’s note on the opening’s wording and subject is preserved.

“An immense revelation” refers first and foremost to the power discernible in its action. There is no necessity that earth apprehends Divine light in greater revelation than the higher beings. The distinction plausibly reconciles scant invested vitality with revelation of capacity. A separate question remains in Tanya 38, which denies vegetative power in the inanimate: one may distinguish between earth that does not grow and a power that makes other things grow through it, but no explicit sentence was found applying this distinction to the two places.

Choosing earth fits the Epistle’s claim about the lowest realm and the endpoint of drawing down. This does not negate the advantage of human or animal reproduction. A numerical relation between sperm cells and the result does not prove the Epistle’s “incommensurability,” and the numbers mentioned in the question were not used as evidence. The full comparison between reproduction and growth has not been exhausted.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 2. The Vegetative Power and the Mazal

The power in the earth is the source of sprouting; the mazal acts in the growth of the individual recipient. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, attributes growth from the vegetative power to the mazal's influence in the same sentence. There is therefore no contradiction merely in calling the vegetative power "that which causes growth" in Epistle 8. The source and the intermediary can operate in the same growth.

In Epistle 20 the addressee of "Grow!" is the grass that has already sprouted. No argument about seed decay is needed to explain this, and "grow on their own" must not be turned into a biological claim about plants arising without prior matter. The precise allocation of species, taste, and details of fruit among the seed, power, and mazal remains to be clarified. It is incorrect to say that all fruit is yesh miyesh: the Epistle also lists fruits among the products of growth from nothing into something.

"Ayin and spiritual" describes the relation between the spiritual power and the physical product. Its mere spirituality does not confer the power to create; the Epistle itself rejects producing the physical through spiritual hishtalshelut alone. The continuation explains the source of the capacity in the sovev and kav. The sovev also acts, illuminates, and imparts power; the earlier distinction "explanation, not agent" is withdrawn. The vegetative power itself must not be identified with the sovev.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 4. The Atzilut Analogy, Atik, and the Repetitions

The analogy of Malchut of Atzilut explains the endpoint's role as a beginning in illumination from below upward. This does not imply a simple identity between Malchut and Keter in every aspect. Atik's

omission from the Arich Anpin–Abba and Imma–ZON list remains open. Atik is mentioned earlier in the Epistle, so one cannot claim that the concept is unused in it. The explanation "so as not to double Keter" is withdrawn: Arich Anpin is already enumerated, and Keter from below upward is not an additional partzuf in the list of garments.

The repetitions about the endpoint are not all functionless duplication: first the feet's relation to the sovev is defined; then the kav's activity; after that the analogy; and finally the precise destination and order of investment. This explains the paragraph's structure; it does not prove that every verbal repetition has been resolved.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 5. The Destination and the Order of Investment

First it states where the radiance arrives: the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah. Then it states the order of investment in Atzilut, Beriah, and Yetzirah within Asiyah until the same destination. One must not draw arrival at the neshamah, departure from it, and return to it. "This radiance" connects the detailing to the kav's radiance previously mentioned. The difficulty of how returning light from below upward is described through an order of garments enumerated from above downward is not resolved by a spatial drawing. One can distinguish between the direction of the radiance and the order of its mediation; this is a plausible interpretation, not a source sentence explicitly reconciling the two descriptions.

The gloss in Tanya 6 verifies the reference "cited in Likkutei Amarim" and the nested structure of investment. Sefer HaGilgulim 20 was located and portions read; the entire wording about the kav and returning light in the Epistle must not be attributed to it without a full reading. "ABYA within Asiyah" are not general ABYA, and Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah is not a synonym for all of Asiyah within Asiyah.

“Which is actual Divinity” refers, on the plain reading, to the neshamah-light, not to earth or to a human soul. The emphasis p-reserves the distinction between Divine light and the vessel and its product even at the bottom of the system. The masculine wording fit-s “light,” and there is no need to correct it to the feminine she-hi or construct a kabbalistic innovation from grammatical gender alone.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Consolidation and Interim Determination — Corrections Whose Rejected Claims Must Not Return to the Record

- Mayin nukvin in Or HaTorah is not explicitly limited to after ger-mination, nor has it been established as specifically before it.
- Absence of sowing is not absence of every human action or every supernal influence.
- The sovev is not merely background; it illuminates and imparts power. It must not be identified with the vegetative power.
- There is no proved reason for Atik’s omission; the doubling-of-Keter explanation is invalidated.
- The new printed witness of Shelach does not retroactively confirm the earlier erroneous page identifications.
- “Examined” is not “decided.” A partial scan of Gilgulim does not prove a term’s absence from the whole chapter.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Consolidation and Interim Determination — Decision on Continuing

There is no need for an R5 round repeating the same sources. There is a positive working explanation of the unit, alongside defined open questions. Reopening would be justified by a specific source capable of changing the conclusion: concerning Atik’s omission, six/seven, Chochmah versus the endpoint of the vessel, the mapping of feet and igulim, the order of returning light, or identification of “elsewhere.”

One can proceed to the next passage while preserving them. This is not a declaration that the overall clarification is complete.

Dossier 0569 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [432]

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Sources, Witnesses, and Reading Limits

September 23, 2026.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Sources, Witnesses, and Reading Limits — Principal Sources

Source	Anchor	Use and limit
Iggeret HaKodesh 20	https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/	The unit's text and context; the source was also supplied in full in the conversation
Tanya 36	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ול_א_קלח_אינת [36]	Read digitally; dwelling and concealment in the lower realm
Tanya 37	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/זל_א_קלח_אינת [37]	Read digitally; humanity's purpose and revelation in physicality
Tanya 41	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אמ_א_קלח_אינת [41]	Read digitally; Divine service and the supernal union
Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "Vayomru," 3–4	https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887	Digital text; 3 connects Divine service and revelation below; 4 concerns action/thought and doubled "very"
Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, קצו [196]	evidence/OHT-196.png	Paragraph on vegetative power, mazalot, rains, and the mayin duchrin–mayin nukvin–mayin duchrin analogy read in a photograph

[432] Document 0569: IGK20-Earth_R4_Sources.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Source	Anchor	Use and limit
Or HaTorah תשפה–תשפו [785–786]	evidence/OHT-785.png; evidence/OHT-786.png	Anchors of influence sustaining existence and addition through Divine service read in an earlier round; not identification of “elsewhere”
Likkutei Torah, Pinchas	evidence/Pinchas-185.png; evidence/Pinchas-186.png	Growth from the earth’s power through the mazal and physical coming into being; photograph and earlier reading
Lessons in Tanya	https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9%2F22%2F2026	Later explanation; the sentence concerning the necessity of mayin nukvin was read in context and not transferred to all growth

The additions of the later explanation must not be attributed to the Alter Rebbe’s text. Sources not reopened rest on documented readings in earlier rounds and are not presented as a new examination.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Sources, Witnesses, and Reading Limits — Shelach: The Three New Photographs

File	What was read independently	What was reported by Bot
D2_HB14963_p-212.png	Heading Shelach לז [37]; beginning of “Vayomru” in the middle/continuation of the left column	Source HB14963 and PDF page number
D2_HB14963_p-214.png	Shelach לח [38]; section 4 in the left column	As above
D2_HB14963_p-215.png	Continuation at the top of the right column on “very” and two kinds of worlds; number 76	As above

The content matches the digital discourse. The exact year of the edition, the complete file, and its SHA256 were not independently veri-

fied. Bot's results on the two HB58812 pages are preserved as a source report: the Emor לז [37] page and the Shelach מא [41] page are different pages, and no fixed offset may be inferred from filenames.

In Pinchas, the traditional reference must be distinguished from the heading and column observed. PDF numbering does not in itself verify א/ב in a traditional reference; do not invent a correspondence of sides.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Sources, Witnesses, and Reading Limits — The List of Corrections and Gilgulim

The photograph of the list on p. 414 was supplied in the previous conversation and read there. It does not propose a hu/hi or six/seven correction on this page; this does not prove that there is no correction elsewhere. The proposed placement of "אבל…יאמר" ("but…would speak") remains a proposal, not adopted wording.

Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20: located in earlier photographs, and a corrected reading distinguished the outer dimension and the chapter heading in the right column. The whole chapter has not been read. There is no claim that kav or returning light are absent on the basis of a partial reading.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Sources, Witnesses, and Reading Limits — Archive and Package Scope

- R4 preparation package: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1PnTQT4jgYkLirrywcsRVL_j9bcbPHhou
- Bot R4 report and evidence: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1GLWmt2VwOIRIjLk22diMulPYZp8sXGWY
- Bot ZIP: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FSr-fIYEBNA0iMt5SrKsy8sXA6aqJt9N/view

- The complete Grok and Claude reports were supplied in the conversation; what is preserved here is the review determination concerning them, not their full verbatim text.
- The old preparation report and continuity map are preserved unchanged in the history folder. Their old statuses must not be read as the current conclusions.
- Bot's reports are preserved as supplied in the bot_reports folder, without automatically adopting every determination.

No previous versions are deleted. The package is a consolidation of research only.

Dossier 0570 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [433]

IGK20-Earth — Status of the Questions after R4

Numbering is preserved. This current status takes precedence over an earlier status without erasing the history of the investigation.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E01	The opening: "and furthermore" / "beyond" / "all the above"	Partial interpretation	Added revelation of power in earth; the precise significance of the duplication remains in need of further study.
E02	Subject of "it" and threefold radiance	Partial	The radiance and all the above as subject; no complete syntactic determination.
E03	Immense revelation versus tzimtzum	Supported interpretation	Revelation of power in action; the question of vegetative power in Tanya 38 is separate.

[433] Document 0570: IGK20-Earth_Status_E01-E41.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E04	Ayin and spiritual	Supported	Power–product relation; spirituality in itself is not the power of creation.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E05	Mazal, growth, and fruit	Partial	Source and intermediary coexist; allocation of species and taste open.
E06	Before it sprouts, to whom would it speak?	Supported in its essentials	Existing individual addressee; seed-decay argument withdrawn.
E07	Why earth?	Partial interpretation	Fits the lowest realm and endpoint; comparison of all elements not exhausted.
E08	Sovev/igulim/yosher/ kav	Explicit in its essentials	The four terms must not be identified.
E09	Beneath his feet and small interruption	Partial	Relation of levels, not physical distance; enumeration of intermediaries needs completion.
E10	Remoteness versus interruption	Open after narrowing the difficulty	Two different pairs; no complete reconciliation of the mapping.
E11	Adam Kadmon's feet and the igulim of Atik	Open	Igulim of Atik = igulim of Adam Kadmon has not been proved here.
E12	Returning light	Partial	Attributed to the kav; no explicit mechanism for the added force.
E13	Omission of Atik	Open	Doubling-of-Keter explanation withdrawn.
E14	Malchut as Keter from below	Supported interpretation	Role in the returning radiance, not absolute identity.
E15	Repetitions of the kav's endpoint	Supported interpretation	Location, activity, analogy, destination, and order; not every precise wording resolved.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E16	Returning light and mayin nukvin	Supported distinction	No proved identity; mayin nukvin requires identification of the recipient in each source.
E17	Which is actual Divinity	Supported interpretation	The neshamah-light, not earth and not a human soul.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E18	Pronouns and wording	Partial	The photographed list does not decide every hu/hi variation.
E19	Sefer HaGilgulim 20	Partial reading	Chapter located; full transcription not yet completed.
E20	Cited in Likkutei Amarim	Verified anchor	Gloss in 6 names the source; not proof of the entire returning-light route.
E21	ABYA within Asiyah	Supported distinction	Nesting; Malchut of Malchut is not all of Asiyah within Asiyah.
E22	Destination and order of garments	Partial	Destination followed by route to it; tension between direction and investment preserved.
E23	Strength and force, and the vessel of “Let [the earth] sprout”	Partial	Imparting power to the vessel; recurrence of the phrase is not identity of the entire mechanism.
E24	Chochmah versus endpoint of the vessel	Open	Attributions explicit; their precise reason not found.
E25	Six versus seven	Open	Do not emend; note 48 is not on this sentence.
E26	Gratuitous kindness and Adam’s prayer	Partly open	Without mayin nukvin is said of the days of Creation; coming into being/emergence is a candidate distinction.
E27	Continually and every year	Supported explanation	The activity’s existence and renewal of the radiance need not contradict one another.
E28	A likeness of Ein Sof	Supported interpretation	Conditional capacity for continuity; not an actual infinity of years.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E29	Why not reproduction?	Not exhausted	Advantage of the lower realm explains the choice; no denial of the power of Ein Sof in reproduction.
E30	Yesh me-ayin and like yesh me-ayin	Explicit distinction	Prior seed versus relative incommensurability with the product.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E31	Incommensurability with fruit and tree	Partial	Disparity in quantity and quality; not mathematical zero.
E32	On their own and decay	Limit of applicability	No empirical claims established about coming into being without a seed.
E33	Mayin nukvin in sowing and growth	Supported interpretation	Two applications; no proved botanical division in time.
E34	Very, very and Shelach	Verified anchor; partial application	Discourse also located in print; no automatic transfer to the duplication concerning fruit.
E35	Charity and prayer in Epistle 8	Supported parallel	Sowing as an arousal; does not resolve every applicability of the analogy in 20.
E36	“Only if” in 8 versus “on their own”	Open	Restriction to the sowing analogy is a contextual reading, not an explicit qualification.
E37	Humanity’s purpose	Supported substantive reconciliation	Action of drawing down and realization of the dwelling; not an exhaustive account of all reasons for creation.
E38	ABYA versus the lower realms	Supported substantive reconciliation	Shelach section 3 and Tanya 41 connect Divine service and revelation; “elsewhere” unidentified.
E39	List and notes	Corrections verified within their limits	Note 48 on the opening; reference for “Let [the waters] swarm” to 1:20; list 414 only.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E40	Seed data and comparisons	Not used as evidence	Unverified; not a sufficient criterion for yesh me-ayin.
E41	Sovev and returning light at the conclusion	Partial	Both are sources of revelation; returning light explicitly concerns the kav.

IGK20-Earth — Status of the Questions after R4 — Aliases of Added Questions

- E42-Grok / E46-Claude: expansions of E23/E41 — strength and force.
- E44-Grok: expansion of E11 — the igulim of Adam Kadmon/Atik.
- E42-Claude: E05–E06; E43-Claude: E24; E44-Claude: E37–E38.
- E45-Claude: E03/E07, and the source concerning earth is Tanya 38.
- E47-Claude: E05 — “that causes growth” in Epistle 8; the contradiction claim was withdrawn.
- E48-Codex / E53-Claude: E16/E26/E33 — applicability of mayin nukvin; division into before/after germination withdrawn.
- E49-Codex / E51-Claude: E04 — spirituality, ayin, and physical coming into being.
- E50-Claude: E05–E06 — function of the mazal parentheses in the sequence.
- E52-Claude: E05 — the mazal within the system of hishtalshelut.
- Bot’s later numbers are preserved in its reports; do not import status from them by number alone.

Dossier 0580 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [434]

IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot — WITNESS VERIFICATION ONLY — Layout

evidence/ — provenance + D2 HB14963 + Pinchas crops/pages + source cards

deliverables/ WITNESS_TABLE.md README.md REPORT_HE.md

WITNESS_TABLE.md · README.md · REPORT_HE.md

IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot.zip

IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot — WITNESS VERIFICATION ONLY — Key verdicts

1. Provenance: same PDF HB58812; page 103 (Emor לז [37], 150dpi) ≠ page 111 (Shelach מא [41], 140dpi).
2. D2 print: found in HB14963 PDF212 (Shelach לז [37] title) + PDF214 (Shelach לח [38] §4). Not in HB58812 OCR body. S6 digital stands.
3. Pinchas: PDF185 header עח [78] / LEFT mazal; PDF186 header Arabic 156 / RIGHT Iggeret HaKodesh — do not equate 186 to printed «עח ב [78b]».

IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot — WITNESS VERIFICATION ONLY — Drive

- Earth parent: 1ptqHOycgA–ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk
- Upload folder: IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (created under Earth)

---

[434] Document 0580: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0581 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [435]

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only)

Date: 2026-09-23 America/New_York · Agent: Grok Bot · No Gilgulim / list / Atik · No new E numbers · R1–R3 were not edited.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — What Changed (R4)

1. Provenance before an offset theory: R3_LT_p-103.png and R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png were proved to be from the same PDF (H-B58812), but different pages (103≠111) and extracted at different DPI (150 versus 140), byte-identical to pdftoppm.
2. D2 was found in print: in another identified edition, HB14963, p. 212 (heading “Vayomru…”; heading Shelach לז [37]) and p. 214 (§4, «And after all the above… the spies’ action»; heading Shelach לח [38]). In HB58812, the D2 text was not found in OCR.
3. Pinchas: the scan/leaf/side/column/printed-heading map was separated; no identification of «PDF186=ב עח [78b]» from the side alone.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — P1 — Provenance (I Read)

File	Source	Page	Printed heading	Extraction method
R3_LT_p-103.png	HB58812	103	Emor לז [37]	pdftoppm –r150
R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png	HB58812	111	Shelach מא [41]	pdftoppm –r140

[435] Document 0581: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Provenance verdict in one sentence: the two files are extractions from the same book-scan, HB58812, from different pages (Emor לז [37] versus Shelach מא [41]): not a forgery, not an edition substitution, and not a mislabeled copy of the same page; searching for an «eight-page offset» is secondary to the headings' names alone.

The sequence of sections in HB58812 (OCR): Emor לו/לז/לח/לט… [36/37/38/39] → Behar מ [40] → Shelach מא [41] (p. 111). The table of contents of the same volume cites «Vayomru…» at classical Shelach לז [37]; this is not the running heading of p. 103 (there: Emor לז [37]).

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — P1 — Hunting for D2 in Print

Target: discourse beginning "Vayomru el kol adat go' tovah v'go"'; §4, «And after all the above, the matter of the spies' action will also be understood» (not "very, very" alone; not the spies in a different discourse).

- HB58812: OCR negative for the unique §4 wording; Shelach 111 carries a different §4 («4. And through this the matter of the spies will be understood») — remains a separate target.
- HB14963 (another Kehot edition, 767 pp.): found. P. 212, heading Shelach לז [37] + discourse heading; p. 214, heading Shelach לח [38] + requested §4; p. 215, "very, very" ↔ concealed worlds in the same discourse.
- S6 digital (aid/5898887 / R3 ChabadText) remains a standing digital witness.

Limit: the union dossier was not opened; no claim that a photograph was created from a transcript; the three R2 pages (111/117/128) remain separate targets.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — P2 — Short Pinchas Map (HB58812)

Scan	Printed heading	Leaf / side (structure)	Target column	Anchor
PDF185	Likkutei · Pinchas · Torah · עח [78]	Leaf עח [78], side א (recto; the print bears a Hebrew number on side-א pages nearby)	Lower left	Mazal / Grow
PDF186	Likkutei · Pinchas · Torah + Arabic 156	Leaf עח [78], side ב (verso; «עח ב [78b]» is not printed in the heading)	Upper right	In Iggeret HaKodesh, Ihu ve-chayohi

Mapping sentence: PDF185=Pinchas עח א [78a] (heading עח [78]; mazal in the left column); PDF186=verso of the same leaf with printed heading 156 (not «עח ב [78b]»), and beginning of the Iggeret HaKodesh reference in the right column — classical attribution «עח ב [78b]» is a structural inference, not a reading from the heading.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — Claim / Source / Inference / Limit Table

Claim	Source	Inference	Limit
p-103 and PDF-111 are from the same HB58812	Byte identity with pdftoppm	Different pages	No forgery on the basis of the names לז/מא
D2 in print at HB14963 212/214	PNG + OCR	Different edition from 58812	58812 lacks D2 text in OCR
S6 digital stands	Kehot link + R3	Matches compiler's wording	Not a photograph of print
Pinchas עח [78] on PDF185	Printed heading	—	עח ב»≠186 [78b]» from heading
לז≡[41] מא [37] in 58812	TOC versus running heading	Open as classical↔ running mapping	Not decided by offset 8

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — Reader's Glossary

- Printed heading = what is written at the top of the scanned page, not a classical citation alone.
- I read / reported / not read = I saw an image or direct OCR / compiler's or previous round's report / not obtained.
- Leaf ב/א = recto/verso; do not infer "ב" merely because it is the next page in the scan.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — What Remains Open

- Complete mapping of classical-TOC לז [37] ↔ running heading מא [41] within HB58812 (without D2 text there).
- Live he.chabad.org aid/5898887 text (Cloudflare).
- Whether HB14963 and HB58812 share the same Shelach block with only a pagination change, or omission/different arrangement — beyond R4's scope.

REPORT_HE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot (Witness Only) — Confirmations

- No R1–R3 folders or ZIPs were edited/deleted.
- Gilgulim / list / Atik were not opened; no E numbers were added.

Dossier 0582 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [436]

[436] Document 0582: WITNESS_TABLE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

WITNESS_TABLE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot

Date: 2026-09-23 America/New_York · Witness only · No new E numbers

Witness: P1-prov-103

URL or file identifier: HB58812 /workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/hb58812.pdf SHA256 164d19a2…f47e · evidence evidence/R3_LT_p-103.png

PDF page: 103 (pdftoppm –r150, byte-identical)

Printed heading: Emor לז [37]

Column: two columns

Two anchor words: כבשים / והניף (“and he shall wave” / “lambs”)

What was read: I read

Witness: P1-prov-111

URL or file identifier: same HB58812 · evidence evidence/R2_LT_Shelach_PDF-111.png

PDF page: 111 (pdftoppm –r140, byte-identical)

Printed heading: Shelach מא [41]

Column: right: §4

Two anchor words: המרגלים / ובזה יובן (“and through this will be understood” / “the spies”)

What was read: I read Witness: P1-D2-title

URL or file identifier: HB14963 https://hebrewbooks.org/14963 SHA256 161a386e…669d · D2_HB14963_p-212.png

PDF page: 212

Printed heading: Shelach לז [37]

Column: discourse heading spanning columns

Two anchor words: ויאמרו אל / מאד מאד (“and they said to” / “very, very”)

What was read: I read

Witness: P1-D2-§ד

URL or file identifier: same HB14963 · D2_HB14963_p-214.png

PDF page: 214

Printed heading: Shelach לח [38]

Column: left

Two anchor words: ואחר כל / מעשה דמרגלים (“and after all” / “the spies’ action”)

What was read: I read

Witness: P1-D2-מאד×סתימין

URL or file identifier: HB14963 · D2_HB14963_p-215.png

PDF page: 215

Printed heading: Shelach (continuation of לח [38])

Column: right

Two anchor words: מאד מאד / עלמין סתימין (“very, very” / “concealed worlds”)

What was read: I read Witness: P1-D2-digital-S6

URL or file identifier: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887 · R3/chabadpedia digital text

PDF page: —

Printed heading: —

Column: —

Two anchor words: ואחר כל / מעשה דמרגלים (“and after all” / “the spies’ action”)

What was read: reported (S6 stands; he.chabad Cloudflare) / R3 text read digitally

Witness: P1-D2-HB58812

URL or file identifier: HB58812 Shelach 111–128, full OCR

PDF page: —

Printed heading: Shelach מא [41]…

Column: —

Two anchor words: מעשה דמרגלים / ואחר כל הנ (“the spies’ action” / “and after all the…”)

What was read: not read in the text (OCR negative)

Witness: P2-Pinchas-185

URL or file identifier: HB58812 · Pinchas-185.png

PDF page: 185

Printed heading: Pinchas עח [78]

Column: lower left

Two anchor words: אין לך / מזל (“you have no” / “mazal”)

What was read: I read Witness: P2-Pinchas-186

URL or file identifier: HB58812 · Pinchas-186.png

PDF page: 186

Printed heading: Likkutei Pinchas Torah + Arabic numeral 156 (no printed «עח ב» [78b])

Column: upper right

Two anchor words: באגה”ק / איהו וחיוהי (“in Iggeret HaKodesh” / “Ihu ve-chayohi”)

What was read: I read

WITNESS_TABLE — IGK20-Earth-R4-Bot — Short Source Card

Identifier	Title / edition	Pages	Size	SHA256
HB58812	Likkutei Torah; Kehot; revised edition ©1998; 7th printing, 2017	904	75172590	164d19a2a8a aacc56e21fad c723fcedcfda 0828085137c 0daabaf41b0c 2ef47e
HB14963	Likkutei Torah; Kehot; ©2002 on English title page; catalog 1991	767	57574026	161a386e5c6 d496e1f8eee2 5dcb4862aaf1 53e467d0861 ee9f162e1dcc f4669d

Dossier 0583 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [437]

HebrewBooks ID: 14963 URL: https://hebrewbooks.org/14963 Title: Likkutei Torah — Shneur Zalman ben Baruch (the Alter Rebbe) Edition (English t.p. OCR): Kehot Publication Society, Brooklyn; Copyright ©2002; catalog Pub.Date 1991; 767 pp File size: 57574026 bytes Extraction: pdftoppm -png -r 120; PDF 212 title (Shelach לז [37]), PDF 214 §4 (Shelach לח [38]), PDF 215 מאד×סתימין ["very" × "concealed"]

[437] Document 0583: D2_HB14963_SOURCE.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0590 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [438]

HebrewBooks ID: 58812 URL: https://hebrewbooks.org/58812 Local: /workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/hb58812.pdf Title: Likkutei Torah — Kehot; Revised ©1998; Seventh Printing 2017 Pages: 904 | size: 75172590 | SHA256: 164d19a2a8aaacc56e21fadc723fcedcfda0828085137c0daabaf41b0c2ef47e R3_LT_p-103.png == pdftoppm -f 103 -r 150 (byte-identical); header Emor לז [37] R2_LT_Shelach_PDF -111.png == pdftoppm -f 111 -r 140 (byte-identical); header Shelach מא [41] Pinchas 185/186 == pdftoppm -f 185/186 -r 150 (byte-identical to R3)

Dossier 0425 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [391]

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — And Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire, and Air — This Is Not a Material Identity but a Correspondence of “Aspects”

The difficulty you raised is very real: water, in itself, is apparently inanimate. Fire is not an animal. Air is not a human being. Thus the sentence:

“The inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, and air”

[438] Document 0590: PROV_HB58812_SOURCE.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[391] Document 0425: Initial-Deep-Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

cannot be read as though the Alter Rebbe were saying zoologically: water = plant, fire = animal.

The decisive word is "aspects." Within the framework of the four elements, every created being consists of a combination of the elements; the correspondence here is between the dominant character of the creature's level and the inward quality of the corresponding element. The explanation at this location also presents the four elements as a system from which reality is composed, not as four simple "biological classes." Water can therefore itself be an inanimate object in terms of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, while at the same time "the element of water" can represent the power characteristic of the vegetative.

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — And Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire, and Air — Inanimate — Earth

Here the connection is most direct.

Earth is the element of downwardness, rest, permanence, and absence of self-movement. It thus becomes the clearest expression of the "inanimate." But this Epistle contains a much deeper innovation: precisely earth, which appears more devoid of vitality than anything else, is where the Alter Rebbe located "the vegetative power" in the preceding paragraph, a power that repeatedly produces wondrous multiplicity from a tiny seed. He described the power in "the endpoint of the vessel of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah within the element of earth" as a power acting "within the earth continually." Earth, then, is not merely an example of "low." It is the central paradox of the entire Epistle: outwardly it is the most inanimate; inwardly it bears an unexpected creative power.

This is also why, concerning the omission of earth in the continuation, the Rebbe stresses in his note that "everything was from the

earth," and even after creation everything depends on it and is nourished by it.

Vegetative — Water

The inward connection is growth, expansion, and the generation of multiplicity. Water is the power enabling earth to bring its potential from concealment into revelation. Thus the statement here is not that "water is a plant," but that the dynamic of the water element — expansion, irrigation, multiplicity, and vitality — is the aspect dominant in the vegetative level.

This is particularly important in this Epistle: the Alter Rebbe is not describing "objects," but forms of vitality. Inanimate — hidden and fixed vitality; vegetative — vitality that already expands and grows; animal — inward, warm, moving vitality; speaking — vitality that reaches awareness and expression.

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — And Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire, and Air — Animal — Fire

At the animal level two qualities appear that are not present in the vegetative in the same way: internal heat and self-movement. In the terms of the four elements, these two qualities particularly fit fire: fire is hot, active, leaping, and rising.

This does not mean that the living body consists "mainly of fire" in the modern scientific sense. This is cosmological-kabbalistic language in which fire is the principle of warmth and movement. Thus, after the vegetative, whose life is expressed mainly in growth in one place, the animal already moves of its own accord.

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — And Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire, and Air — Speaking — Air

Here the connection is both bodily and spiritual. Speech issues through air, breath, and voice; in kabbalistic and Chasidic language, letters are "engraved" in the voice and breath of speech. A fundamental biblical-Targumic source for this is Onkelos's rendering of the human "living soul" as "ruach memalela," a speaking spirit. Tanya also explains the direct connection between the letters of speech and voice and breath. But there is a further layer: "air/spirit" is the subtlest of these aspects in the present correspondence. In the speaking being, vitality is no longer only growth or movement; it becomes intellect, meaning, relationship, and speech.

The sequence is therefore not arbitrary:

Earth — existence; water — growth; fire — vitality and movement; air — awareness and expression.

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — And Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire, and Air — Why, Then, Does the Alter Rebbe Immediately Omit the Inanimate?

He says:

"Although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both."

Your question is strong: why not begin, "the vegetative is nourished by the inanimate"?

Here we have an almost explicit answer from the Rebbe. In his note at this location, he writes that the omission of the element of earth is understandable because everything comes from the earth, and even after its creation everything depends on it and is nourished by it. Earth

is therefore not merely another link in the chain; it is the chain's general foundation. I would thus divide the answer in two:

First, factually and conceptually, the Alter Rebbe does not deny that the vegetative, animal, and speaking need the inanimate — water, salts, earth, etc. On the contrary, the Rebbe's note explicitly says that everything depends on it.

Second, in terms of the argument, the Alter Rebbe now seeks to illustrate the paradox of the higher being nourished by the lower. The animal is higher than the vegetative and nevertheless lives from it; the speaking is higher than both and nevertheless depends on them. Earth has already been demonstrated at length in the preceding paragraph as the lowest place where the higher power is surprisingly revealed. There is therefore no need to begin the sequence from it again.

In other words: the inanimate was not omitted because it is less relevant; it was omitted because it is already the foundation upon which everything stands.

Dossier 0372 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [263]

3. Lessons Notes / Lessons 61–67 (P2) — Note 61 (EN from the Prompt)

"[It is superior] also with regard to its creation; 'nevertheless, [it] is nourished…[by the vegetative].' (This enables us to understand why the element of Earth is not mentioned here, for everything comes from the Earth. It may likewise be said that for this reason, even after

[263] Document 0372: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

having been created, [everything] depends on it and is nourished by it.)”

Question	Answer in the round
Hebrew source?	Not opened. Lessons Vol.4 (Iggeret 1–20) was not found on HebrewBooks (only Vol.1 = HB15840 was opened). chabad.org Lessons pages are blocked by Cloudflare.
Who wrote it?	Later explanation — Rabbi Yosef Weinberg’s lessons / Lessons editors; not the Alter Rebbe’s wording.
Assertion versus «it may be said»	In EN: opening sentence on «superior…nevertheless nourished» as explanation of the main text; in parentheses: «This enables us…» + «It may likewise be said…» = “it may be said” / possibility concerning the omission of earth here. Distinguish the Alter Rebbe’s text (animal nourished by vegetative) from the commentator’s proposal concerning earth.

Dossier 0406 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [265]

Working Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1 — B. Previous Context and Limits Already Clarified

Close to the preceding unit, the Alter Rebbe wrote about the radiances of the kav: the neshamah-light in the sefirot of BYA, a radiance of a radiance in nefesh–ruach and the vessels, and a radiance of a radiance of a radiance in the created beings. In addition, the sovev shines to the kav through the vessels and imparts to them the power to create yesh me-ayin. The earth unit states:

“And furthermore, beyond this, beyond all the above, a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, and all the above, shows its strength and ability in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation,

[265] Document 0406: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

with greater force than in the elements higher than it, and even than in the hosts of heaven, which do not have the strength and ability to bring forth something from nothing continually, as does the element of earth, which continually causes something to grow from nothing, namely grasses and trees... from the vegetative power within it, which is ayin and spiritual, whereas they are physical. And this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds, without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone. And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light... And likewise at the endpoint of the kav of the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of the yosher of Adam Kadmon's feet, it shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity, from the outer dimension of the vessels of Malchut of Atzilut."

Subsequently this destination is detailed through an order of investment in Atzilut–Beriah–Yetzirah within Asiyah; finally, power in the endpoint of the vessel in earth, the utterance "Let [the earth] sprout," and continual growth. It says that some are sown and planted through mayin nukvin, and that these fruits are "very, very superior" to those growing on their own, and from this "we can understand the drawing down of supernal lights into ABYA (which is the purpose of the creation of the human being), as explained elsewhere."

Working conclusions from the previous dossier, marked with their statuses:

1. The radiance from the sovev and the returning light of the kav are two components of the explanation. There is no identity sovev=igulim=kav=Essence. The kav is explicitly the subject of returning light; no source has been found for the sovev itself "returning."

Precise applicability at the conclusion is now your research question.

2. The neshamah-light in the sefirot is not a human soul. “Actual Divinity” is not a description of physical earth itself.
3. “The destination followed by the order of investment leading to it” is the corrected reading; there is no route arriving at the neshamah-light, departing from it, and returning to it. The tension between returning light and an order of garments has not been wholly resolved.
4. The remoteness of the vessels of Asiyah in Etz Chaim and the small interruption between Adam Kadmon’s feet and sovev are not the same pair; the complete mapping, igulim of Atik versus igulim of Adam Kadmon, omission of Atik from the garment analogy, six/seven, and Chochmah versus endpoint of the vessel remain open. Do not reopen these dossiers unless a new source directly necessary for the conclusion is found.
5. Returning light is not identified with raising mayin nukvin. In the Epistle, mayin nukvin refers to sowing/planting; in Or HaTorah קצו [196], growth as the recipient’s response is compared to mayin nukvin. Do not automatically divide before/after germination. “On their own” is not the absence of every influence or every human action.
6. Tanya 36–37, 41,

and Likkutei Torah, Shelach, the discourse beginning “Vayomru,” 3–4, allow a substantive reconciliation of drawing down in the higher realms with revelation in the lower. “Dwelling” is not only a physical place but revelation within concealment. This does not identify “elsewhere,” which was not found.

7. Likkutei Torah, Shelach, separates action/thought and explains “very” ×2; Or HaTorah תשפה–תשפו [785–786] explains influence sustaining existence and addition through Divine service. These

are different distinctions; do not automatically copy them to every analogy.

8. The research on the union of ZON of BYA versus Etz Chaim 47 remains on hold; it is not your task.

Dossier 0424 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [439]

B. Continuous Explanation — From Earth to Human Nourishment

"And from this" refers back to the advantage of the lowest point explained in the earth unit. There earth, although lowest, reveals an enduring creative power; the explanation includes the radiance of sovev at the lowest point and the returning light of the kav ending there. Near the transition, human action in sowing and planting, which draws down an addition, is also mentioned. The principle is now applied to the order of created beings' levels: a level low in its manifest state can add to the level above it. This is not a claim that every lower thing is superior in every respect. Epistle 20

The inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking correspond here to earth, water, fire, and air. "Aspects" denotes a relation of characterization and correspondence; it does not turn all physical water into the vegetative. In Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, water is connected to growth, fire to the root of animal souls in the attendants of the chariot, and air/spirit to human speech according to Onkelos. Animal–fire is therefore not merely a hypothesis about body heat. The explanation is spiritual and explicit in the parallel. Earth–inanimate is supplied there without similar explanation. The reversed order of the two higher pairs in Etz

[439] Document 0424: Final-Closure.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Chaim remains a difference to note, without emending the Epistle or presenting a proposed reconciliation as a determination. L6, §3

"Above" here describes the level of the creature's vitality and knowledge, yet the animal depends on the vegetative and the human being on both. "Is nourished and lives" presents the animal's dependence; for the human being it is explicitly added that the intellect too receives from what is lower. "From both" is explained through the two proofs: food from the vegetative and food from the animal. There is no basis for assigning the differences between the verbs to separate sefirah-levels.

The grain comes from Berakhot 40a, within Rabbi Yehudah's words about wheat as the Tree of Knowledge. The evidence concerns the infant's recognition and calling "father" and "mother" after tasting grain. In Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, wheat is given a particular explanation: its root is in Daat of Tohu. This explains wheat's distinctiveness beyond the general explanation of the root of foods. Nevertheless, wheat, grain, bread, and matzah are not terms to substitute in every context. The Epistle uses both parents in the wording of the Sages; in the parallels examined, "father" alone is expounded. An interpretation concerning the two partzufim of Abba and Imma has not been proved here.

The meat comes from Bava Kamma 72a. Rav Nachman explains to Rava his answer of the preceding evening in terms of not having eaten ox meat. Rashi explains the lack of precision in the reason for the matter; Tosafot mentions a fast. The Epistle uses shortened and different wording to illustrate that food from the animal order also affects the power of knowledge. This Chasidic use is not an invention of later explanation: "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" brings meat and grain together and explains that the root of foods in Tohu enables them to add even to the power of Chochmah in the human being of Tikkun. There meat precedes grain, "father" appears without "moth-

er," and the expression is Chochmah and intellect. Bava Kamma 72a · L1, §2

Food in its manifest state is not wiser than the human being. According to L1, it is lower and requires refinement, but after refinement it gives life by the power of its higher root. Kuntres Acharon 4 expresses a close relation through Sag and Mah and explicitly includes inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods. This reinforces that the chain of examples in the Epistle is not a complete list of all foods. It does not prove the reason for omitting the inanimate specifically. Nor should a condition of blessing and prayer for every reception of vitality be planted in the Epistle's sentence: the transition to intentional Divine service is marked in L1 after the proofs. The very concept of refinement is present there even earlier. L7

Note 61 in Lessons explains that the animal is higher than the vegetative also in respect of its creation, and yet is nourished by it. The subject of "It" is the animal. The explanation for earth's omission appears in parentheses, and its extension to nourishment after creation is qualified. This is a note attributed to the Rebbe in a later explanation; the original Hebrew wording was not verified. Do not reverse the subject and say, on the basis of this sentence, that the lower is superior in its creation.

Dossier 0377 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [440]

Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10 — pairing anchors (Wikisource): inanimate → element of earth; vegetative → from the portions of water; animal → from the portion of air; speaking → from the portion of fire.

[440] Document 0377: EC_N10_pairing_anchors.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

(Also) Atzilut: element of fire / Beriah: air / Yetzirah: water / Asiyah: earth — a separate layer.

Dossier 0378 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [441]

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot

Time: 2026-09-23 ~12:47–1:05pm ET

Role: locating and verifying focused witnesses for the concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20.

Limit: no R1 / Earth / booklet files were deleted/replaced; union / Earth / conceptual was not reopened.

Dossier 0381 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [442]

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — G. Mishnat Chasidim — Masechet HaHarkavah (Chapter 1, OCR)

The speaking… like the portion of fire in relation to the other elements.

Inanimate / vegetative / animal as powers of the soul (composing, vegetative, animal/volitional).

Taam Etzo commentary (elsewhere): inanimate–earth, vegetative–water.

---

[441] Document 0378: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[442] Document 0381: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0389 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [443]

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — Mishnat Chasidim — Masechet HaHarkavah (Printed צא [91]; PDF 210)

Main text (above): mishnayot about the speaking / elements / souls…

Visual boundary: heading «Taam Etzo».

Commentary (below): «Four elements from the higher portion…» etc. — includes an explanation of powers for earth/fire/air/water in the vegetative soul.

Evidence: MC_Harkava_printTZA_pdf-210.png … -213.png; title page: MC_HB7122_title-001.png.

Dossier 0400 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [444]

LOCATIONS — IGK20-Finale-R5 — L6 — Likkutei Torah Pinchas (FIRST maamar)

Field	Value	Status
Title	צו את בני ישראל … את קרבני לחמי לאשי ["Command the Children of Israel… My offering, My food for My fire-offerings"]	SEEN print + digital
Section	§3 (marker ג SEEN on PDF180 left col)	SEEN

[443] Document 0389: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[444] Document 0400: LOCATIONS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Field	Value	Status
Print folio (start of maamar / Pinchas header)	עה [75]	SEEN (TL crop PDF179); TOC confirms עה [75]
Print folio (continuation / §3 page)	עו [76] span (PDF181 header OCR sometimes «ער» [270])	PDF181 header; TOC explanation=עו [76] for next unit
Arabic print page on §3 leaf	150	SEEN PDF180
PDF page (§3 four pairs)	180	SEEN
PDF pages (opener / cont)	179 (Torah portion Pinchas + title), 181 (cont §3/§4)	SEEN
Four pairs	Earth=inanimate; water=vegetative; fire=animal; air=speaking	SEEN photo + body
Adjacent §1 snippet	A clarified world / angels possessing emotive attributes	digital body + band crop PDF180
NOT	Parshat Tzav; NOT Earth-R3 mazal ¶ on PDF185 (different maamar locus)	—

17 · The End of the Kav, Returning Light, and the Order of Investment

The discussion of the kav's endpoint is not a spatial map of light moving within a space. When expressions such as "below," "endpoint," and "returning" appear, one must understand which relation between levels they describe. Even a diagram can be harmful if it turns the order of explanation into a new sequence of stations.

In the earth research it became clear that the Epistle may first give the radiance's destination and then detail the order of its investment. The destination must not be inserted as an early stage before "first," then reached again, and the double route presented as though written in

the source. One must distinguish a summarizing sentence from its elaboration.

Similarly, sovev, the igulim of Adam Kadmon, the yosher of Adam Kadmon, and the kav are not four names for one thing. Not every relation stated concerning Atik and igulim can be transferred to every other relation. The proposal that Atik's omission was intended "not to double Keter" was not found to be substantiated. The existence of a discussion of the inner and outer dimensions of Keter does not by itself give a reason for an omission in another list.

These determinations do not halt the explanation. They make it possible to state clearly what the destination is and which garments are described, while leaving open the exact reason for some of the enumerations, repetitions, and relations of the igulim. A marked limit is more useful than a closed diagram adding unwritten connections.

The Wording of the Epistle — Source Units

W14-01 · 1–9

And this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah,

W14-02 · 10–18

and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds,

W14-03 · 19–26

without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone.

W14-04 · 27–34

And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet,

W14-05 · 35–46

also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light, just as that which is invested in Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Atzilut

W14-06 · 47–58

shines in returning light from Malchut of Atzilut, and Malchut of Atzilut is the aspect of Keter from below upward,

W14-07 · 59–67

and their beginning is embedded in their end. And likewise at the endpoint of the kav of the Ein Sof light,

W14-08 · 68–75

which ends at the endpoint of the yosher of Adam Kadmon's feet, it shines from below upward

W14-09 · 76–88

to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity, from the outer dimension of the vessels of Malchut of Atzilut.

W14-10 · 89–102

And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim, this radiance of the kav of the Ein Sof light is first invested

W14-11 · 103–109

in the light of Atzilut within Asiyah, and from it into Beriah and Yetzirah within Asiyah,

W14-12 · 110–116

and from them into the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah.

W14-13 · 117–127

And through this there is strength and force in the endpoint of the vessel of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah within the element of earth,

W14-14 · 128–139

and this is the utterance “Let the earth sprout, etc.,” to be active within the earth continually, forever and ever

W14-15 · 140–147

(an aspect of Ein Sof, and not only during the six days of Creation,

W14-16 · 148–159

like the utterance “Let the waters swarm” and the utterance “Let the earth bring forth a living soul,” from Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah,

W14-17 · 160–171

for during the seven days of Creation a radiance of the Ein Sof light shone in this world through gratuitous kindness,

W14-18 · 172–176

without any raising of mayin nukvin at all),

W14-19 · 177–186

to cause grasses, trees, and fruits to grow from nothing into something continually, year after year,

W14-20 · 187–200

which is a likeness of the aspect of Ein Sof, for if this world were to endure for many myriads of years, they would grow year after year.

The word ranges preserve the local count in the earlier division of the source; W identifiers are fixed. Word count of the working text: 1,640 words.

Mapping the Question and Its Clarification

How do the sovev, the kav's endpoint, and the raising of mayin nukvin meet at the bottom of Asiyah without being turned into a single mechanism that is not written?

The Epistle gives two explanations for the revelation of power in earth. The encompassing light shines beneath Adam Kadmon's feet with a relatively small interruption; and the kav, ending at the endpoint of the feet of yosher, shines from below upward in the mode of returning light. Proximity to the sovev and the kav's return combine in the explanation, but they are not the same movement. The sentence does not claim that the sovev pushes the kav to return, or that the sovev itself becomes a returning kav.

The lowest place is not an end where the light ceases to operate. At the endpoint a relation of return is revealed, and the Epistle compares it to Malchut as Keter from below upward. This is one meaning of the beginning's embedding in the end: the receiving place in the order of descent can become a point of revelation in the opposite direction. This gives no license to identify every use of "embedded" with precisely the same returning light; in the Epistle's text and its parallels, the formula has different functions.

The radiance is described through levels and vessels as far as the neshamah-light in Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity. This does not mean a human soul located in the ground, nor should it be said that physical earth itself is actual Divinity. The light must be distinguished from that in which it acts. The mentions of Atzilut, Beriah, and Yetzirah within Asiyah likewise refer to internal levels in the world under discussion, not necessarily a renewed passage between the four general worlds.

On the basis of this power comes the act of sowing. What grows on its own shows the vegetative power itself; fruits produced through sow-

ing and planting show the advantage of raising mayin nukvin. “On its own” here does not require the absence of every possible assisting factor. The conclusion is that an action from below arouses a superior drawing down from above, and from this one can understand human Divine service in ABYA. The precise destination of “as written elsewhere” has not been identified; Kuntres Acharon 4 is a close parallel, but not a proved reference.

The Order of Investment Is Not a Travel Map

One proposal read the list of levels as though the kav arrives at the bottom, leaves it, and then returns and becomes invested in it. There is no such description in the text. There is a description of the returning light’s direction and a description of the levels of investment. They can be distinguished, but the distinction does not by itself resolve every syntactic detail in the list. Atik’s omission from the list and the explanation “to prevent duplication” remained without sufficient evidence.

What Counts as Raising Mayin Nukvin in the Analogy

In the Epistle, sowing and planting are called raising mayin nukvin. A parallel in Or HaTorah emphasizes a stage of growth and awakening. This is no reason to restrict the Epistle to the stage after germination, nor to establish that all stages of the process are equal. The seed does not create the power but arouses it; hence the relation to human action and drawing down light. The discussion of Creation without raising mayin nukvin is not a ruling that all present growth occurs without any awakening.

Status of the Questions after the Fourth Round of Clarification

This is a documented register of conclusions from dossier 0570; the term “supported” denotes the conclusion of that investigation within its limits.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E08	Sovev/igulim/yosher/ kav	Explicit in its essentials	The four terms must not be identified.
E09	Beneath his feet and small interruption	Partial	Relation of levels, not physical distance; enumeration of intermediaries needs completion.
E10	Remoteness versus interruption	Open after narrowing the difficulty	Two different pairs; no complete reconciliation of the mapping.
E11	Adam Kadmon’s feet and the igulim of Atik	Open	Igulim of Atik = igulim of Adam Kadmon has not been proved here.
E12	Returning light	Partial	Attributed to the kav; no explicit mechanism for the added force.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E13	Omission of Atik	Open	Doubling-of-Keter explanation withdrawn.
E14	Malchut as Keter from below	Supported interpretation	Role in the returning radiance, not absolute identity.
E15	Repetitions of the kav’s endpoint	Supported interpretation	Location, activity, analogy, destination, and order; not every precise wording resolved.
E16	Returning light and mayin nukvin	Supported distinction	No proved identity; mayin nukvin requires identification of the recipient in each source.
E17	Which is actual Divinity	Supported interpretation	The neshamah-light, not earth and not a human soul.
E18	Pronouns and wording	Partial	The photographed list does not decide every hu/hi variation.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E19	Sefer HaGilgulim 20	Partial reading	Chapter located; full transcription not yet completed.
E20	Cited in Likkutei Amarim	Verified anchor	Gloss in 6 names the source; not proof of the entire returning-light route.
E21	ABYA within Asiyah	Supported distinction	Nesting; Malchut of Malchut is not all of Asiyah within Asiyah.
E22	Destination and order of garments	Partial	Destination followed by route to it; tension between direction and investment preserved.
E23	Strength and force, and the vessel of “Let [the earth] sprout”	Partial	Imparting power to the vessel; recurrence of the phrase is not identity of the entire mechanism.
E24	Chochmah versus endpoint of the vessel	Open	Attributions explicit; their precise reason not found.
E25	Six versus seven	Open	Do not emend; note 48 is not on this sentence.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E26	Gratuitous kindness and Adam’s prayer	Partly open	Without mayin nukvin is said of the days of Creation; coming into being/ emergence is a candidate distinction.
E27	Continually and every year	Supported explanation	The activity’s existence and renewal of the radiance need not contradict one another.
E28	A likeness of Ein Sof	Supported interpretation	Conditional capacity for continuity; not an actual infinity of years.
E29	Why not reproduction?	Not exhausted	Advantage of the lower realm explains the choice; no denial of the power of Ein Sof in reproduction.
E30	Yesh me-ayin and like yesh me-ayin	Explicit distinction	Prior seed versus relative incommensurability with the product.
E31	Incommensurability with fruit and tree	Partial	Disparity in quantity and quality; not mathematical zero.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E41	Sovev and returning light at the conclusion	Partial	Both are sources of revelation; returning light explicitly concerns the kav.

The Topic's Conclusion: Distinguish Destination, Direction, and Order of Investment

The topic brings two matters together: earth's relation to sovev, and the kav's radiance from below upward. There is no source for turning them into a single mechanical action in which sovev pushes the kav. Nor are the terms igulim, yosher, and sovev interchangeable merely because they can be drawn with similar lines in a diagram.

An important correction concerns sentence order. The Epistle specifies a destination of radiance and afterward, following Sefer HaGilgulim, details the order of its investment. A reading that inserts the destination as another station before "first" creates an unwritten double route. The sequence of the text is not necessarily a new sequence of entities.

The phrase "which is actual Divinity" belongs to the neshamah-light under discussion. It must not be attributed to physical earth, nor should "neshamah" here be read as a human soul lying in the ground. This distinction continues the clarification of the source vessels and the recipient from the beginning of the book.

The map of determinations also preserves unresolved details: the reason for Atik's omission, some of the relations of the igulim, and the precise reason for the repetitions. The proposed reason of preventing "doubling Keter" is not presented as a conclusion. This makes it possible to describe the main progression clearly and leave

the detailed questions sharply formulated, rather than erecting a closed diagram unsupported by its evidence.

The Research Questions in This Topic

The wording of the questions is preserved so that the completeness of the discussion can be checked. The mere appearance of a question in the register does not constitute a decision about it; the investigation and the limit of its conclusion must be read. The identifiers here form the edited map of questions and are not an automatic merger with the earlier numbering of other reports.

E08 — Distinguish between the encompassing Ein Sof light, the igulim of Adam Kadmon, the yosher of Adam Kadmon, and the kav within it. Does “only the igulim of Adam Kadmon” indicate mediation, interruption, or both? Igulim and the general sovev must not be automatically identified.

E09 — What are “beneath his feet” and “without a great interruption between them” when there is no place in spirituality? What do proximity and interruption measure, and between which two things? Why is the smallness of the interruption decisive specifically here?

E10 — Etz Chaim, gate 1, branch 4, describes the vessels of Asiyah as most remote from both the internal light and the sovev. How does this accord with the small interruption here? Examine whether the axis of comparison changes: the order of investment versus the endpoint of yosher.

E11 — In the same branch of Etz Chaim, the endpoint of Adam Kadmon’s feet is described in relation to the igulim of Atik, and a gloss discusses its relation to Radla. How is this mapped to the bottom of Asiyah? Separate the main text, R. Chaim Vital’s gloss, and R. Tzemach’s note; proximity must not be turned into a reconciliation.

E12 — What returns, from where and to where, and why does the return add power? Is the source of the addition the kav, the sovev, or the embedding of the beginning in the end? Which details are explicit, and which come from a later analogy?

E13 — Why are Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and ZON enumerated, but not Atik? Earlier in the same Epistle, Arich Anpin and Atik Yomin appear together. Examine the scope of the enumeration, intermediary/emanated, and the inner/outer dimensions of Keter; do not choose one without local evidence.

E14 — In what sense is Malchut Keter from below upward? Does this concern an order of enumeration, the advantage of a source, the function of returning light, or all of these? What does "their beginning is embedded in their end" prove, and what does it not prove?

E15 — Map the repetitions about the endpoint of the kav and Adam Kadmon's feet: identifying the location, adding returning light, the analogy of Atzilut, returning to the referent, and the destination of investment. Does each repetition add a datum? The direction in the text is from below upward.

E16 — Are returning light and raising mayin nukvin the same thing? The passage first describes an activity in spontaneous growth and subsequently an activity through sowing; two ascents must not be identified merely because both begin below.

E17 — Why is "which is actual Divinity" emphasized again concerning the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? What is the subject of "which is" (שהוא)? What distinguishes this neshamah-light from the vessel, the vegetative power, and the physical plant?

E18 — Map hu/hi/zo/mimmenah/mehen/al yedei zeh (הוא/היא/זו/ממנה/מהן/על ידי זה) throughout the unit. The absence of a correction in the list is not proof of kabbalistic intent. The list of corrections mentioned by the user was not actually attached to this round's package.

E19 — Verify the cited matter in the text of Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20; distinguish it from Shaar HaGilgulim. What are the book's title, edition, printed folio, scan number, and extent of correspondence? HB23822 is a target for examination, not a witness read in this round.

E20 — The gloss in Tanya 6 explicitly mentions Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20; note 53 also refers to chapter 18, the end of chapter 51, and the end of chapter 52. What does each chapter supply? Identify the reference without claiming that the entire chain of returning light appears there.

E21 — Why is the precision of Atzilut, Beriah, and Yetzirah within Asiyah needed? What is their relation to the general worlds? What is the place of Asiyah within Asiyah and of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? Do not assume these are synonyms.

E22 — How is light ascending from the endpoint of the kav "first" invested in Atzilut within Asiyah and then in Beriah and Yetzirah within it? Is this the same returning light, a detailing of it, or an additional route? What changes with "and according to what is written"?

E23 — Map: kav → neshamah-light → endpoint of the vessel → the utterance "Let [the earth] sprout" → vegetative power → plant. Which arrows were stated and which were supplied? What does "and it is the utterance" refer back to, and how does "strength and force" relate to the preceding paragraph about the sovev?

E24 — Why are "Let [the waters] swarm" / "Let [the earth] bring forth" attributed to Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, while "Let [the earth] sprout" is discussed at the endpoint of the vessel? What exactly refers to Chochmah, and does the change of level explain the difference in the time of the activity?

E25 — Why do the same parentheses mention the six days of Creation and then the seven days of Creation? Distinguish the time of the acts of creation from the scope of gratuitous kindness. This is only a pro-

posed reading until a source is found; do not emend ו׳ to ו׳ without a witness.

E26 — What does "without any raising of mayin nukvin at all" mean in the first creation, and what remains gratuitous now? Is spontaneous growth an exception? How would Adam's prayer for growth in the sources of Genesis 2 / the Sages fit in, if it concerns the same claim?

E27 — What is the difference between "continually, forever and ever" and "continually, year after year"? Note 58 points to Iggeret HaKodesh 14: examine annual renewal of the light, and do not be satisfied with the existence of seasons.

E28 — What does the condition "for if [this world] were to endure… many myriads of years" prove? Is it an inexhaustible power, repetition without a fixed limit, or an actual infinity? Why first "an aspect of Ein Sof" and subsequently "a likeness of"? No fixed finite duration of the world may be inferred from this.

E29 — Why is growth chosen rather than animal and human reproduction? Distinguish yesh me-ayin itself, matter versus spiritual power, reproduction from an existing species, continual renewal, and the advantage of the lowest recipient. Do not categorically deny revelation of Ein Sof in reproduction.

E30 — Why are those sown and planted described as "like yesh me-ayin"? Is the qualification present only in their case, and what is its relation to "absolute nothingness and naught" earlier? What does the seed nevertheless do, and what does it not supply?

E31 — Why the details of fruit, tree, branches, leaves, hundreds of kernels, straw, and ears of grain? Distinguish quality, quantity, and difference of level. A large number alone is not mathematical incommensurability; how does the evidence work here?

E41 — At the end of the Epistle the sovev and the kav appear together near the aspect of returning light. Is the return also attributed to the

sovev, or only to the kav? The present passage explicitly formulates it in the kav. Examine the scope of the description without anticipating the entire study of the next passage.

The Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism, and Alternatives

The dossiers are arranged here by family of investigation and round, within the topic. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Designations such as PASS, SEALED, and the like are historical determinations by the dossier's author; they are not an independent endorsement by the editor. English passages were preserved in their own language so as not to replace original evidence with a conjectural translation. Document identifiers make it possible to return to the archive.

Dossier 0239 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [4]

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — The Epistle's Wording

«And beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses and surrounds the four worlds of Atzilut, Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah equally.»

And subsequently:

[4] Document 0239: E1.3 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 12-17.md [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 12–17]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

«And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light.»

And finally:

«And Malchut of Atzilut is the aspect of Keter from below upward, and their beginning is embedded in their end.»

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — Terms

Returning light here is light described in an ascending direction: from the lowest place where the kav ends, from below upward.

It must not yet be claimed that "returning light" here is identical to every other use in kabbalistic sources. In the Epistle's text it appears to describe the radiance rising from the endpoint and returning upward.

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — Plain Explanation

The kav reaches the lowest realm, but the endpoint is not an end of cessation. From the endpoint itself a radiance shines from below upward. In this the principle "their beginning is embedded in their end" recurs: the end is not only a point of descent; it is also a starting point of a returning movement.

This is why the Epistle compares the kav shining from below upward with Malchut of Atzilut, which is "Keter from below upward." Malchut is an end from the perspective of Atzilut, but a beginning from the perspective of the world beneath it; in the reverse direction it becomes a point of ascent.

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — The Station's Function

This station completes the Epistle's axis:

- The light descends through vessels and radiances.
- It reaches the lowest realm.
- In the lowest realm the power of creation is revealed.
- From the lowest realm a returning movement shines upward.

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — What Does the Station Clarify?

It explains that "their beginning is embedded in their end" is not merely a slogan about a connection between Keter and Malchut. It becomes a structure of movement: descent to the end and ascent from the end.

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — What Remains Open?

The comparison between Malchut's returning light and the kav's radiance from the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet is clear in the wording, but their complete identity as a single mechanism is not explicit. It should be presented as the Epistle's parallel, not as a new solution to Q70.

Dossier 0012 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [134]

[134] Document 0012: 154 — R17-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.2 Why here

After equal sovev (13), Admur escalates: the lowest element — physical earth — uniquely shows continuous yesh me'ayin (always sprouting). Reason chain: (1) AK feet end at bottom of Asiyah; (2) under the feet, sovev shines with only AK's iggulim interrupting; (3) the kav at that terminus reflects upward as or chozer (parallel to Malchut-of-Atzilut reflecting as Keter from below); (4) that or chozer reaches neshamah of Malchut-of-Malchut of Asiyah (= Elokut); (5) Gilgulim 20 chain clothes it through Atzilut/Beriah/Yetzirah within Asiyah into that neshamah → power in earth's keli → «Let the earth sprout» forever. נעוץ ["embedded"] is now visible at the bottom.

5. Continuous peshat — 14 (The Element of Earth and Returning Light) — 5.5 Tags

Body [E] · Gilgulim 20 via Likkutei Amarim [E-primary] via Admur · Gen. 1:11 etc. via Admur [E-primary] · or chozer [E] · deep iggulim cosmology [E-secondary] if opened · Q70: upward radiation ≠ post-exit measure HOLD · Q42: no flip HOLD

154 — R17-GB03 FULL — Continuous Peshat Map, יא–טו [11–15] — 8. Proposed R17-T16+ (net-NEW; no remint T01–T15 / R14 / R15 / R16)

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T16	Iggeret HaKodesh 20 presents two kav loci: (A) haarah through Malchut kelim piercing parsa (10/T15); (B) the kav itself vested in end of Netzach–Hod–Yesod of Adam Kadmon / feet of yosher at Malchut Asiyah radiating into neshamah of BYA. Wording forces both; whether one source or two functions = open	[E] wording · [P]/[U] identity	propose

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T17	Three haarah degrees: radiance of the kav → neshamah-light (Elokut); a radiance of a radiance → nefesh–ruach + kelim; a radiance of a radiance of a radiance → all creatures (Neh. 9:6). Grades of hitpashtut, not three atzmiyut; ≠ auto human NR″N	[E]	propose
R17-T18	Atzmut Or Ein Sof encompasses all worlds equally (Jer. 23:24; TZ «there is no place»); not h itpashtut/hitlabshut of chayut; creatio only via haarah cascade from kav	[E]	propose

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T19	Same sovev shines to the internal kav through BYA kelim and gives them strength and force to create yesh me-ayin; multiplicity/limit via kelim (esp. letters)	[E]	propose
R17-T20	Physical earth uniquely continuous yesh me'ayin; because Adam Kadmon's feet end at bottom of Asiyah and under feet sovev shines with only the igulim of Adam Kadmon interrupting; kav at that end radiates returning light from below upward	[E]	propose
R17-T21	Or chozer from end of kav → neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah (= Elokut mamash); per Sefer Gilgulim 20 (via Likkutei Amarim) via Atzilut-in-Asiyah → Beriah/Yetzirah-in-Asiyah → that neshamah; powers «Let the earth sprout» forever	[E]	propose
R17-T22	Inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking paradox: animal lives from vegetative and speaking from both (incl. wisdom via grain/meat) because returning light from bottom of Asiyah	[E]	propose

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T23	Merkavah angels (face of the ox / face of the eagle) nourished from spirit of korbanot — Zohar «and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root» as or chozer to their element	[E]	propose

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T24	Practical mitzvot = purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world («today, to perform them»); Avot «One hour is better…» — telos of the epistle after all above	[E]	propose

Honest EMPTY: no empty subsection inside יא–טו [11–15].

Not proposed as T: Q42 MICRO · Q70 measure · Moses NHYM · "A≡ B kav" as sealed fact · remints of T01–T15.

Dossier 0031 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [135]

157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md — Source windows (local plain nikud-stripped + Wikisource)

T	Lemma hit	Match
T16	And likewise the kav itself · Netzach–Hod–Yesod of Adam Kadmon · feet of yosher · Malchut of Asiyah	MATCH
T17	A radiance of a radiance · a radiance of a radiance of a radiance · and You give life to them all	MATCH
T18	Encompasses all worlds · there is no place · surrounds and encompasses · radiance… from the kav	MATCH

T	Lemma hit	Match
T19	Shines to the internal kav · strength and force to create yesh me-ayin · multiplicity… the letters	MATCH
T20	Element of earth · Adam Kadmon's feet / the igulim of Adam Kadmon · returning light from below upward	MATCH

[135] Document 0031: 157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

T	Lemma hit	Match
T21	Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah · Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20 · Let the earth sprout	MATCH
T22	Inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking · returning light from the bottom of Asiyah	MATCH
T23	Face of the ox · face of the eagle · from their foundation and root	MATCH
T24	Practical mitzvot · today, to perform them · One hour is better · Thus far we have found	MATCH

Dossier 0076 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [178]

P6 — Or chozer / yesod afar — Kav from below — Quotes [E]

«…a radiance of a radiance of a radiance… in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force… which continually causes something to grow from nothing»

«For the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light… which encompasses… only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone»

«And the kav… which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet shines from below upward in the mode of returning light… and their beginning is embedded in their end»

«…shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity…»

[178] Document 0076: 158 — R17_D_KAV_PARSA.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

«And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim… Let the earth sprout… continually, forever and ever»

P6 — Or chozer / yesod afar — Kav from below — Proven [E]

- Yesod afar uniquely continuous yesh me'ayin growth.
- AK feet end under Asiyah; under feet sovev (only AK iggulim interrupt).
- Kav at that end radiates or chozer upward → neshamah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah.
- Parallel: Malchut d'Atzilut returns or chozer / is Keter from below.
- Gilgulim 20 via LA → "Let [the earth] sprout" forever.

P6 — Or chozer / yesod afar — Kav from below — Not proven

- Apparatus beyond Admur cite [U].
- Q42 / Q70 — growth/or chozer ≠ MICRO / ≠ measure; HOLD [U].

P6 — Or chozer / yesod afar — Kav from below — Optional ONE Admur parallel [E]

Body: «Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim» — cite only; do not invent Gilgulim page.

Dossier 0079 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [445]

145 — R17 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q YA-IGK20 · R17 · Parent ACTIVE: 144 QC T01–T08: 1ave2nMWUvEYO9yejKh1nuKW DGhiMbFUc QC T09–T15: 11t4cTVbyIH59njnXW50fskHZEgID8CjU

[445] Document 0079: ZZ - SUPERSEDED — 145 R17 PAPER LEDGER (pre T25–T29). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

QC T16–T24: 13oHDpeit3luaS-vqZJWHoHCDpQESe9Uz Packs: 146/147 · 148/149 · 153/154 Prior sealed ledger:

1XkFSm9GdcumK6L98ndFIJ1JpVOWkaa_h0RlZ5IAipgk (superseded) Sealed prior (do not remint) R13–R15 · R14(ours) T01–T06 · R16 T01–T47 · R16-GB10 EMPTY (QC 143) SEALED — R17-T01–T15 (prior) T01–T15 stand (ledger 1XkFSm9GdcumK6L98ndFIJ1JpVOWkaa_h0RlZ5IAipgk superseded). T13 ≠ remint T08 kept. SEALED — R17-T16–T24 (QC 157 / GB03) ID Grade Claim R17-T16 [E] wording SEALED · [P]/[U] identity Two kav loci: (A) haarah through Malchut kelim/parsa (10/T15); (B) the kav itself in end of Netzach–Hod–Yesod of Adam Kadmon / feet of yosher → Malchut Asiyah — A≡B identity stays [U]/[P] R17-T17 [E] SEALED Three haarah degrees: radiance of the kav → neshamah-Elokut; a radiance of a radiance → NR+kelim; a radiance of a radiance of a radiance → all creatures (Neh. 9:6); grades not three atzmiyut R17-T18 [E] SEALED Atzmut Or Ein Sof encompasses all worlds equally (Jer. 23:24; TZ «there is no place»); creatio only via haarah cascade from kav R17-T19 [E] SEALED Same sovev shines to the internal kav through BYA kelim → strength and force to create yesh me-ayin; multiplicity/limit via kelim R17-T20 [E] SEALED Physical earth uniquely continuous yesh me'ayin; Adam Kadmon's feet end under Asiyah + under-feet sovev; kav radiates returning light from below upward R17-T21 [E] SEALED Or chozer → neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah; Gilgulim 20 via Likkutei Amarim chain → that neshamah; powers «Let the earth sprout» forever R17-T22 [E] SEALED Inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking paradox: animal from vegetative; speaking from both because returning light from bottom of Asiyah R17-T23 [E] SEALED Merkavah angels (face of the ox / face of the eagle) nourished from korbanot spirit — Zohar «and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root» as or chozer R17-T24 [E] SEALED practical mitzvot = purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world —

≠ remint T13/T14 (descent-purpose after or-chozer vs kingship/she laya) Open Q carry Q Status Q42 MICRO named flip HOLD [U] Q70 graded kav post-exit HOLD [U] T16 A≡B identity [U]/[P] open Moses pnimiyut NHY”M forever-OPEN Film HOLD Batches GB Focus Result GB01 R17-A peshat א–ה [1–5] SEALED T01–T08 GB02 R17 ו–י [6–10] SEALED T09–T15 GB03 R17 יא–טו [11–15] SEALED T16–T24

Dossier 0103 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [140]

R17 SCOUT — Iggeret HaKodesh 20, §§יא–טו [11–15] — Section cuts (working — verify; not printed headings)

§	From → To	Meta thesis (VERIFY)
יא [11]	«And likewise also the kav itself, invested in the termination and endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon…»	Two Kav presentations
יב [12]	Three he’arah degrees through «the extension of vitality»	3× radiance
יג [13]	«The existence and nature of the Ein Sof light… encompassing» → strength and force via BYA kelim	Sovev + inner Kav
יד [14]	«And furthermore… in the element of earth» → or chozer / “Let [the earth] sprout” / mayin nukvin / mashal	Earth + or chozer
טו [15]	«The order of levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking» → practical mitzvot + colophon	Closing telos

[140] Document 0103: 155 — R17 SCOUT יא–טו CORROBORATE-ONLY.md [sections 11–15]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

14 — The Element of Earth / Returning Light — 1) Exact [E]

«And furthermore, beyond this… in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force… which continually causes something to grow from nothing, namely grasses and trees»

«And this is only because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds, without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone»

«And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light… and their beginning is embedded in their end»

«And likewise at the endpoint of the kav… it shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, which is actual Divinity»

«And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim… Let the earth sprout… continually, forever and ever» «To cause grasses, trees, and fruits to grow from nothing into something continually, year after year, which is a likeness of the aspect of Ein Sof»

«Now, the fruits produced through raising mayin nukvin… are very, very superior… and from this we can understand the drawing down of supernal lights into ABYA (which is the purpose of the creation of the human being)»

14 — The Element of Earth / Returning Light — 3) Neighbors

- From 13 → To 15 applications of or chozer

Dossier 0215 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [146]

11. Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon / Feet of Yosher — Quotes [E]

- «And likewise also the kav itself, invested in the termination and endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon, which is the end of his feet of yosher, ending in Malchut of Asiyah» — IHK20 body (after §10 / 11 cluster) [E]
- «Because the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds… And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light» — IHK20 body (later) [E]
- «At the endpoint of the kav of the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of the yosher of Adam Kadmon's feet, it shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah» — IHK20 body [E]

151 — R17-B GLOSSARY — Iggeret HaKodesh 20 terms — 14. Returning Light

Aliases: או"ח [or chozer], בבחי' אור חוזר [in the mode of returning light]

Forced by sections: יג [13]

[146] Document 0215: 151 — R17-B GLOSSARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

14. Returning Light — Quotes [E]

- «And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light, just as that which is invested in Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Atzilut shines in returning light from Malchut of Atzilut» — IHK20 body [E]
- «For it is the aspect of returning light from below upward from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light as above» — IHK20 body (tzomeach/chai/medaber) [E]

14. Returning Light — Plain peshat (this letter)

Returning/reflected light from below upward. At the end of Kav/AK-feet: light shines upward to neshamah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah. Analogy: as light vested in Arich/Abba-Imma/ZA-Nukva of Atzilut returns from Malchut of Atzilut (and Malchut is Keter from below). Explains why lower levels (earth/tzomeach) can nourish higher, and why maaseh mitzvot draw from the intensified he'arah at the bottom.

14. Returning Light — Not proven from quote alone [U]/[I]

- Technical or chozer vs or yashar physics beyond Admur's analogy [U]

Dossier 0251 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [26]

Theme 8 — Or chozer / yesod afar / practical mitzvot excellence — 8.1 HIT — TT [E] (yesod afar + AK feet — cites IHK20)

«And see Iggeret HaKodesh, Ihu ve-chayohi (“He and His vitality”), in what is written there, “And the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah”… and this is also why the element of earth has the power to produce growth continually, something from nothing, etc.» — Work+locus: Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah (“The Root of the Commandment of Prayer”) §27 — Speaker: Tzemach Tzedek — Parallels: Yesod afar continuous yesh me’ayin; AK feet / lower Asiyah proximity of sovev — direct midrash of IHK20 closing cluster — Does NOT prove: Independent or-chozer mechanism beyond what TT draws from IHK20; Q42/Q70 HOLD

Theme 8 — Or chozer / yesod afar / practical mitzvot excellence — 8.2 HIT — TT biur [E-secondary] (mitzvot maasiyot excellence)

«And therefore the practical mitzvot, which are in physical action, contain the power of this drawing down for actual yesh me-ayin… as at the beginning of creation… thus the practical mitzvot have the power to draw down vitality and the Ein Sof light to become invested in vessels»

- Work+locus: LT Re’eh 7 biur stream (Vilna כח,ד [28d] region)
- Speaker: TT biur — not Admur

[26] Document 0251: 165 — R17_H_PARALLEL_CHASSIDIC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- Parallels: Excellence of maaseh mitzvot at the lowest as highest continuation of yesh me'ayin ("their beginning is embedded in their end" family)
- Does NOT prove: Or chozer from Kav end; Admur body authorship

Theme 8 — Or chozer / yesod afar / practical mitzvot excellence — 8.3 HIT — TT biur [E-secondary] (or chozer — weak/adjacent)

«Benjamin is from below upward, the aspect of returning light…» — Work+locus: LT Re'eh 7 biur (§23) — Speaker: TT biur — not Admur — Parallels: Term "returning light from below upward" only — Does NOT prove: IHK20's Kav-end or chozer into Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah; different mashal (Binyamin/Yosef)

Dossier 0260 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [385]

2. Exact [E] quotes (R17-D core) — 2.5 Or chozer / yesod afar (14; sealed T20/T21)

«…a radiance of a radiance of a radiance… in the physical element of earth, in an immense revelation, with greater force… which continually causes something to grow from nothing» «For the feet of Adam Kadmon end at the bottom of Asiyah, and beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light… which encompasses… only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone»

«And the kav… which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet shines from below upward in the mode of returning light, just as that which is invested in Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and Ze'ir Anpin

[385] Document 0260: 164 — R17-GB05 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

and Nukva of Atzilut shines in returning light from Malchut of Atzilut, and Malchut of Atzilut is the aspect of Keter from below upward, and their beginning is embedded in their end»

«…shines from below upward to the aspect of the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah…»

«And according to what is written in Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim… Let the earth sprout… continually, forever and ever»

Proves [E]: earth uniqueness; AK feet; or chozer upward; explicit analogy to Malchut-as-Keter / “embedded”; Gilgulim 20 via Likkutei Amarim.

Already sealed: T20/T21 (fact + destination).

Open for deepen: analogy architecture as discrete claim (→ T33).

Dossier 0330 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [156]

153 — R17-GB03 SUMMARY — Proposed T (R17-T16+ only; no remint T01–T15 / R14 / R15 / R16)

ID	Claim	Tag
R17-T16	Iggeret HaKodesh 20 presents two kav loci: haarah-through-Malchut-kelim/parsa (10) and the kav itself ending in Netzach–Hod–Yesod of Adam Kadmon / feet of yosher → Malchut Asiyah; wording forces both; identity vs two functional descriptions of one source = [P]/[U] (meta 141 question kept open)	[E] wording · [P] identity

[156] Document 0330: 153 — R17-GB03 SUMMARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID	Claim	Tag
R17-T17	Three haarah degrees: radiance of the kav → neshamah-Elokut of BYA sefirot; a radiance of a radiance → nefesh-ruach + kelim; a radiance of a radiance of a radiance → all creatures (Neh. 9:6). Grades of hitpashtut, not three atzmiyut; ≠ auto human NR″N	[E]
R17-T18	Atzmut Or Ein Sof encompasses all worlds equally (Jer. 23:24; TZ «there is no place»); not hitpashtut/hitlabshut of chayut; creatio only via haarah cascade from kav	[E]
R17-T19	Same sovev also shines to the internal kav through BYA kelim and gives them strength and force to create yesh me-ayin; multiplicity/limit via kelim (esp. letters)	[E]
R17-T20	Physical earth uniquely continuous yesh me'ayin growth; reason: Adam Kadmon's feet end at bottom of Asiyah + under feet sovev with only the igulim of Adam Kadmon interrupting; kav at that end radiates returning light from below upward	[E]
R17-T21	Or chozer from end of kav → neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah (= Elokut mamash from chitzoniyut kelim of Malchut Atzilut); per Sefer Gilgulim 20 (via Likkutei Amarim) via Atzilut-in-Asiyah → Beriah/Yetzirah-in-Asiyah → that neshamah; powers «Let the earth sprout» forever	[E]

ID	Claim	Tag
R17-T22	Inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking: despite rank order, animal lives from vegetative and speaking from both (incl. wisdom via grain/meat) — because returning light from bottom of Asiyah	[E]
R17-T23	Merkavah angels (face of the ox / face of the eagle) nourished from spirit of korbanot animals — Zohar «and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root» = or chozer to their element	[E]
R17-T24	Practical mitzvot = purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world («today, to perform them»; «One hour is better… than all the life of the World to Come») — telos after all above	[E]

EMPTY: none of יא–טו [11–15] subsections empty.

Not proposed: Q42 MICRO · Q70 graded post-exit measure · Moses NHYM · remints · «same kav» as sealed fact.

Dossier 0538 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [28]

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — The Epistle's Wording

«And beneath his feet shines the Ein Sof light, blessed be He, which encompasses all worlds, without a great interruption between them, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon alone.»

«And the kav from the Ein Sof light, which ends at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet, also shines from below upward in the mode of returning light, just as that which is invested in Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Atzilut shines in returning light from Malchut of Atzilut.»

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — Which Question Does the Station Resolve?

It explains that "their beginning is embedded in their end" is not merely a slogan about a connection between Keter and Malchut. It becomes a structure of movement: descent to the end and ascent from the end.

Station 17 — Returning Light: From the Lower to the Higher — Which Question Does the Station Leave Open?

The comparison between Malchut's returning light and the kav's radiance from the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet is clear in the word-

[28] Document 0538: E1.6-HY1-Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ing, but their complete identity as a single mechanism is not explicit. It should be presented as the Epistle's parallel, not as a new solution to Q70.

Dossier 0541 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [406]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E08 — Sovev and igulim

Source: user.

Distinguish between the encompassing Ein Sof light, the igulim of Adam Kadmon, the yosher of Adam Kadmon, and the kav within it. Does "only the igulim of Adam Kadmon" indicate mediation, interruption, or both? Igulim and the general sovev must not be automatically identified.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E09 — Interruption

Source: user.

What are "beneath his feet" and "without a great interruption between them" when there is no place in spirituality? What do proximity and interruption measure, and between which two things? Why is the smallness of the interruption decisive specifically here?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E10 — Opposing parallel

Source: research addition.

Etz Chaim, gate 1, branch 4, describes the vessels of Asiyah as most remote from both the internal light and the sovev. How does this ac-

[406] Document 0541: IGK20-Earth-R1_02_Questions.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

cord with the small interruption here? Examine whether the axis of comparison changes: the order of investment versus the endpoint of yosher.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E11 — Adam Kadmon's feet

Source: research addition.

In the same branch of Etz Chaim, the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet is described in relation to the igulim of Atik, and a gloss discusses its relation to Radla. How is this mapped to the bottom of Asiyah? Separate the main text, R. Chaim Vital's gloss, and R. Tzemach's note; proximity must not be turned into a reconciliation.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E12 — Returning light

Source: user.

What returns, from where and to where, and why does the return add power? Is the source of the addition the kav, the sovev, or the embedding of the beginning in the end? Which details are explicit, and which come from a later analogy?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E13 — Atik

Source: user.

Why are Arich Anpin, Abba and Imma, and ZON enumerated, but not Atik? Earlier in the same Epistle, Arich Anpin and Atik Yomin appear together. Examine the scope of the enumeration, intermediary/emanated, and the inner/outer dimensions of Keter; do not choose one without local evidence.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E14 — Keter

Source: user.

In what sense is Malchut Keter from below upward? Does this concern an order of enumeration, the advantage of a source, the function of returning light, or all of these? What does "their beginning is embedded in their end" prove, and what does it not prove?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E15 — Repetitions

Source: user.

Map the repetitions about the endpoint of the kav and Adam Kadmon's feet: identifying the location, adding returning light, the analogy of Atzilut, returning to the referent, and the destination of investment. Does each repetition add a datum? The direction in the text is from below upward.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E16 — Two ascents

Source: research addition.

Are returning light and raising mayin nukvin the same thing? The passage first describes an activity in spontaneous growth and subsequently an activity through sowing; two ascents must not be identified merely because both begin below.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E17 — Actual Divinity

Source: user.

Why is "which is actual Divinity" emphasized again concerning the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? What is the subject of "which is" (שהוא)? What distinguishes this neshamah-light from the vessel, the vegetative power, and the physical plant?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E18 — Pronouns and wording

Source: user and expansion.

Map hu/hi/zo/mimmenah/mehen/al yedei zeh (הוא/היא/זו/ממנה/מהן/על ידי זה) throughout the unit. The absence of a correction in the list is not proof of kabbalistic intent. The list of corrections mentioned by the user was not actually attached to this round's package.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E19 — Sefer HaGilgulim

Source: user.

Verify the cited matter in the text of Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20; distinguish it from Shaar HaGilgulim. What are the book's title, edition, printed folio, scan number, and extent of correspondence? H-B23822 is a target for examination, not a witness read in this round.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E20 — Cited in Likkutei Amarim

Source: user.

The gloss in Tanya 6 explicitly mentions Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20; note 53 also refers to chapter 18, the end of chapter 51, and the end of chapter 52. What does each chapter supply? Identify the reference without claiming that the entire chain of returning light appears there.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E21 — ABYA within Asiyah

Source: user.

Why is the precision of Atzilut, Beriah, and Yetzirah within Asiyah needed? What is their relation to the general worlds? What is the place of Asiyah within Asiyah and of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah? Do not assume these are synonyms.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E22 — Order of investment

Source: user and expansion.

How is light ascending from the endpoint of the kav “first” invested in Atzilut within Asiyah and then in Beriah and Yetzirah within it? Is this the same returning light, a detailing of it, or an additional route? What changes with “and according to what is written”?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E23 — Agent and vessel

Source: user.

Map: kav → neshamah-light → endpoint of the vessel → the utterance “Let [the earth] sprout” → vegetative power → plant. Which arrows were stated and which were supplied? What does “and it is the utterance” refer back to, and how does “strength and force” relate to the preceding paragraph about the sovev?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E24 — Chochmah and Malchut

Source: research addition.

Why are “Let [the waters] swarm” / “Let [the earth] bring forth” attributed to Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah, while “Let [the earth] sprout” is discussed at the endpoint of the vessel? What exactly refers to Chochmah, and does the change of level explain the difference in the time of the activity?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E25 — Six and seven

Source: user.

Why do the same parentheses mention the six days of Creation and then the seven days of Creation? Distinguish the time of the acts of

creation from the scope of gratuitous kindness. This is only a proposed reading until a source is found; do not emend ו״ to ו׳ without a witness.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E26 — Gratuitous kindness

Source: user and expansion.

What does “without any raising of mayin nukvin at all” mean in the first creation, and what remains gratuitous now? Is spontaneous growth an exception? How would Adam’s prayer for growth in the sources of Genesis 2 / the Sages fit in, if it concerns the same claim?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E27 — Continually and year

Source: user.

What is the difference between “continually, forever and ever” and “continually, year after year”? Note 58 points to Iggeret HaKodesh 14: examine annual renewal of the light, and do not be satisfied with the existence of seasons.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E28 — A likeness of Ein Sof

Source: user.

What does the condition “for if [this world] were to endure… many myriads of years” prove? Is it an inexhaustible power, repetition without a fixed limit, or an actual infinity? Why first “an aspect of Ein Sof” and subsequently “a likeness of”? No fixed finite duration of the world may be inferred from this.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E29 — Reproduction

Source: user.

Why is growth chosen rather than animal and human reproduction? Distinguish yesh me-ayin itself, matter versus spiritual power, reproduction from an existing species, continual renewal, and the advantage of the lowest recipient. Do not categorically deny revelation of Ein Sof in reproduction.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E30 — Yesh me-ayin and “like”

Source: user.

Why are those sown and planted described as “like yesh me-ayin”? Is the qualification present only in their case, and what is its relation to “absolute nothingness and naught” earlier? What does the seed nevertheless do, and what does it not supply?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E31 — Incommensurability

Source: user.

Why the details of fruit, tree, branches, leaves, hundreds of kernels, straw, and ears of grain? Distinguish quality, quantity, and difference of level. A large number alone is not mathematical incommensurability; how does the evidence work here?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E41 — Sovev and returning light

Source: research addition.

At the end of the Epistle the sovev and the kav appear together near the aspect of returning light. Is the return also attributed to the sovev,

or only to the kav? The present passage explicitly formulates it in the kav. Examine the scope of the description without anticipating the entire study of the next passage.

Dossier 0544 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [409]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Prompt for Grok

Task: new research into the penultimate passage of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, from "And furthermore" to "the purpose of the creation of the human being." Dossier opening date: September 23, 2026. Do not write a booklet. This is R1 in the Earth dossier, not F11 in the dossier on the union of ZON.

The user's goal: the most detailed possible plain meaning — wording, pronouns, contexts, concepts, parallels, and contradictions. Partial answers and questions remaining open are a legitimate result. Add questions if the sources require it, but do not lose the user's questions. This is a first stage, not a request for a final determination of the entire dossier.

Rules of evidence:

1. Read the source texts. The compiler's report or another model's report is a claim to examine; agreement between models is not evidence.
2. For every claim, state whether it is the source's wording, a later interpretation, your conclusion, or a hypothesis. State exact source,

[409] Document 0544: IGK20-Earth-R1_05_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

paragraph/page and link, and what you read yourself: photograph, digital text, or reference only.

3. Do not attribute an explanation from Lessons, a translation, or an editorial note to the Alter Rebbe. Do not call truncated search results "full text." An exact quotation must not be a paraphrase in quotation marks.
4. If a text is inaccessible: report the barrier once, try an accessible primary route, and continue with what is possible. Do not claim to have read a photograph on the basis of a transcription. For each scan: book and edition identity, printed page, file/PDF page number, and limit of reading.
5. In each in-depth dossier: preferred answer, evidence, serious alternative, strongest evidence against your answer, and limit of the determination. Do not turn "I did not find" into "there is no source."
6. Do not invent a mechanism to connect two sentences. If you propose a connection, write which additional sentence would verify it. A diagram must mark explicit arrows versus conjectural arrows.
7. Avoid an endless survey and repeated searching of the same pages without a new target. Finish with a report even when some sources are inaccessible. There is no need to wait for the other models' results.
8. New questions: E42 onward with the model's name, to avoid collisions. Preserve existing E01–E41.

Limits accepted from the previous research:

- The union of ZON of Asiyah in Iggeret HaKodesh 15 is explicit; its reconciliation with the negation in 47 has not been proved. Do not reopen the dossier unless a new source directly relevant to the present question is found.

- Do not automatically identify Essence, sovev, igulim, and kav. Do not turn “just as in Atzilut itself” into proof of identity of nature or intensity not found in the source.
- Do not

identify the neshamah of sefirot with a human soul. The pronoun “their” in the previous dossier did not prove kav in the nefesh–ruach–neshamah of souls.

- Different printed witnesses and different websites are not necessarily independent witnesses.
- The specific list of corrections mentioned by the user has not been received. Look for an identified copy if needed, but do not claim to have examined his.
- Orally stated numbers about sperm cells and crop yield are not a verified basis. Preserve the underlying question about reproduction without relying on them.

Your role: conceptual and textual research into the beginning of the unit and the orders of drawing down.

Four in-depth dossiers:

A. E01–E03, E08–E12: what the passage adds; sovev versus the igulim of Adam Kadmon, yosher, and kav; without a great interruption; source of the intensity of returning light. Read Etz Chaim, gate 1, branches 2–4 as needed, and Tanya 48. Explicitly set the description of the remoteness of the vessels of Asiyah in Etz Chaim against the description of the endpoint here. The distinction “order of investment / endpoint of yosher” is a candidate to examine, not a solution supplied to you. Show how the endpoint of the kav, which does not connect to Ein Sof from below, accords with returning light and proximity to the sovev.

B. E13–E15: why Atik is omitted from the Arich Anpin–Abba and Imma–ZON list; Malchut as Keter from below upward; “their begin-

ning is embedded"; the role of every repetition. Earlier in the same Epistle, before the passage, Arich Anpin and Atik Yomin are mentioned together: read the sentence in its location. Do not be satisfied with "five partzufim are enumerated" without a source for the applicability of that enumeration here.

C. E17–E23: hu/hi, actual Divinity, neshamah-light, ABYA within Asiyah, returning light versus order of investment. Examine the gloss in chapter 6, chapter 18, and the ends of 51–52, to which note 53 refers. The gloss in 6 mentions Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20; it must be verified, and what it proves and what still depends on the book itself clarified. Do not turn the local order within Asiyah into general BYA without evidence.

D. E16 and E41: is returning light identical to raising mayin nukvin, and is returning light also attributed to sovev at the end of the Epistle? Read the conclusion only to determine the expression's scope, without now composing an explanation of tomorrow's passage.

For all four dossiers give the reader a clear answer, even if part of it is "undecided." Check the rest of the map's questions with a status line; growth and purpose questions will also be examined in depth by Claude, so there is no need to duplicate their complete source survey.

Deliverable: IGK20-Earth-R1-Grok. Opening with up to five new findings; four in-depth dossiers; a concept/relation map (without a misleading spatial drawing); a short E01–E41 table; source register; up to three specific follow-up targets with a threshold for changing the conclusion. Target length 2,500–4,000 words, without padding. If this scope does not allow precision, prefer precision and explicitly state the status of what you did not examine.

Round folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ptqHOycgA--ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk

Everything needed to begin the work also appears later in this prompt. If a link is blocked, do not claim that the files were read, and there is no need to wait for them.

Starting sources (S was read by the compiler to the extent recorded in the register; you must verify for yourself what you quote):

- S01: the Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 20: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקודש_כ_ד. Digital text, marked “not checked”; the unit and its context were examined.
- S02: Lessons in Tanya, 11 Tishrei, Hebrew, https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026. Later explanation; read digitally.
- S03: Lessons in Tanya, 11 Tishrei, English, https://www.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026. Later explanation and translated notes; the text and notes 48–60 were read.
- S04: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 6, gloss: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_א_ו. Digital text; the gloss was read in context.
- S05: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 18: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_א_יח. Digital text.
- S06: the Alter Rebbe, end of Tanya 51: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_א_נא. Digital text; the end of the chapter and the textual note were read.
- S07: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 52: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_א_נב. Digital text, marked “not checked.”
- S08: R. Chaim Vital, Etz Chaim, gate 1, branch 4: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/שער_א/ענף_ד. Digital text; the orders of igulim/yosher, the endpoint of the feet, and the notes were read.
- S09: R. Chaim Vital, Etz Chaim, gate 1, branch 2: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/שער_א/ענף_ב. Opened and the beginning read; continuation of the branch is a target for completion.
- S10: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 48: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_קלח_א_מח. Digital text.

- S11: the Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 14: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אינת_קלח_ד_די. Digital text.
- S12: the Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 8: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אינת_קלח_ד_ח. Digital text.
- S13: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 36: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תנ_אי_קלח_א_ול. Digital text.
- S14: the Alter Rebbe, Tanya 37, opening and continuation: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אינת_קלח_א_זל. Digital text; the opening and paragraphs on performing mitzvot were read.
- S15: Genesis 1, 11/20/24: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תישארב_א. Digital biblical text.
- T01: Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, HB23822 https://hebrewbooks.org/23822. Target; its text has not been read in the present study.
- T02: glosses and corrections to Tanya; the list of corrections: https://chabadlibrary.org/books. Target only.
- T03: Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, קצו [196] and תשפו [786]: https://chabadlibrary.org/books. Reference from Lessons; the target texts were not read.
- T04: Likkutei Torah, Shelach, “Tovah ha-aretz me’od me’od” (“The land is very, very good”): https://chabadlibrary.org/books

Reference from the Rebbe’s note in translation; the text was not read.

- T05: Genesis 2 and the Midrash/Talmudic discussion on Adam’s prayer and growth: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תישארב_ב. New target for examination, not read in this round.

Dossier 0548 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [412]

[412] Document 0548: IGK20-Earth-R2_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E13 — Why Not Atik?

Grok's proposal that Atik is already included in "Malchut as Keter from below upward," so mentioning it would be a duplication, is insufficient: Arich Anpin is itself an aspect of Keter and is nevertheless enumerated, and Malchut returning as a source is not the same partzuf enumerated as a garment. There is no basis here for preferring the proposal to an enumeration of five partzufim or a difference in the scope of investment. All possibilities require a source that distinguishes at this location. The user's question is preserved in full.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E09–E12 — Proximity and Remoteness

Changing the axis of comparison is a worthy hypothesis, not a proved bridge. Each sentence must document who is remote from whom and within which configuration, and distinguish yosher/igulim and vessels/lights. The formulation "where the kav ends, sovev begins" is at most explanatory language; the general sovev must not be assigned a spatial starting point. Describing sovev as "background only" is also weak: the Epistle places it within the explanation, but does not establish that sovev produces the kav's return.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E22–E23 — Two Statements, Still Not One Settled Map

The first description: at its endpoint, the kav shines from below upward to the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah. The second description: the same "this radiance" is first invested in Atzilut within Asiyah, through Beriah and Yetzirah within it, as far as the aforementioned neshamah-light. Do not invent a departure from the neshamah-light back to Atzilut within Asiyah. It remains to clarify whether this details the same radiance, different aspects of it, or an-

other passage; “this” supports continuity but does not alone resolve the tension of direction. The detailed order does not describe physical movement.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E27–E28 — Continually, Renewal, and Infinity

Note 58 and Epistle 14 support annual renewal that is not repetition of the same level. “A likeness of Ein Sof” must not be reduced to “not continuity, but a cycle”: cyclicality alone is not limitlessness, and continuity and renewal are not absolute opposites. The activity’s existence, renewal of the light, and the capacity to act as long as the world exists are three distinct aspects. The question of why “an aspect of” and then “a likeness of” remains.

Dossier 0550 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [414]

Prompt for Grok: IGK20-Earth-R2-Grok — E21: In R1 You Established Malchut of Malchut as the Point of Asiyah within Asiyah, Then Warned Against Identifying Them. Reconcile the Two Claims and Distinguish Inclusion from Identity.

1. E13–E15: a short examination. Your R1 explanation that Atik was omitted to avoid doubling Keter does not stand alone: Arich Anpin is enumerated, and Malchut as Keter from below is not necessarily an additional partzuf in the list of garments. Is there a focused source distinguishing Atik/Arich in the kav’s investmen-

[414] Document 0550: IGK20-Earth-R2_02_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

t here? One may also conclude that the reason has not yet been found. Do not replace the user's question with the observation that Atik was mentioned earlier. Likkutei Torah, Shelach, mentioned below discusses the inner dimension of Keter; do not transfer from it a reason for the omission without a bridge.

Deliverable package: up to approximately 1,800 words beyond the necessary short quotations. Do not write a paragraph for the booklet. If no bridge was found, give two conflicting sentences and a limited proposal, without declaring a final contradiction.

— Rules, updates, and sources —

B"H. IGK20-Earth-R2 — unit from "And furthermore" to "the purpose of the creation of the human being." This round continues Earth-R1; it is not F11 and not production of a booklet. Write in Hebrew. Read the sources themselves; do not decide on the strength of model agreement or the compiler's confidence. You may disagree with the compiler's criticism with evidence. Do not present a text you did not open as though it was read. Separate: explicit / later explanation / reasoned interpretation / open. Report a barrier once and continue with available sources. Do not reopen the union dossier. It was put on hold after F10 with a defined gap; it was not wholly resolved. The original E01–E41 map is attached. Reassigning numbers is prohibited. Additional questions are allowed and called for if they arise from reading; mark an identifier with the model's name, not a bare number that could collide.

Mandatory evidence update for all models: the user's photograph of "Notes and Corrections," p. 414, was read by the compiler. The heading is "tentative note." Lines:

1. 131b, "דהארה" ("of a radiance"), "'וכו" ("etc."): "It requires further study what this includes."

2. 131b, “יתר” (“beyond”), “הנ”ל הארה .. הנ”ל” (“the above, a radiance .. the above”): “The wording and the intent require further study.”
3. 132a, “אבל” (“but”), “אבל .. יאמר” (“but .. would speak”): “Seemingly these words belong earlier, after the word ‘the grass.’ Or later, after the word ‘particular details.’ ”

This page contains no hu/hi correction in the passage and no six/seven correction; etzlo→etzlah (“with him → with her”) appears elsewhere. The whole list was not read, and the image’s edition was not identified. If you did not see the image, write “compiler’s transcription from a photograph.” Do not emend the working text or silently change a span of words. Compiler’s addendum: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Gel3pPw7ItbaxCO-Gf9EP3QhYgdtht1O/view

R1 corrections to take into account:

A. Note 48 concerns the opening; do not rely on it for six/seven.

B. “It does not even contain the vegetative power” is in Tanya 38, not 48. Chapter 48 does concern scant vitality in the inanimate and vegetative.

C. The sovev paragraph before the unit says “strength and force,” not “strength and might.”

D. Bot’s table received different E numbers from our map. The content of the testimony is preserved; statuses are not imported by number.

E. “Without any raising of mayin nukvin at all” in the text is said in parentheses about the days of Creation. Subsequently the division between the sown and that which grows on its own is explicit. A connection may be made, but the statement from the parentheses must not be copied as a direct quotation about all present growth.

F. Bot’s sources on Sefer HaGilgulim became accessible in the folder, but there is not yet a clean transcription of the decisive paragraph.

The absence of a word in a partial reading is not its absence from the chapter.

Basic sources:

- The Epistle's text: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת
- Explanation and notes: https://www.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026
- Tanya 6: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_א_קלח_אינת
- 38: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חל_א_קלח_אינת
- 48: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת
- Epistle 8: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ח_ד_קלח_אינת
- 14: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/די_ד_קלח_אינת
- 36–37: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ול_א_קלח_אינת ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/זל_א_קלח_אינת
- Etz Chaim 1, 4: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/הנע/א_רעש/מייח_זע_ד
- Rashi on Genesis 2:5: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/שר%22י_לע_ה_ב_תישארב
- Likkutei Torah, Shelach, discourse beginning "Vayomru

el kol adat go' tovah v'go' " ("And they said to the entire congregation, etc., good, etc."), section 4: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898887

The compiler has now read the continuation of the last discourse: it does indeed discuss the doubled "very," action, "embedded," and the inner dimension of Keter. This is a real target for correspondence with note 59, not certain identification of "as written elsewhere."

Bot sources:

- Folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Ht9JICBliI6zijzh5xKkkWNpAivM6iq0
- ZIP: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ypxiaZPUDKCj8PooKNhksdD7W1kNDzXV/view

- Gilgulim 30: https://drive.google.com/file/d/12jdifGI8HNYzGH5rgjQ7h06g-Rim4H7a/view
- Gilgulim 31: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VLrXjd5Vz2GgHrrPkqpLUxsdfKHjjn6-/view
- Bot's description: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ir6QxJOvqgtPJbeHks0wQRgX6E3JopNO/view

According to Bot alone: HB23822, Frankfurt am Main 5444; beginning of chapter 20 on PDF30 and continuation on 31, folio 17. The compiler opened the description but could not transfer the images and therefore did not read them personally. If Drive is blocked, continue from the text and open sources. Do not invent the contents of a missing ZIP.

Deliverable template: up to five new findings; for each principal dossier, preferred answer, evidence in the text, inferential step, serious alternative, strongest evidence against, limit, and one source capable of changing it. A change table only for the identifiers examined. A clear explanatory paragraph marking the proposals. No need to duplicate 41 "examined" rows. "Examined" is not "decided." New questions and a change of direction in response to a source are appropriate, but do not return to the same pages to produce an unwritten sentence.

— Working text —

Dossier 0553 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [417]

[417] Document 0553: IGK20-Earth-R2_05_Canonical_Map.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Additional Questions Are Preserved as Aliases — E42-Bot = Photograph of the Gloss in Chapter 6; E43-Bot = Gilgulim Transcription; E44-Bot = Or HaTorah; E45-Bot = Likkutei Torah.

No deletion or renumbering. Bot's old table is mapped separately in the sources file.

— The original map, verbatim —

Dossier 0554 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [418]

The Result — 5. Sefer HaGilgulim: The "Clean Paragraph" Is Not Clean

I opened the complete PDF30 and the crops of the left column. At the beginning of the relevant paragraph, "כי תחלה קונה נפש חיצוניות עשיה" ("for first he acquires the nefesh of the outer dimension of Asiyah") can be read; later, "רוח מחיצוניות היצירה" ("ruach from the outer dimension of Yetzirah") can also be read. P3 replaced the outer dimension with the inner dimension here. This is a content change, not a vowel-pointing error. Further on, the expression "nefesh of Atzilut within Asiyah" is indeed visible, but there are deletions and words that are hard to read.

New status: photographs were viewed by the compiler; only verbal focal points were verified. There is not yet a complete diplomatic transcription. The heading of chapter 20 is visible in the right column of PDF30 under the running heading "Gilgulim, chapter 19"; the statement that the chapter begins in the left column therefore also requires correction.

[418] Document 0554: IGK20-Earth-R3_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The text concerns acquisition of levels of nefesh and their garments. Transferring from it to the order of the kav's radiance in the neshamah-light of Malchut of Malchut is not automatic. The Alter Rebbe's reference may rest on a rule of investment, but one must separate: the wording of Sefer HaGilgulim; the rule learned from it; its application in the Epistle. The absence of kav/returning light from the lines read does not prove absence from the chapter.

Dossier 0568 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [399]

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 6. "Let [the Earth] Sprout," Continually, and a Likeness of Ein Sof

The Epistle contrasts the continuing activity of "Let [the earth] sprout," producing growth, with the utterances creating animals at Creation. It attributes the latter to Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah and the power of "Let [the earth] sprout" to the endpoint of the vessel. The precise reason for choosing the two aspects has not been proved. The transition from six days of Creation to seven days of Creation has likewise not been reconciled; do not emend the wording without a witness. The Rebbe's note on the opening "And furthermore" is not a note on six/seven.

"Continually," renewal every year, and capacity to persist if the world exists for many years are not the same concept. Note 58 and the parallel in Epistle 14 allow renewal of radiance within the activity's continuity;

[399] Document 0568: IGK20-Earth-R4_Consolidated.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

do not infer that renewal negates continuity. “A likeness of Ein Sof” describes the continuing capacity revealed in a limited, conditional order, not proof of the actual existence of an infinity of years or of a known finite duration for the world.

Dossier 0425 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [391]

The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — In-Depth Research into Plain Meaning, Kabbalah, and Chasidut — “Returning Light,” the Sovev, and the Kav — And Precision in “A Radiance of a Radiance, Etc.”

Here, in my opinion, your precise reading of the syntax is substantially correct and very important.

The sentence is:

“For it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds, and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light as mentioned above.”

Dossier 0405 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [446]

[391] Document 0425: Initial-Deep-Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[446] Document 0405: IGK20-Finale-R1-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Compiler's Review and Additional Sources — 5. Returning Light — What Can Be Established

In the sentence "where… a radiance… from the light… and from the kav is revealed," the verb's subject is the radiance. Both source phrases attach to it. "Is revealed" must not syntactically be restricted to sovev alone. The preferred reading is preserved: returning light at the beginning of the sentence describes the relation in which the lower nourishes the higher; at the end it is directly attributed to the kav, in accordance with the earth unit. This is a reasoned interpretation, not an exclusive syntactic proof.

It is permissible to say that the sovev and kav are named as sources of the radiance at the lowest point; one must not infer that they are two independent mechanisms. Conversely, there is no explicit sentence requiring that sovev itself returns. "Etc."

as an abbreviation of the third radiance is supported by the later explanation, but does not explain why the author specifically chose an abbreviation.

Dossier 0424 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [439]

IGK20-Finale-Close — The Compiler's Report and Explanation of the Concluding Unit — C. Final Corrections Needed Even after R5

Potentially misleading formulation	Wording preserved in the closing report
Returning light from the kav and the sovev	Radiance from the sovev; returning light of the kav, on the preferred contextual reading

[439] Document 0424: Final-Closure.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Potentially misleading formulation	Wording preserved in the closing report
Etz Chaim and the Epistle definitely answer different questions, so there is no difficulty	The object of mapping differs in its wording; this is a proposed reconciliation, and the reversal of the pairs remains without an explicit bridge
An angel possessing one emotive attribute has no interinclusion	A specific function does not rule out refinement or every kind of interinclusion
L6 is the only place where both quotations from the conclusion appear together	L6 is a parallel found in which both are explained together; no claim of exclusivity throughout the literature
Sag/Tohu are the kav's returning light	Explanatory parallels with a structural connection; no explicit identity found
Bot's photograph of Kuntres Acharon 4 is a printed witness	Screenshot of Wikisource; a digital witness, not a photograph of a Tanya edition
אי"ח עט"ב in L2 abbreviates returning light	In this context: eshet chayil ateret baalah, "a woman of valor is her husband's crown"; returning light must be based on the explicit words in the continuation

18 · Sowing, Water, Raising Mayin Nukvin, and Humanity's Purpose

The act of sowing adds the human contribution to the description of the earth's power. The Epistle distinguishes between growth that comes on its own and fruits produced through sowing and planting. "On their own" must not be turned into a botanical claim that every wild plant comes into being without a seed; the contrast concerns the awakening described and its advantage.

The analogy in Epistle 8 raised a real difficulty: there the vegetative power is said to become actual through the seed and kernel. The analogy's applicability can be interpreted in light of the sown growth it discusses, but this qualification must not be inserted into the au-

thor's wording as though it had been written there. The explanation must hold the parallel and the difficulty together.

The photographed witness from Or HaTorah קצו [196] discusses rains, bringing the earth's power from concealment into revelation, and three levels of influence. The source provides a real basis for connecting earth, water, and growth. It does not prove the proposed division between mayin nukvin before germination and mayin nukvin afterward. Reading the paragraph continuously requires seeing the analogy of bestower and recipient within it as well.

This raises the question of purpose. Drawing down within the higher systems and a dwelling in the lower realms need not be two competing purposes. One can distinguish between the scope of Divine service's action and the place where its purpose is realized. Kuntres Acharon 4 and the Tanya parallels support connecting elevation and drawing down, but this does not constitute a proved identification of every "elsewhere" reference in the Epistle.

The Wording of the Epistle — Source Units

W14-21 · 201–209

Except that some of them come through raising mayin nukvin, namely those that are sown and planted.

W14-22 · 210–222

And nevertheless, they are like something from nothing, for the planted seed is utterly incommensurate with the fruit,

W14-23 · 223–233

and also with the entire tree, with its branches and leaves; likewise with varieties of seeds and vegetables,

W14-24 · 234–245

and also with varieties of grain, for hundreds of kernels to come into being from one kernel is like something from nothing,

W14-25 · 246–256

and all the more so the straw and ears of grain. Now, the fruits produced through raising mayin nukvin, namely sowing and planting,

W14-26 · 257–266

are very, very superior to those growing on their own from the vegetative power in the earth alone.

W14-27 · 267–278

And from this we can understand the drawing down of supernal lights into ABYA (which is the purpose of the creation of the human being), as written elsewhere.

The word ranges preserve the local count in the earlier division of the source; W identifiers are fixed. Word count of the working text: 1,640 words.

C20 · Raising Mayin Nukvin and Humanity's Purpose: The Contribution of Kuntres Acharon 4

Kuntres Acharon 4 combines inanimate, vegetative, and animal food, refinement through Mah, a root in Sag, sowing, and drawing down through mitzvot. Its verbal correspondence to Likkutei Torah, Emor's reference to "Iggeret HaKodesh near its end" closed a substantive target initially sought in Epistle 20. It did not identify the author of the reference or decide the bibliographical history of the title.

The parallel's importance is not identification of Sag with returning light. It explicitly requires elevation and drawing down together, and establishes the purpose as revelation below. This corrects an explanation that could have made departure from the lower realm the entire advantage of mitzvot. A seed arouses the earth's power; parch-

ment and an etrog arouse a higher root; the result is light drawn down into vessels.

Epistle 8 gives a sowing analogy in the context of charity and prayer. The tension between "only if" there and spontaneous growth in Epistle 20 remains a question about the analogy's applicability. Restricting Epistle 8 to cultivated growth is plausible from context, but not an explicitly written qualification. The difficulty must not be erased by altering the quotation.

Drawing down in all of ABYA does not replace a dwelling in the lower realms with a purpose centered in the higher. One can distinguish between action through the order of drawing down and its purpose in the very lowest realm. The parallels support this substantive correspondence, not a proved identification of "elsewhere." Nor does the doubled "very" in the description of the fruits automatically bear the two levels in the discourse "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od" ("The land is very, very good").[447]

Status of the Questions after the Fourth Round of Clarification

This is a documented register of conclusions from dossier 0570; the term "supported" denotes the conclusion of that investigation within its limits.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E32	On their own and decay	Limit of applicability	No empirical claims established about coming into being without a seed.
E33	Mayin nukvin in sowing and growth	Supported interpretation	Two applications; no proved botanical division in time.

[447] Iggeret HaKodesh 8 and 20; Kuntres Acharon 4; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, 3–4; Earth R4; Finale R5.

ID	Question	Status	Conclusion and limit
E34	Very, very and Shelach	Verified anchor; partial application	Discourse also located in print; no automatic transfer to the duplication concerning fruit.
E35	Charity and prayer in Epistle 8	Supported parallel	Sowing as an arousal; does not resolve every applicability of the analogy in 20.
E36	“Only if” in 8 versus “on their own”	Open	Restriction to the sowing analogy is a contextual reading, not an explicit qualification.
E37	Humanity’s purpose	Supported substantive reconciliation	Action of drawing down and realization of the dwelling; not an exhaustive account of all reasons for creation.
E38	ABYA versus the lower realms	Supported substantive reconciliation	Shelach section 3 and Tanya 41 connect Divine service and revelation; “elsewhere” unidentified.
E39	List and notes	Corrections verified within their limits	Note 48 on the opening; reference for “Let [the waters] swarm” to 1:20; list 414 only.
E40	Seed data and comparisons	Not used as evidence	Unverified; not a sufficient criterion for yesh me-ayin.

The Topic’s Conclusion: Awakening from Below and the Limits of the Water Analogy

Sowing and planting are called raising mayin nukvin in the Epistle. The seed does not create the vegetative power from nothing, but its action within the earth arouses a superior manifestation of that power. This is the transition from coming into being discernible in nature to the meaning of human Divine service.

“On their own” is not an instruction to formulate a botanical theory of growth without seed. It is part of the contrast with the described work of sowing. Epistle 8, in which the seed brings the earth’s power into

actuality, requires reading the scope of each analogy. A correspondence between the discussions may be proposed, but their wordings must not be merged without showing what each comes to prove.

Likewise, physical water must not automatically be identified with raising mayin nukvin in every detail. In the reader's book we will use irrigation as an analogy for bringing potential into actuality; in the research book, the distinction between the educational analogy and the kabbalistic term and its evidence is preserved. The mere sharing of the word "water" is not evidence that the actions are identical.

The central determination is that the lower action adds revelation not described as the source's action alone. This opens the question of nourishment: not only does the higher act upon the lower, but the higher receives from the lower after the latter becomes a vessel for realizing its purpose.

The Research Questions in This Topic

The wording of the questions is preserved so that the completeness of the discussion can be checked. The mere appearance of a question in the register does not constitute a decision about it; the investigation and the limit of its conclusion must be read. The identifiers here form the edited map of questions and are not an automatic merger with the earlier numbering of other reports.

E32 — What is the scope of "grow on their own," and what is the role of seed decay in the explanations? This must not be translated into the absence of all matter or a botanical rule the author did not formulate. Scientific questions should be marked separately and must not replace linguistic clarification.

E33 — What ascends in sowing and planting, who is the Nukva, what arouses the power, and what is drawn down in response? Is mayin

nukvin a sufficient cause, a vessel, a refinement, or an awakening? How is an addition received that exceeds the measure of the action?

E34 — In what respect are the fruits superior, what is the role of the doubled “very,” and what is the scope of the generalization? Examine note 59 and the parallel “Tovah ha-aretz me’od me’od” (“The land is very, very good”); do not present all cultivated produce as superior in every respect.

E35 — How does “from this we can understand” lead to human Divine service? Iggeret HaKodesh 8 is a direct parallel for the analogy of sowing, charity, and prayer. Which detail in the analogy corresponds to action, mayin nukvin, source, light, and fruit?

E36 — In Iggeret HaKodesh 8, the description of the vegetative power within the analogy is conditional on a seed; in Epistle 20 there is also spontaneous growth. Is the discussion in Epistle 8 limited to a sown type, or is another reconciliation required? Do not apply a sentence from the analogy to all growth without its context.

E37 — What do the parentheses “which is the purpose of the creation of the human being” add, and what does “which is” (שהוא) refer back to? What is the relation to a dwelling in the lower realms, knowledge of G-d, and revelation of His powers? Distinguish purpose, manner of realization, and result, without declaring in advance that all formulations are identical.

E38 — Why draw down into all of ABYA if chapter 36 emphasizes that the purpose is not for the higher worlds? Examine chapters 36–37; preserve the continuation of the Epistle on the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders and practical mitzvot as context, rather than now opening up the whole of tomorrow’s passage.

E39 — Verify the Rebbe’s glosses, the list of corrections, and notes 48, 53, 58, 59. At the end of chapter 51 there is a textual note about Malchut of Yetzirah; attribute it to the correct editor. Note 56 on the

English website refers to Genesis 1:10, but “Let [the waters] swarm” is 1:20; this is a correction of a reference, not of the Epistle’s wording.

E40 — Preserve the user’s difficulty from the tiny seed and reproduction, without building on unverified numbers of sperm cells or crop yields. What is the relevant measure for the plain meaning: size, matter, vitality, species, continuity, or the level of the source?

The Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism, and Alternatives

The dossiers are arranged here by family of investigation and round, within the topic. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Designations such as PASS, SEALED, and the like are historical determinations by the dossier’s author; they are not an independent endorsement by the editor. English passages were preserved in their own language so as not to replace original evidence with a conjectural translation. Document identifiers make it possible to return to the archive.

Dossier 0239 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [4]

Station 13 — The Kav at the Endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon — The Epistle’s Wording

«And likewise also the kav itself, invested in the termination and endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon, which is the end

[4] Document 0239: E1.3 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 12-17.md [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 12–17]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

of his feet of yosher, ending in Malchut of Asiyah: the radiance of the kav shines from there.»

Dossier 0612 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [448]

B”H. YeshivahAI — Review of Four Booklets on the Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Base edition: September 23, 2026, 12 Tishrei 5787.

Suggestions for improvement are supplied here in writing only. No action on files, no sharing changes, and no sending to a third party.

Gemini — distinctive review focus: independent reading, completeness, and clarity for the reader. Open the research without assuming that model agreement is evidence. Examine which questions are actually asked, which are answered, and which are pushed into a footnote. Read the reader’s edition as someone encountering the unit for the first time: is it clear what the paradox is, what the Epistle answers, and what the parallels add? Summarize the argument yourself before reading the continuous explanation, and compare. Independently examine the forty questions, hypothesis register, history of the rounds, and source mapping. Propose a short alternative opening and two improved explanatory passages in Hebrew and English, without changing the degrees of certainty. Examine whether the long book gains value from the detail and photographs, or whether there are repetitions that add nothing.

[448] Document 0612: Review-Prompt-Gemini.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0057 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [449]

Map of the Consolidated Dossier — R01 to R07 — The Files in This Folder

- 00 — GROK BOT START HERE — Universal Prompt — the launch file and universal prompt for every model.
- 01 — R05 ARCHIVE — Baseline Q01-Q88 — consolidated R05 archive.
- 02 — R06 ARCHIVE — Baseline and Delta — consolidated R06 archive.
- 03 — R07 ACTIVE — Current Research and Prompt — the active working round, including an independent ChatGPT baseline, Delta R06→R07, and the prompt.
- 04 — OPEN QUESTIONS AND WORKPLAN — R07 — the open work queue and tasks for Grok Bot.
- 05 — R01 ARCHIVE — Research and Questions — canonical R01 material.
- 06 — R02 ARCHIVE — Packet — canonical R02 material.
- 07 — R03 ARCHIVE — Packet — canonical R03 material.
- 08 — R04 ARCHIVE — Packet — canonical R04 material.

Map of the Consolidated Dossier — R01 to R07 — Recommended Reading Order

1. 00
2. 04
3. 03

[449] Document 0057: 09 — ARCHIVE INDEX — R01 to R07. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. 02
5. 01
6. 05, 06, 07, 08 — as needed, to return to a historical source.

Map of the Consolidated Dossier — R01 to R07 — History Rule

R01–R04 are background and archive material. R05 and R06 are locked baselines. R07 is the active round. Do not write a new dossier named R05 or R06, and do not retroactively change the closed rounds.

Map of the Consolidated Dossier — R01 to R07 — Earlier Raw Files

The raw Claude/Grok responses from R01–R04 were also preserved in the original Drive archive. They are not a source; they are provenance and review material. If there is disagreement about what a model claimed, open the original raw file and record the claim separately from the Torah source.

Map of the Consolidated Dossier — R01 to R07 — What Grok Bot Must Return

Grok Bot does not need to summarize all seven rounds again. It must read them, choose 3–5 open questions from 04, open sources itself, and write a new R07 checkpoint: findings, quotations, verdict, Delta R06→R07, R07-T## claims, questions partly closed, and questions remaining open.

Dossier 0122 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [6]

[6]Document 0122: 06 — R02 ARCHIVE — Packet. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

A. The Questioner's Message — Copied from the Current Message — The Questioner's Follow-Up Instruction — Preserved Verbatim

Also, this is very important, look at our previous booklet that we made, which is actually the opening of Iggeret HaKodesh twenty. So there, even though these questions are new, still, since this is a continuation of the whole series of studying Tanya, today in particular it is connected to the beginning of the Epistle. There is a connection, so I want there to be some continuity, you understand? Because, again, we are working on the booklet, everything will be organized. So the way we made the booklet will help you a lot with the study and explanation in this booklet, you understand? Because it really is in the same Epistle. And we have already done a great deal of study on the beginning of the Epistle. So it is very important, and it is all saved with you, you understand? So, and I think it will help a lot. And in the future, too, put it in the general instructions: when we continue the series, everything should be consistent, you understand? Because often this is a continuation of the previous booklet. So we need to check that. So put that in, update it in the instructions.

Implementation: the previous booklet was read, the continuity map above was added, and it was also incorporated into the round's prompt below. The live guide and "Start Here" file were updated with a standing rule for continuity between studies; specific Torah conclusions remain in the research dossier and do not become a binding rule for the series.

Dossier 0597 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [450]

R03 — Full Texts to Copy — To Copy to Grok

B”H — Round R03 — The Beginning of Created Yesh, Iggeret HaKodesh 20

Identifier: YA-IGK20-RESHIT-HAYESH-R03-GROK

Dossier 0041 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 6

Report or testimony from the history of the research [170]

Appendix — Previous Models’ Materials within the Consolidated Dossier — CLAUDE-R05-A — The Initial Synthesis

Claude-R05-A built a broad Q18–Q88 matrix and proposed these distinctions: a likeness of Divinity as an intermediate level; a distinction between root, abode, and garment; two axes of limit–measure and separation–yeshut; neshikin as a typical source for angelic souls and ZON as a typical source for human souls; the kav in nefesh–ruach–neshamah versus departure from the vessels; Adam, the first man, as a system of roots; and palaces and angelic bodies as yesh of Atzilut. This version contained points requiring examination and correction: Etz Chaim 40, discourse 10, was initially marked unverified; the source of the worlds was not stably located; BYA’s vessels were not

[450] Document 0597: reshit-hayesh-R03-prompts.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[170] Document 0041: 02 — R06 ARCHIVE — Baseline and Delta. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

emphasized as recipients of the power of creation; and some mappings were formulated too exclusively.

Appendix — Previous Models' Materials within the Consolidated Dossier — CLAUDE-R05-B — The Updated Version

Claude-R05-B incorporated some corrections: Etz Chaim 40, discourse 10, was recognized as a source for angels and humanity and for the ruach–nefesh–vessels layers; §§116–117 in Iggeret HaKodesh were recognized as a source that the vessels of BYA also receive strength and force to create; the source of the worlds was corrected to Idra Zuta 292b as a parallel source; Enoch was corrected to the neshamah portion of Atzilut rather than nefesh; "four levels" were marked as a synthesis [I]; and neshikin ceased to be an exclusive mapping. Review is still required of provenance, the degree of the kav's unification in nefesh–ruach–neshamah, the dikna, and the difference between the Epistle's text and later explanation.

Appendix — Previous Models' Materials within the Consolidated Dossier — GROK-R05 — Red-Team Review

Grok-R05 challenged the following claims: four levels as an explicit structure; vessels as independent creators; the exclusivity of Atzilut's vessels in possessing the power of creation; neshikin as a source only of angels; absence of nefesh–ruach–neshamah among angels; identification of the early tzaddikim with Enoch; mapping head/body/heel to nefesh/ruach/neshamah; and a necessary contradiction between the invested kav and departure from the vessels. It emphasized the power of creation in BYA's vessels, overlap in the neshikin and ZON mappings, the existence of ruach–nefesh–vessels among angels, and the need to keep questions open. Each claim must be examined to determine whether it is an independent discovery by Grok, verification

of previous material, or a correction already appearing in Claude-R05-B.

Appendix — Previous Models' Materials within the Consolidated Dossier — GROK-R05-UPDATED — The Red-Team Output Just Received

Status: a model response received after the independent research, before directly opening the pages in the follow-up round. It is not evidence in itself. Read it as review material, not as a source; current status is in R05-SOURCE-REOPENING.

Appendix — Previous Models' Materials within the Consolidated Dossier — CLAUDE-R05-UPDATED — Claude's Response Received after GROK-R05-UPDATED

Status: model review material, not evidence in itself. Incorporate it into the same dossier without opening a separate Claude package. The old access qualifications concerning 128 and 292 were replaced with the updated status in R05-SOURCE-REOPENING after the pages were opened.

Tailored Routes within the Same Prompt — If You Are Claude — A Route for Reviewing and Deepening Claude's Response

First read the sections marked CLAUDE-R05-A and CLAUDE-R05-B and the comparison matrix. Check Claude's previous response against the sources, and answer these questions in particular:

C1. Which claims initially marked [E] should be downgraded to [I], [E-secondary], or [U]?

C2. Are "three/four levels" the Epistle's wording or an editorial synthesis?

C3. Reexamine Etz Chaim 40, discourse 10: outer/inner dimensions, angelic souls, and nefesh–ruach–neshamah among angels.

C4. Examine §§116–117 in Iggeret HaKodesh: do BYA's vessels also receive strength and force to create yesh me-ayin, and how do they differ from Atzilut's vessels?

C5. Examine the mapping neshikin=angels and ZON=humanity against Etz Chaim 39, 4/9/12/14. Present the typical mapping and exceptions.

C6. Examine the reconciliation "the kav is invested in nefesh–ruach–neshamah" versus "departed and became separated from the vessels"; distinguish the source text from the explanation.

C7. Examine Adam, the first man, new souls, head/heel, Enoch, and Rashbi; do not identify Enoch with the early tzaddikim without a source.

C8. Read the new status in R05-SOURCE-REOPENING: Idra Rabba, Zohar III 128b, and Idra Zuta 292b were opened as full pages [E]. Examine separately printed Iggeret HaKodesh note 33 [U], variants among witnesses, the combination Arich Anpin/Ze'ir Anpin, and 288 as a different passage.

C9. Examine Likkutei Torah's interpretation: the worlds as letters in potential, not actual worlds.

C10. Produce a complete correction list for Claude-R05-B, with before/after, the source of the correction, and the cost of the correction.

C11. Examine the Alter Rebbe's direct source "Od biur al pi ha-nal" ("A Further Explanation Based on the Above," aid/5899043): Rashbi is an explicit example of a soul of Atzilut in a body in a different work, but does this identify the parentheses in Iggeret HaKodesh 20? Separate the two claims.

C12. Separate the text of Zohar 128 now read directly [E], Idra Zuta 292 read directly [E], Kehot note 33 not located [U], and variants among witnesses not fully surveyed. Do not write “in all textual witnesses” without examination.

C13. Distinguish in Q42 between a proved external framework (Malchut, letters, investment in BYA) and a full internal mechanism of turning “not yesh” into yesh, which remains [U].

C14. Distinguish in Q68 between [E] a neshamah invested in an angel’s ruach, nefesh, and vessels and [I]/[U] the claim that an angel’s nefesh–ruach–neshamah structure is identical to the structure of a human soul.

C15. Report what in Claude’s response verifies the canon, what corrects provenance, and what is an independent discovery; do not attribute discovery without documented priority.

Tailored Routes within the Same Prompt — If You Are Grok — A Red-Team Route for Grok’s Response and the Disagreements

First read the sections marked GROK-R05 and GROK-R05-UPDATED and the comparison matrix, but also read the Claude material to check whether a particular correction already appeared before your response. Answer these questions in particular:

G1. Which corrections were your independent discoveries, which verified the canon, and which had already appeared in Claude-R05-B? Do not demand undocumented credit.

G2. Read R05-SOURCE-REOPENING: Idra Rabba 128b and Idra Zuta 292b were opened directly [E]. Examine separately the provenance of Iggeret HaKodesh note 33 [U], variants among witnesses, the Arich Anpin/Ze’ir Anpin relation, and 288 as a separate passage.

G3. Challenge the distinction “only Atzilut’s vessels impart the power of creation”: what precisely is proved about BYA’s vessels, and what remains open concerning the degree of unification?

G4. Challenge the one-to-one mapping neshikin=angels and ZON= humanity using Etz Chaim 39, 4/9/12/14.

G5. Examine the claim of nefesh–ruach–neshamah among angels in Etz Chaim 40, discourse 10, and distinguish an angel’s structure from the structure of a human soul.

G6. Examine the Enoch claims: the neshamah portion of Atzilut and Metatron in Shaar HaGilgulim, versus the absence of identification in the text of Iggeret HaKodesh; add Rashbi as an example in another discourse of the Alter Rebbe.

G7. Challenge the reconciliation “kav in nefesh–ruach–neshamah = contracted radiance” and separate the Epistle’s text from the Rebbe’s explanation.

G8. Examine the dikna: the thirteen tikkunim of Arich Anpin, the nine of Ze’ir Anpin, and the drawing down between them; keep the precise syntax in Iggeret HaKodesh open.

G9. Examine “דיתבא/דיתבין” (“that sits / that sit”) versus “נטלין וסמכין” (“take and support”) and Likkutei Torah’s interpretation of letters in potential.

G10. Produce a table of claims to reject, correct, or leave [U], with a counter-claim source and the cost of correction.

G11. Also read CLAUDE-R05-UPDATED and R05-SOURCE-REOPENING: Claude’s access assessment was historical; both pages are now marked [E] because they were opened directly. Keep note 33 and the uniformity of the witnesses open.

G12. Verify the Alter Rebbe’s page “Od biur al pi ha-nal” (aid/5899043): Rashbi as an example [E-primary, different work], with-

out inferring an identification of “the early tzaddikim” in Iggeret HaKodesh.

Tailored Routes within the Same Prompt — If You Are an Additional Model — An Independent Review Route

Read the whole dossier, both routes, and the models’ responses, but do not assume any one of them is correct. Select the claims with the greatest structural impact, verify them in primary sources, and state whether you are discovering a new source, correcting an existing error, or only confirming a claim already made.

Dossier 0094 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 7

Report or testimony from the history of the research [186]

12 — R07 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q

Locked: R05, R06 — DO NOT edit those matrices

Seed source: 04 — OPEN QUESTIONS AND WORKPLAN — R07 (1AbRxbwjI_uc8O_Ms7XiWaAMDZy8vzsbQmdIUBQDiI9c)

Created: 2026-09-20 ~00:02 ET

12 — R07 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q — A. R07-BATCH log

Batch ID: (none yet)

When (ET): —

Qs worked: —

Sources opened (URL/loc): —

[186] Document 0094: ZZ — SUPERSEDED R07 ledger stub (see 12 R08). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Delta R06→R07: —

Status: WAITING first pass

Provenance: stub

How to append a row: after each Grok Bot / model pass, add one line with Batch ID (e.g. R07-BATCH-01), Qs checked, real sources opened, Confirmed/Corrected/Rejected/Unresolved vs baseline, and link/id of the pass artifact. No invented findings.

12 — R07 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q — D. Maintenance

- Update section A after each batch lands.
- Flip a Q row only when a cited pass artifact exists (link/id in batch row).
- Never edit R05/R06 matrix docs (01, 02).

Dossier 0108 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Combined dossier: findings must be distinguished from the follow-up brief [40]

B. A Central New Finding: Correction of R07-T09 — What Was Found

On 124b appears:

«דְּסָלִיק הַהִיא נִשְׁמָתָא דַּאֲצִילוּתָא מִנֵּיהּ וְאִתְפָּרַשׁ מִנֵּיהּ» — “that that neshamah of Atzilut ascends from him and becomes separated from him.”

And later on the same page:

[40] Document 0108: 16 — R08-BATCH-02 CHATGPT INDEPENDENT RESEARCH + UNIVERSAL PROMPT. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

«דְּאִסְתַּלַּקַת מִנֵּיהּ נְשְׁמָתָא בְּאֹרַח אֲצִילוּת» — “that a neshamah in the manner of Atzilut departed from him.”

The difference matters: the page opened says «ההיא» (“that”), not «האי» (“this”). Thus a very close direct source was found, but it was not proved identical to every wording transmitted in earlier rounds.

Dossier 0257 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or testimony from the history of the research [306]

12 — R08 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q

Locked archives: R05, R06, R07 — DO NOT edit those matrices / archive docs

Seed open-Q list: still from 04 — OPEN QUESTIONS AND WORK-PLAN — R07 (1AbRxbwjI_uc8O_Ms7XiWaAMDZy8vzsbQmdIUBQDiI9c) until R08 workplan supersedes

Prior stub id (R07-named): 1FwuHoxqYo-2E3yDe1NcjSYuSqxWJi3zT — superseded by this R08-tagged file

12 — R08 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q — C. Folder inventory (prior snapshot; R07 docs = locked archive)

#	Title	Drive id	Note
00	GROK BOT START HERE	1F9W3jqGH9a167WNgA7tlatBJ-l9Z4rP2pW0CvvGPkwQ	
01	R05 ARCHIVE	1ek9vN36Gz1KyWgPM62H-lMkpaqg_p51nl_EWpaN4sOY	LOCKED

[306] Document 0257: ZZ — SUPERSEDED R08 ledger pre-BATCH-01 (see newer 12). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Title	Drive id	Note
02	R06 ARCHIVE	15BQZkIb2iuLJmHwabyOg7uDUIli6i7JvyTK3V8hQVdQ	LOCKED
03	R07 ACTIVE (historical title)	1xXDo2C9ryg7QoHFtliVUUQcgGP3Fpi_TXaTNg9tEDWc	treat as archive with 10
04	OPEN Q + WORKPLAN R07	1AbRxbwjI_uc8O_Ms7XiWaAMDZy8vzsbQmdIUBQDiI9c	seed list
05–08	R01–R04 packets	see prior inventory	archive
09	ARCHIVE INDEX R01–R07	1AOChKylsJcC8WPPMmY1EjiwTPyuFRWw0MKA4dITrWB8	
10	R07 ARCHIVE — FINAL CLOSURE	1t4YWtjAIzoEDvMJlr9JEg3nf17cuUWCIpInDFJAYJTE	LOCKED — R07 CLOSED
11	R08 WORKPLAN — NEXT RESEARCH	19rIySPQGG8EtZ1l0YJwQGvy44H9v5zCoAHgesJFaWYU	active plan

Film lane: HOLD.

Dossier 0201 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or testimony from the history of the research [210]

GOAL 3 — Petach Eliyahu — 17a — “Whoever Separates One from Another” — 3b. Distinction from TZ 124

String	TZ 17a (Petach Eliyahu)	TZ 124a/b
כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה [whoever separates one from another]	PRESENT	ABSENT

[210] Document 0201: 78 — R12-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

String	TZ 17a (Petach Eliyahu)	TZ 124a/b
יקוו המים [let the waters gather]	ABSENT (יקוו count 0)	PRESENT (124b / Mantua קכג [123] continuation)

Proves: PE 17a lemma is sefirot-unity / not-to-separate-one-from-ten ; TZ 124 locus is “Let the waters gather” → histalkut neshama / “a dry body.” Do not conflate.

GOAL 4 — Tikkunei Zohar 124 — 4b. PRINT — Independent Print/Scan OPENED — Mantua 5318, HebrewBooks 44506

Field	Value
HB ID	44506
Edition	Tikkunei HaZohar — Mantua 5318 / 1558 (first print)
PDF	r12gb01/hb_tz44506.pdf (303 pp.)
OCR	tz44506.txt; page dumps tz_m_p250.txt…tz_m_p257.txt, tz_mantua_p253.txt

Print folio headers (OCR):

PDF p.	Header (OCR)	Folio mark
251	תקונא שבעין [Tikkun Seventy]	קכב [122]
253	תקונא שבעין [Tikkun Seventy]	קכג [123]
255	תקונא שבעין [Tikkun Seventy]	קכד [124]

Mantua קכג [123] (PDF p.253) — ascent + יקוו [“let [the waters] gather”] (OCR; sense clear):

…“But your iniquities were separating”… what is “separating,” if not that this neshamah of Atzilut ascends from him and becomes separated from him, and the mystery of the matter is “And G-d said, Let the waters beneath the heavens gather,” etc.; his neshamah departed from him and a dry body remained…

What Mantua print proves [E-primary]: 1. Independent print/scan of the ascent / יקוו ["let [the waters] gather"] complex (not WS-only). 2. Running header תקונא שבעין [Tikkun Seventy] on folios קכב–קכד [122–124] — print assignment of this block to Tikkun 70. (R09 left tikkun-number [U] for lack of print folio header; Mantua moves that claim.)

Pagination apparatus (not denial of text): Mantua places the joined lemma on קכג [123]; WS/Sefaria split across 124a/b. Same Aramaic complex; different daf label.

Dossier 0266 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or testimony from the history of the research [77]

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — 3) NOT TZ124 (R09 T01/T02 lane untouched)

Witness	דאפריש חד [who separates one]	פתח אליהו [Petach Eliyahu]	יקוו המים [let the waters gather] (124b)
Sefaria / local sefaria_tz124a.json (7 segs)	ABSENT	ABSENT	—
Sefaria / local sefaria_tz124b.json	ABSENT	ABSENT	PRESENT at 124b:1 (…And G-d said, Let the waters gather)
tz124a_plain.txt / ws_124a_bare.txt	ABSENT	ABSENT	—

Claim contrast stands: Petach 17a ≠ TZ124 ascent / יקוו ["let [the waters] gather"] lane.

No edits to R09-T01 / R09-T02 packs or QC logs this pass.

[77] Document 0266: 77 — R12-T01_QC_LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0278 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Report or testimony from the history of the research [97]

Quote verification (Sefaria live + opens + HB) — R15-T01 — EC 28:2

Live Sefaria Sefer_Etz_Chaim.28 §2 + cache r15gb01/ec28_2_block.txt / Sefer_Etz_Chaim_28_2_plain.txt:

Outer dimension of ZON of Atzilut · souls of righteous human beings · more inward than the angels · except … BYA — MATCH

≠ R14-T01 (TO from the outer dimension of the vessels); ≠ R13-T02 (investment).

Dossier 0052 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [103]

E1 — Editorial QC for Complete Booklet — 0. Intake of Inputs

#	Required	Status	ID / note
1	Complete E1.5 draft (plain-meaning booklet)	Found and read in its entirety, from beginning to end	1xcjqjWlktI2W317RVduw0Rxd77EUlOGX — «E1.5 — חוברת הפשט — טיוטה מלאה לסבב ביקורת.md» [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Complete Draft for a Review Round]
2	R15 report	Found	1zP0fcyPP_8q8rgpOsdOtLT1YY_zLngERnSFHDktZZ-M + ledger 195

[97] Document 0278: 100 — R15-INTAKE QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[103] Document 0052: 201 — E1 — Editorial QC for Complete Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Required	Status	ID / note
3	Handoff E1	Found	1ACiQ_r-KjjMU2ykH671MKwadwGa-9KGo

#	Required	Status	ID / note
4	Claude review of the complete booklet	Missing	No Claude review file on E1.5/Complete Booklet in the research folder. (There are Claude archives for other projects; they are not E1.5 input.)
5	Grok review	Partial	1Uw0e_9qlAUyOvUnCZR6qU4H_8cugV152 — review of stations 1–5 only. No separate Grok review of stations 6–21. Status: model report, not a primary source.

Do not write that the draft is missing. The complete draft exists and was read before any verdict.

Dossier 0204 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or testimony from the history of the research [115]

Dedup vs sealed R13–R15 + R16-T01–T37 — Fold check — T39 vs R16-T14

Aspect	Sealed/propose R16-T14	Propose T39
Locus	LT Song of Songs כ"ט:ז'–ח'/י") [29:7–8(/10)]	LT Song of Songs י"ח:י"ג [18:13]
Axis	3-tier mayin nukvin (embodied= outer dimension; angels=inner dimension; unembodied=encompas sing lights)	OS-as-OS receiveability vs angels' emotive attribute (fire/ruach bodies; excess annihilates)

[115] Document 0204: 131 — R16-T38–T40 QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Aspect	Sealed/propose R16-T14	Propose T39
Shared milah	unembodied souls; angels with elemental bodies	same surface props, different causal claim
Key milah	Raising mayin nukvin / the encompassing lights themselves	Whole fear / Ein Sof light as it is / in measure / He extended His finger

QC call: PASS as separate R16-T39. CoS may FOLD → companion under R16-T14 Shir unembodied/elemental-body lane if single Admur pre-body capacity preferred. Not hard FAIL / remint. (Parallel to T03 fold-opt under R15-T11; T37 under T02.)

Dossier 0208 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or testimony from the history of the research [451]

R16-T41–T43 QC LOG — Research Director SOURCE QC (under CoS) · R16-QC-12 Moses pnimiyut NHY”M: OPEN forever (not closed)

Rules: Dedup vs sealed R13–R15 + R16-T01–T40 (esp T16 Bechukotai, T14/T39 Shir, T25 Tzav). No self-seal. Do not message CoS. Packs under QC Drive id Title Role 132 1K7sr106IWapoao-w1QCZjj2SagkNBSuL R16-GB08 SUMMARY CoS primary SUMMARY 133 1qDPnfvptn-BHlPagFWs5Zqogd_a6eBV0 R16-GB08 FULL CoS primary FULL prior QC Drive 131 T38–T40 QC floor (propose-land pending seal) Folder 1eRz9M6HuZBGLZuJN4Yy6IMKgR-Sp7eb9 YA-IGK20 Drive parent Local: CoS hunt ya_igk20/r16/hunt_gb08/verify/ · verify qc/r16_t41_t43_verify/ · this log → Drive 134

Floor locked (not reminted): R13-T01–T09 · R14-T01–T06 · R15-T01–T12 · R16-T01–T40 (T38–T40 propose-land from QC-11; T11/T12 FOLD → R14; T18 REOPEN R10-T06)

[451] Document 0208: 134 — R16-T41–T43 QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID rule: Keep CoS R16-T41–T43. No competing IDs this pack.

ID Claim (one-line) PASS/FAIL Tag R16-T41 LT Vayikra ג׳:י״א–י״ב [3:10–11] — angels' apprehension only Malchut (=animal); souls additional Divine service through Torah (=human) PASS → propose SEAL [E-primary] Admur R16-T42 LT Song of Songs ד׳:ג׳ ט״ו [15:3] — angel in a third of the world; soul → only a radiance in the body; principal part e ncompassing/mazal PASS → propose SEAL (fold-opt under R16-T14/T39 Shir makif/unembodied family) [E-primary] Admur R16-T43 LT Bechukotai ה׳:א׳ [5:1] — angels=grass without sowing;

souls=grain through sowing PASS → propose SEAL (fold-opt under R16-T25 Tzav food/behemah lane) [E-primary] Admur HOLD Q42 MICRO named flip PASS as not found HOLD MICRO [U] HOLD Q70 Graded post-exit kav PASS as not found HOLD degree [U] HOLD Film Film HOLD — NOTE Moses pnimiyut NHY"M PASS forever-OPEN kept not closed NOTE R13–R15 / R16-T01–T40 floors PASS no remint locked HOLDs / hygiene Rule Status HOLD R13–R15 sealed untouched complied R16-T01–T40 floor untouched (no remint T16/T14/T25/T38–T40) complied CoS IDs T41–T43 kept complied Q42 / Q70 stay [U] complied Moses forever-OPEN not closed complied No self-seal complied Do not message CoS complied

Dedup vs sealed R13–R15 + R16-T01–T40 Candidate Comparator Same lemma? QC T41 LT Vayikra 3:10–11 Malchut-only hasagah Emor 1 shared-hasagah Beriah (GB05/06 log — not sealed T) ≠ — Emor1 = shared OS greatness; T41 = asymmetric cap (angels stuck at Malchut; souls get Torah-supplement) NEW T41 Ki Teitzei 4 / Vayakhel 2 hasagah-gap (log) negative gap (angels don't grasp Atzmut / "where is the place") ≠ positive Malchut-only + soul Torah axis NEW T41 R16-T25 Tzav angels=behemot / food surface "animal" yes; remint no — T25=food elevation + pnimi-rank in BYA; T41=hasagah ceiling + Torah=human NEW T41 R16-T26 Behar body/makom/zman song phenomenology ≠ Malchut-only hasagah NEW T41 R16-T02 /

T13 machshavah/dibbur shoresh letter-shoresh ≠ hasagah-cap NEW T41 R16-T37 Emor 4:9 shared hithavut cosmogony ≠ avodah hasagah NEW T42 LT Shir 15:3 1/3-world → partial investiture R16-T39 LT Shir 18:13 OS-as-OS vs middah Family Shir yes; remint no — T39= receiveability of Ein Sof as it is vs measure (elemental bodies); T42= spatial magnitude → partial ha'arah / makif-mazal NEW fold-opt T42 R16-T14 LT Shir 29:7–8 3-tier mayin nukvin Family makif yes; remint no — T14=mayin nukvin quality ladder (outer dimension/inner dimension/the encompassing lights themselves); T42=angel "a third of the world" as reason body can't contain whole soul NEW fold-opt T42 R16-T03 Shir 30 no-ribui ≠ spatial/partial investiture NEW T42 R16-T18 birth of souls birth-in-BYA ≠ makif/mazal clothing NEW T42 R16- T26 no body/makom/zman related soul-vs-body phenomenology; T26=kadoshim song schedule ≠ magnitude→partial clothing NEW T43 LT Bechukotai 5:1 grass/grain R16-T25 LT Tzav 1 food/behemot/elevation Family food/behemah yes; remint no — T25=shared BYA + pnimi-rank + elevate food from angel shoresh; T43=agricultural ontology spontaneous (grass without sowing) vs sown (grain via Or HaZaru'a) NEW fold-opt T43 R16-T16 LT Bechukotai 1:3–4 omdim/mehalchim same book different § (1 ≠ 5:1); growth/standing ≠ zera ontology NEW T43 Bechukotai 5:2 (GB04 companion-log → T16/Vayeshev mehalchim via omer) correctly not reminted — different se'if; 5:2 = mehalchim via omer; 5:1 grass/grain = zera avoided T43 R16-T20–T24 mehalchim family walking/status ≠ agricultural spontaneous-vs-sown NEW Fold check — T42 vs R16-T14 / T39 Aspect Sealed/propose R16-T14 Propose T39 Propose T42 Locus LT Song of Songs כ"ט:ז'–ח' [29:7–8] LT Song of Songs י"ח:י"ג [18:13] LT Song of Songs ט"ו:ג' [15:3] Axis 3-tier mayin nukvin OS-as-OS vs measure angel 1/3 world → partial body / makif-mazal Shared milah encompassing lights / unembodied elemental angel bodies mazal + makif +

spatial size Key milah raising mayin nukvin tiers / Ein Sof as it is / in measure / in a third of the world / a little radiance / mazal

QC call: PASS as separate R16-T42. CoS may FOLD → companion under R16-T14 (or T39) Shir makif/unembodied lane if single Admur investiture family preferred. Not hard FAIL / remint. Fold check — T43 vs R16-T25 Aspect Sealed R16-T25 Propose T43 Locus LT Tzav א׳:א׳,ד׳–ה׳ [1:1,4–5] LT Bechukotai ה׳:א׳ [5:1] Axis BYA souls+angels; neshamot d'Beriah more pnimi; angels=behemot; food elevation from angel shoresh angels=grass from Malchut without zera; souls=grain requiring sowing; food for supernal Adam via mesirat nefesh Shared milah food / animal / elevation food for an animal / food for a human / Malchut-as-earth Key milah pnimi-rank + elevate gashmi food without sowing vs sowing / grass vs grain

QC call: PASS as separate R16-T43. CoS may FOLD → companion under R16-T25 if single Admur food/behemah lane preferred. Not hard FAIL / remint. (Pack flagged fold-opt correctly.) Avoided correctly (not reminted this pack) T01–T40 floors · T16 Bechukotai omdim · T14/T39 Shir · T25 Tzav food · Bechukotai 5:2 → T16/Vayeshev companion · Tzav 2:8 (Leviathan R13 Shemini) · Emor1 / Vayakhel2 hasagah · Shir 8/13/17/24/31 · Yitro 7–8 · EC20:11 kelim · SK quarry T28 · SHG31/38 → T36/T40 · DMC SMT taxonomy · Q42/Q70 HOLD · Moses forever-OPEN · Film HOLD · R10-T06 → T18 only · IGK/SRHK/print EMPTY this pass.

Quote verification (hunt_gb08 verify + qc/r16_t41_t43_verify) Sefaria live often Cloudflare-blocked — hunt cache under ya_igk20/r16/hunt_gb08/verify/ + copies in qc/r16_t41_t43_verify/. R16-T41 — LT Vayikra 3:10–11 p_Likkutei_Torah_Vayikra.3.10.txt / .3.11.txt + T41_Vayikra3_quote.txt: the angels' apprehension is only in the aspect of Malchut · souls have additional Divine service · angels are called animals · their apprehension is only in the aspect of Malchut · through Torah, the aspect of human — MATCH Tag [E-primary] Admur. ≠

Emor1 shared hasagah; ≠ T25 food axis. R16-T42 — LT Shir HaShirim 15:3 p_Likkutei_Torah_Shir_HaShirim.15.3.txt + T42_Shir15_quote.txt: an angel stands in a third of the world · the soul is higher · a little radiance of the soul is what becomes invested in the body · in the mode of encompassing and called mazal — MATCH Tag [E-primary] Admur. Fold-opt under T14/T39 noted — not FAIL. ≠ T39 OS-as-OS; ≠ T14 mayin nukvin tiers. R16-T43 — LT Bechukotai 5:1 p_Likkutei_Torah_Bechukotai.5.1.txt + T43_Bechukotai5_quote.txt: angels called grass of the field · without sowings of the sown light · grain, which is the souls · grows specifically through the aspect of sowing in the earth · food for supernal Adam — MATCH Bechukotai 5:2 checked (p_…5.2.txt): mehalchim via omer — correctly logged not proposed (T16/Vayeshev companion). Tag [E-primary] Admur. Fold-opt under T25 noted — not FAIL. HOLD Q42 / Q70 / Moses / Film

Three net-NEW propose-land: R16-T41 · T42 · T43 — PASS (T42 fold-option under R16-T14/T39 Shir makif/unembodied family; T43 fold-option under R16-T25 Tzav food/behemah lane; T41 clean NEW hasagah-cap axis.)

No hard FOLD / FAIL this pack. HOLDs kept: Q42 · Q70 · Film · Moses OPEN. Await Research Director/CoS seal. No self-seal. Do not message CoS.

Drive upload: this file → 134 — R16-T41–T43 QC.md

Dossier 0240 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or testimony from the history of the research [121]

[121] Document 0240: R16_GB02_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Proposed tickets (R16-T13+ only) — R16-T14 quote

…the raising of mayin nukvin of the souls of Israel… invested in a body is called… outer dimension relative to… angels, inner… a third level… the encompassing lights themselves… the souls… not invested in a body…

URL: https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Shir_HaShirim.29.7?lang=he

Dossier 0270 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or testimony from the history of the research [123]

Proposed tickets (R16-T22+ only) — R16-T22 quote

And of this it is said, “A well, princes dug it”: Chochmah, Binah, and Daat, like a minister before the king, etc. And the matter of “with their staffs.” For the aforementioned aspect of raising mayin nukvin is called walking, as it is written, “I will give you walkers among those who stand.” For the angels, whose service is to arouse and draw down the constant union, the aspect of “and in His goodness He renews,” etc., are called those who stand; but the souls, which through “they dug it, they excavated it” draw down new light, are called walkers. Therefore concerning the angels it says, “And their feet were a straight foot,” and Tosafot explains in chapter 2 of Chagigah, 13a, from the Jerusalem Talmud, chapter 9 of Berakhot, that it is a journey of five hundred years, like that from earth to heaven, and beyond that the foot is י”ה [15], that is, the numerical value of ישרה [515], namely five hundred and fifteen. Their service is to draw down the aspect of Yud–Heh into the aspect of the worlds, which are a journey of five

[123] Document 0270: R16_GB04_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

hundred years; this is as written, “For with Yud–Heh, Havayah is the rock of worlds”: with Yud the World to Come was created, with Heh this world was created. Therefore their service is to draw down this aspect so that “in His goodness He renews the work of Creation continually, every day”; and since the source of the drawing down is the aspect of the two letters Yud–Heh, they are called those who stand. But of Israel it is said, “Until Your people pass over, Havayah,” above the name Havayah, to draw from the actual essence of the Ein Sof light new light: this is the matter of walkers. As it is written, “And I shall walk within you.” This drawing down is through “with all your might,” without limit.

URL: https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Chukat.9.25?lang=he

Dossier 0260 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [385]

2. Exact [E] quotes (R17-D core) — 2.2 Path B / The Kav Itself — NHY d’AK (יא [11]; sealed T16)

«And likewise also the kav itself, invested in the termination and endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon, which is the end of his feet of yosher, ending in Malchut of Asiyah: the radiance of the kav shines from there and is invested in the neshamah-light of the ten sefirot of BYA, which is Divinity»

Proves [E]: second presentation linked by «and likewise also»; terminus = NHY d’AK / feet of yosher → Malchut of Asiyah; haarah from “there.”

[385] Document 0260: 164 — R17-GB05 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Already sealed: T16 (loci); A≡B stays open.

Open for deepen: what «from there» indexes for degree-1 (→ T32).

Dossier 0538 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [28]

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Part ג [3] — Stations 12–17

Continuation of the booklet's earlier parts.

Status of evidence: quotations from the Epistle's text — [E-subresearch] in a digital witness marked «not checked». Kehot print — [U]. Explanations from later sources are marked separately.

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Part ד [4] — Stations 18–20 and the Epistle's Conclusion

Continuation of the booklet's earlier parts.

Dossier 0332 · The Focused Studies · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [452]

B"H. IGK20-Focused-F4 — Handover Instructions

We continue the investigation. No editing of a booklet or R16. Gemini is not participating in this round: in the current reports, the cost of correcting claims exceeded the added evidence. The decision is judged by actual contribution, including for the other participants in the future.

[28] Document 0538: E1.6-HY1-Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[452] Document 0332: IGK20-Focused-F4-Start-Here.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Send each model only its independent prompt: 02_Claude_F4.txt — "mamash," the birth of souls in Atzilut and the kav in their nefesh–ruach–neshamah; a short correction concerning the three radiances. 03_Grok_F4.txt — the link Abba and Imma→ZON versus the union of ZON themselves; the scope of weekdays; kav and sovev, revelation and being. 04_Grok_Bot_F4.txt — supplying photographs of תרס"ו [5666] and Sefer HaGilgulim with transcription and numbering; locating "cited in Likkutei Amarim."

Every prompt includes the background, questions, anchor wording, and links; there is no need to assemble several messages. It is also advisable to attach that model's F3 report if the conversation is new. It is input for review, not evidence.

01_F3_Audit_and_F4_Findings.md is the independent examination report and the rationale for the division of tasks. 05_Received_Grok _Bot_F3.md preserves the report received through a Drive link.

The three investigations can begin in parallel. When Bot returns photographs, pass them to Claude and Grok for independent examination. The mere notice "opened" does not complete its task.

Only new, reasoned change is requested. There is no need for another 22 full answers, and no determination according to the number of agreeing models.

Dossier 0209 · The Focused Studies · Round 7

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [453]

B"H. IGK20-Focused-F7 — Focused Investigation of Iggeret HaKodesh 20.

[453] Document 0209: 02_Claude_F7.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Mandatory compiler's correction: my previous criticism of the year was wrong. העת"ר and תרע"ה are the same letters, totaling 675. There is no need for a theory of an "internal cycle," and תרע"ו [676] must not be inferred from this. Do not defend an error that appeared in the task package.

Status not being reopened in this task: the denial of the power of creation in souls that departed from the vessels is explicit; S7 reads "their nefesh–ruach–neshamah" as referring to the sefirot. The contrast of tzimtzum in souls/unification in vessels was invalidated. The nature of "a likeness of Divinity" after separation is open and substantive. In the three radiances, vessels and nefesh–ruach are the beginning of yesh; do not transfer the radiance's status to the recipient without justification. Q42, Netzach–Hod–Yesod–Malchut, and Gilgulim were not closed.

Your task: complete the explanation of "just as in Atzilut itself" on the basis of located photographs, and keep the question of the sovev's addition separate.

Accepted from your F6: the first distinction of תער"ב [5672] can already apply in Atzilut; the second distinction attributes diminution to the piercing. The compiler has now directly read תרצז–תרחצ [697–698] and also תתקנ [950] and תתקנה [955]. There is no longer any need to rely on truncated search extraction.

The central new evidence — תתקנ [950]: "And the matter of the distinction between the vessels as they are in Atzilut and as they descended into BYA"; and subsequently, "When the vessels of Atzilut become invested in the ten sefirot of BYA, the lights of Atzilut do not shine within them in the manner in which they shone in Atzilut." The continuation discusses multiplicity of vessels and diminution of light, as far as the possibility of becoming a source for yesh coming into being, while attributing coming into being to light through ves-

sels. This is V67 note 38's reference in its place; do not identify it with תרצז–תרחצ [697–698].

Transcription corrections:

- After "and only when ZON are equal in stature, it may be said that there shines" on תרצז [697], there follows "the light in Malchut as in Ze'ir Anpin, etc." and references, and only afterward "but in the aspect of Malchut that descends." The truncation is not the end of a sentence.
- On the same page there is a parenthetical paragraph explaining why light must shine in the vessels that descended so that they can be light and neshamah for BYA. Vessels without lights are like a body without a soul. Include it in the argument.
- The sentence "And as is known, the radiance of the kav ends in Malchut of Atzilut and does not shine in BYA" appears in the photograph of תרצז [697]. Withdrawing it in F5 as a paraphrase was too broad. This does not constitute blanket confirmation of all F4 quotations.
- "Distinction of rank" at the end of תרחצ [698] is not in itself a sentence about preservation of the power of creation. Show the bridge if you claim this.

Perform two parts:

A. Up to 800 words on "mamash": present what was decided in each of three comparisons (vessels/worlds; Malchut/rest of Atzilut; the same vessels before/after descent). Do not leave the third without evidence after תתקנ [950]. Then answer positively: in what respect is the radiance "as in Atzilut" if revelation has diminished? Distinguish the Rebbe Rashab's wording, an interpretation you propose, and what remains unexplained. Do not be satisfied with denying equality of revelation or with an unsupported formula "status and ca-

pacity to bring into being." Give a continuous explanatory paragraph of approximately 200 words for the reader.

B. Up to 450 words on the sovev's addition: chapter קכ"ט [129] in edition HB58808, שלח–שמ [338–340], and תש"ג [5703], 131–133, have now been read. They discuss additional revelation and nullification, in the context of the giving of the Torah. On תתקנה [955], first there is coming into being from the union of ZON of BYA through the neshamah-light, and then drawing down in Baruch She'amar so that the light shines in the vessels as in Atzilut and the nature is revealed. Separate existing coming into being from additional revelation. Was a sentence found connecting this addition itself to "strength and force to create" in the Epistle, or is this a parallel requiring justification? Do not return to kav=yesh mi-yesh, and do not negate the Epistle's attribution of the power of creation to the sovev. Write what the sources actually explain, even if there is no complete reconciliation.

Mapping: chapter קכ"ט [129], HB58808, is volume II in the new edition; do not correct "volume I" in the old reference on this basis alone. Photograph scan014 is שמ [340], not שט [309]. The beginning of p. 338 still concludes chapter 128; chapter 129 begins at its bottom and ends before 130 on p. 340. תש"ג [5703], section 7, begins on p. 132.

Do not reopen Q70 or the three radiances; on תתקנה [955], "existence" is also discussed as apprehension and does not alone prove the recipient's status in S10. If the photographs are inaccessible, say so once and distinguish what the compiler reported from the source you read yourself.

Digital sources:

- Text of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

- S9 — “Ve-chazakta” (“You Shall Be Strong”), תשכ”ח [5728]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3140178
- V67 — “Va-yered” (“And He Descended”), תשכ”ז [5727]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4385854
- S7 — Lessons for 7 Tishrei: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/18/2026

Dossier 0657 · The Focused Studies · Round 8

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [317]

IGK20 — Review of F7 and Continuation F8 — Management Decision

According to the reports supplied, there is no need to continue with Gemini as a regular researcher in this project. The problem is not disagreement with the others: the F3 report reinstated the limitation of the kav to vitality/yesh mi-yesh after its cancellation in F2; claims were declared settled although the direct witness remained missing. No distinct, verified contribution was identified here that would justify another broad report. This is an assessment of these outputs, not a ruling on the model’s abilities in all research. In future we will add a researcher only for a defined task that brings a new source, independent reading, or review that exposes an error.

Grok and Claude likewise receive no status as authorities: Grok sometimes demands too narrow a literal sentence; Claude tends to elevate a plausible explanation to the status of a determination. The solution is to examine claim and evidence, not replace one majority with another.

[317] Document 0657: 01_Findings_F8.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [381]

Short Source Reader — F8 — N2 — Nahar Shalom by the Rashash, 14b–15a

Addresses: https://mobile.tora.ws/html/15064-25.html ; https://mobile.tora.ws/html/15064-26.html

The digital text on both pages was read continuously. The location is the transcription's heading; print was not viewed. The transcription contains typing errors, so difficult wording must not be corrected from conjecture.

At the end of 14b a discussion begins of the outer and inner dimensions of unions. On 15a the designations "complete" and "not complete" change according to the relation between levels. The continuation describes mochin of nursing for ZON of Yetzirah and mochin of gestation for ZON of Asiyah, stating that they are complete at their level. Of Asiyah it says:

"And they are complete mochin, except that the mochin of Asiyah are called thus."

Yet the same sequence preserves an upper threshold for producing souls, and says:

"But from the union of Yetzirah and Asiyah, souls do not emerge."

The discussion continues by distinguishing face-aspect and back-aspect and the scope of ABYA of the inner and outer dimensions. This continuation must not be skipped. The finding is not "the Rashash canceled the negation": he sets relative completeness of mochin a-

[381] Document 0661: 05_Source_Reader_F8.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

longside a limitation of product. Its identification with 47 and with Iggeret HaKodesh is the required investigation.

Dossier 0619 · The Focused Studies · Round 9

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [260]

B”H — IGK20-Focused-F9: Review and Focused Continuation — The Determination and Continuation

There is still no complete reconciliation. The permissible wording is: a proposed reconciliation exists based on differences of level, stratum, and kind of action; a source applying it to the specific tension between the souls of Asiyah in 40/15 and the negation of generation in 47 has not yet been located. Agreement between Grok and Claude on the proposal likewise adds no evidence.

F10 will examine only the contribution of 29:3 and 40:15 against the already defined difficulty. The bibliographical corrections are not an additional research task. The attached prompt is identical for transfer to both models, with complementary roles: Grok examines the positive connection; Claude examines its applicability and counterevidence. No new Bot task. If there is no new bridge, record a limited conclusion and leave the dossier open to that extent, without initiating another round based only on the same pages.

Dossier 0540 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Combined dossier: findings must be distinguished from the follow-up brief [405]

[260] Document 0619: 01_Audit_F9.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[405] Document 0540: IGK20-Earth-R1_01_Independent_Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Research and Opening Position — 10. Mayin Nukvin, Charity, and Humanity's Purpose

S12, Iggeret HaKodesh 8, is a direct, significant parallel: the sowing analogy is applied to the act of charity and revelation in prayer. It provides a basis for reading sowing as an act that arouses a source whose result exceeds the measure of the act. This is not evidence that "as written elsewhere" in 20 specifically refers to it.

A counter-question was added from the parallel: in 8 the description of the analogy connects the actualization of the power of growth with the seed, whereas in 20 there is also spontaneous growth. It is plausible that the example's scope differs, but this must be stated explicitly and examined; a local sentence in 8 must not be made a rule that no growth occurs without sowing.

The supplied note 59 does not present the connection as self-evident: it raises a question and proposes a connection to the advantage of practical mitzvot. We will preserve the proposal's status and the reference to Likkutei Torah. We will not attribute to the Rebbe certainty that was not stated.

S13–S14, chapters 36–37, connect a dwelling in the lower realms, the service of mitzvot, and drawing revelation down into physicality. This provides a basis for proposing that "drawings down of lights" here describes human action realizing the purpose, rather than a competing purpose. But "why throughout ABYA?" remains a question, since 36 emphasizes the lowest world. Nor should returning light be identified with raising mayin nukvin without a source: in spontaneous growth the first advantage is already described, and later the work of sowing is added.

Dossier 0541 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [406]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E32 — Analogy and nature

Source: user and expansion.

What is the scope of "grow on their own," and what is the role of seed decay in the explanations? This must not be translated into the absence of all matter or a botanical rule the author did not formulate. Scientific questions should be marked separately and must not replace linguistic clarification.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E33 — Mayin nukvin

Source: user.

What ascends in sowing and planting, who is the Nukva, what arouses the power, and what is drawn down in response? Is mayin nukvin a sufficient cause, a vessel, a refinement, or an awakening? How is an addition received that exceeds the measure of the action?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E34 — Very, very superior

Source: user.

In what respect are the fruits superior, what is the role of the doubled "very," and what is the scope of the generalization? Examine note 59 and the parallel "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od" ("The land is very,

[406] Document 0541: IGK20-Earth-R1_02_Questions.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

very good”); do not present all cultivated produce as superior in every respect.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E35 — Charity and drawing down

Source: user.

How does “from this we can understand” lead to human Divine service? Iggeret HaKodesh 8 is a direct parallel for the analogy of sowing, charity, and prayer. Which detail in the analogy corresponds to action, mayin nukvin, source, light, and fruit?

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E36 — Parallel in Epistle 8

Source: research addition.

In Iggeret HaKodesh 8, the description of the vegetative power within the analogy is conditional on a seed; in Epistle 20 there is also spontaneous growth. Is the discussion in Epistle 8 limited to a sown type, or is another reconciliation required? Do not apply a sentence from the analogy to all growth without its context.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E37 — Humanity’s purpose

Source: user.

What do the parentheses “which is the purpose of the creation of the human being” add, and what does “which is” (שהוא) refer back to? What is the relation to a dwelling in the lower realms, knowledge of G-d, and revelation of His powers? Distinguish purpose, manner of realization, and result, without declaring in advance that all formulations are identical.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E38 — ABYA and purpose

Source: research addition.

Why draw down into all of ABYA if chapter 36 emphasizes that the purpose is not for the higher worlds? Examine chapters 36–37; preserve the continuation of the Epistle on the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking orders and practical mitzvot as context, rather than now opening up the whole of tomorrow's passage.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Register — E39 — Glosses and references

Source: user and expansion.

Verify the Rebbe's glosses, the list of corrections, and notes 48, 53, 58, 59. At the end of chapter 51 there is a textual note about Malchut of Yetzirah; attribute it to the correct editor. Note 56 on the English website refers to Genesis 1:10, but "Let [the waters] swarm" is 1:20; this is a correction of a reference, not of the Epistle's wording.

Dossier 0543 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [408]

The Working Passage — According to the Text Supplied by the User — Notes Supplied with the Passage

Notes 48–60 arrived in the English wording of Lessons in Tanya. The following is a working summary in Hebrew, not an official Hebrew transcription of the Rebbe's glosses:

[408] Document 0543: IGK20-Earth-R1_04_Passage.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- 48: the wording of the repeated introduction and its content require further study.
- 49, 55, 60: the parentheses are in the original.
- 50: Bereishit Rabbah 10:6.
- 51–52: Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. 196 and 786. The work's title is identified in the English explanation; edition and printed pages require verification.
- 53: the Rebbe's note refers to the gloss in chapter 6, chapter 18, and the ends of 51–52.
- 54: Genesis 1:11.
- 56: the website gives Genesis 1:10. "Let the waters swarm" is in Genesis 1:20; preserve the reference error in the log, rather than transferring it to the biblical text.
- 57: Genesis 1:24.
- 58: the Rebbe's note distinguishes "continually, forever" from "continually, year after year" and refers to the end of Iggeret HaKodesh 14 on annual renewal.
- 59: the Rebbe's note raises a difficulty concerning the superior fruits and proposes a connection to the advantage of practical mitzvot and to the advantage of what comes through a mitzvah or prayer over what is given through gratuitous kindness; refers to Likkutei Torah, "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od" ("The Land Is Very, Very Good").

The list of corrections mentioned by the user is not attached to the visible input. Do not claim to have examined it.

Dossier 0545 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [454]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Independent Prompt for Claude

Task: new research into the penultimate passage of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, from "And furthermore, this" to "the purpose of the creation of the human being." Dossier opening date: September 23, 2026. Do not write a booklet. This is R1 in the Earth dossier, not F11 in the dossier on the union of ZON.

Your role: research into growth, time, reproduction, mayin nukvin, and humanity's purpose, and review of the logical transitions.

Four in-depth dossiers:

א [1]. E04–E07, E29–E32, E40: what is produced by the vegetative power, in what sense from ayin, what the mazal's role is, and why specifically earth rather than human or animal reproduction. Separate spiritual power/matter, size/quality, existing species/coming into being, continual creation/observed event. Do not assume that a plant's seed is not alive or that an enormous quantity is mathematically zero proportion. Examine the stages of fruit, tree, leaves, hundreds of kernels, straw, and ears of grain, and yesh me-ayin versus like yesh me-ayin. Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, pp. קצו [196] and תשפו [786], is a target from the explanatory notes, not a source already read in full.

ב [2]. E24–E28: Chochmah of Malchut of Malchut versus endpoint of the vessel; "Let [the earth] sprout" versus "Let [the waters] swarm" / "Let [the earth] bring forth"; six versus seven days of Creation; gratuitous kindness and mayin nukvin; continually, annually, and a

[454] Document 0545: IGK20-Earth-R1_06_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

likeness of Ein Sof. Examine Iggeret HaKodesh 14 and note 58. Six for actions and seven for governance is a possible explanation, not a finding. Examine sources for Adam's prayer for growth only if they really concern "without any raising of mayin nukvin at all." Do not correct wording without a witness.

ג [3]. E33–E36: sowing as mayin nukvin, very, very superior, sowing acts of charity, and "from this we can understand." Read Iggeret HaKodesh 8 and set the applicability of the seed analogy there against spontaneous growth in 20. Note 59 proposes a connection to the advantage of mitzvot; preserve the proposal's wording and the difficulty the Rebbe raises. Examine Likkutei Torah on "Tovah ha-aretz me'od me'od" ("The Land Is Very, Very Good") insofar as an exact source can be located.

ד [4]. E37–E38: humanity's purpose, drawings down in all ABYA, a dwelling in the lower realms, and the connection to practical mitzvot. Read 36–37 and the end of 20 to the extent necessary. Purpose and the manner of realizing it can be distinguished, but the connection must be proved; do not simply say "it is all the same thing."

Also examine E03 and E16: revelation of power versus revelation of light, and returning light versus raising mayin nukvin.

Supplementary review: consider the questions of Atik and interruption (E08–E15) and the chain of investment (E17–E23). You do not need a second complete source survey, but identify unproved assumptions on which your explanations depend. No personal criticism of a model; claim and source are examined.

Deliverable: IGK20-Earth-R1-Claude. Up to five new findings; four in-depth dossiers; a continuous explanatory paragraph marked by degree of certainty; status table for all E01–E41; source register; up to three specific targets for the next round. Target length 2,500–4,000 words; explicitly leave open what has not been decided.

Round folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ptqHOycgA--ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk

Everything needed to begin the work also appears later in this prompt. If a link is blocked, do not claim that the files were read, and there is no need to wait for them.

Dossier 0548 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [412]

3. What My Independent Examination Added — ד [4]. Adam's Prayer Is a Genuine Difficulty of Applicability

I read Rashi on Genesis 2:5: there is a stage of standing at the opening of the ground, and after Adam's prayer, rainfall and growth. Rashi's not using the kabbalistic term mayin nukvin does not remove the difficulty; the report itself parallels prayer with awakening from below. Creation versus appearance/continued growth, or a limited applicability of gratuitous kindness, can be examined. These alternatives require a source. There is no basis for directing the difficulty only toward sown versus spontaneous, because Rashi does not establish such a division here.

3. What My Independent Examination Added — ה [5]. Sefer HaGilgulim: Progress in Access, Not My Reading of a Photograph

I opened Bot's folder, correspondence table, and description T2_Gilgulim20_HB23822.txt. The latter attests to a partial reading of photographs, not a diplomatic transcription. PNG files of scans 30–31

[412] Document 0548: IGK20-Earth-R2_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

were located. The attempt to transfer the photographs to the reading environment failed with 403; I therefore did not see them myself and do not confirm glyphs, a heading, or a printed page from sight. The location of chapter 20 remains Bot's testimony, with direct links in the source package. The next task is a short, precise paragraph on investment, with uncertain readings marked, not another attempt to attribute the Epistle's wording word for word to the book.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E29–E32 — Growth and Reproduction

The choice of the lowest earth is explicit in the explanation, and the roles of the seed and spiritual power are explained. "Specifically continuity" is an insufficient argument against reproduction, which also recurs. Fruits and sown plants also are not devoid of prior matter. A comparison of the kind of action and the level is required; an advantage must not be proved from number alone, and the power of Ein Sof in reproduction must not be denied on this basis. "Those growing on their own" must not be turned into a botanical theory of creating matter without prior matter.

4. Review of the Remaining Arguments — E34–E38 — Human Divine Service and Its Purpose

Note 59 raises a contextual difficulty and proposes a connection to mitzvot; the proposal is neither a denial of the connection nor proof that every detail remains obscure. The Likkutei Torah passage read gives real substance to the continuation. It is still necessary to separate: the advantage of what comes through Divine service over a gratuitous gift; the advantage of action over thought; revelation in all worlds; purpose in the lower realms. The relations among them are the goal of the research, not four synonyms.

Dossier 0550 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [414]

The Working Passage — According to the Text Supplied by the User — Notes Supplied with the Passage

— The original question map; the update on the list's availability takes precedence over the historical wording —

Dossier 0554 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [418]

The Result — 2. Or HaTorah קצו [196]: Strong Evidence, with a Genuine New Difficulty

I opened photograph R2_OHT_BamA_PDF-214.png in Bot's package. The heading read: Discourses for Shavuot, קצו [196]. At the top of the page is the utterance "Let [the earth] sprout" in the earth, followed by the need for awakening from the mazalot. In explaining the striking, it says that it arouses the vegetative power invested in this grass. Here one can hold together the power's location in the earth and its investment in grass. "In the earth" and "in the grass" are not mutually exclusive alternatives on the page.

The continuation of the same paragraph is important: "And this is an analogy to introduce the aspect of drawing down mayin duchrin

[414] Document 0550: IGK20-Earth-R2_02_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[418] Document 0554: IGK20-Earth-R3_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

to arouse the raising of mayin nukvin." It describes growth as rising from the recipient and the mazal's influence as arousing it;

the influence of rains is also introduced. Every use of "mayin nukvin" therefore must not now be defined as human sowing alone.

Limit: the page does not say that the plant under discussion grows on its own; it does not mention here Iggeret HaKodesh 20's division between sown and spontaneous. This is not a proved contradiction. Examine whether "mayin nukvin" is used here for the recipient's movement in general, and in the Epistle specifically for the act of sowing. Do not close the matter with "everything is relative," or turn returning light into mayin nukvin.

Dossier 0555 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [419]

ב [2]. Photographs from the R2-Bot Package Read Now — Verbal Anchors from the Photographs

Or HaTorah קצו [196]: at the beginning of the page, growth exists through the power of the utterance "Let [the earth] sprout." Immediately afterward, the vegetative power within it requires awakening from the higher bestower, followed by the explanation of the striking: "Through this striking it arouses the vegetative power invested in this grass to cause the grass to grow." The continuation: "And this is an analogy to introduce the aspect of drawing down mayin duchrin to arouse the raising of mayin nukvin." The page continues with the analogy of growth from below and with rains. Do not be satisfied with

[419] Document 0555: IGK20-Earth-R3_01_Source_Update.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

the first sentence or erase the wording “the earth has no power to bring forth its growth” in the context of awakening.

Or HaTorah תשפו [786]: the summary is not the entire explanation. The paragraph after it must also be read; it compares the basic light in Gan Eden with the addition through mitzvot and Divine service. The existence/addition distinction is in the source; applying it to every combination of “gratuitous” and “mayin nukvin” in the Epistle is a further step.

Gilgulim PDF30, left: the anchor for correcting P3 is “for first he acquires the nefesh of the outer dimension of Asiyah,” followed by “ruach from the outer dimension of Yetzirah.” I did not copy a whole paragraph because of deletions and density. Uncertainty must remain visible, and a paraphrase must not be turned into a diplomatic transcription.

Dossier 0561 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [425]

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 2. The Principal Correction to R3: Mayin Nukvin Is Not Yet Mapped to Two Botanical Stages

I reread the entire first paragraph in the photograph of Or HaTorah קצו [196]. It begins with the earth’s power and the utterance “Let [the earth] sprout,” says that the power needs awakening from the bestower, describes vegetative power invested in grass, and compares its action to raising mayin nukvin. Rains then appear, together with the distinction between first and second mayin duchrin, and finally a rule

[425] Document 0561: IGK20-Earth-R4_00_Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

about bestower and recipient and three levels: mayin duchrin–mayin nukvin–mayin duchrin.

It is thus explicit that mayin nukvin is not limited there to sowing. It is not explicit that all the mayin nukvin discussed there applies only after germination. "Invested in the grass" supports an individual recipient; it does not erase the general wording concerning bringing forth the earth's plant or the rain analogy. Claude's division — mayin nukvin in the Epistle before growth, mayin nukvin on קצו [196] afterward — is a proposed correspondence between sources. It must not be promoted to the Tzemach Tzedek's wording.

The stable minimal formulation: in Epistle 20, sowing and planting are called mayin nukvin, and spontaneously growing plants are distinguished from them. This does not prove that spontaneous plants lack every aspect called mayin nukvin in another source. Conversely, the very existence of an additional use of mayin nukvin does not prove that such mayin nukvin actually operates in them. The question of applicability remains.

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Review of R3 and Independent Investigation — 4. Humanity's Purpose — Additional Examination

I read Tanya 41, especially the paragraphs concerning the intention "for the sake of unification." The chapter connects the service of Torah and mitzvot below with drawing down and supernal union in Atzilut. It supplies an explicit parallel for the connection of service below–action above; it does not say that it is the Epistle's "elsewhere," nor does it alone explain every mention of ABYA.

Grok's quotation from Tanya 37 concerning the purpose of humanity's creation and a dwelling in the lower realms was also verified in the text. It is therefore insufficient to distinguish verbally between "humanity's purpose" and "the purpose of hishtalshelut": the human be-

ing too is described there in terms of a dwelling in the lower realms. The more useful distinction is between human action and the scope of its operation, on the one hand, and the purpose realized by it, on the other. Examine it with chapter 41 and the continuation of Or Ha-Torah, rather than inventing two unrelated purposes.

Dossier 0566 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [430]

Earth-R4 — Continuity Map Update — E53-Claude → E48-Codex / E16/E33 (Applicability of Mayin Nukvin and Stages of the Plant)

The history of the complete map is preserved below. Its "not yet read" statements report an earlier stage, rather than canceling the new readings.

Dossier 0568 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [399]

IGK20-Earth-R4 — Consolidation and Interim Determination — What Is Accepted from R4

Humanity's purpose and drawings down in ABYA: there is a supported substantive reconciliation. Drawing down and union in the higher realms do not require those realms to be the final purpose. Tanya 36–

[430] Document 0566: IGK20-Earth-R4_05_Continuity.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[399] Document 0568: IGK20-Earth-R4_Consolidated.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

37 establishes the dwelling in the lower realms; 41 connects the service of Torah and mitzvot with supernal union. In addition, Likkutei Torah, Shelach, discourse beginning “Vayomru” (“And They Said”), section 3, explicitly connects human service with removing concealment above and revealing the lights below. There is therefore no necessary contradiction before us between drawings down in ABYA and a dwelling in the lower realms. This is a reasoned combination of parallels, not an explanatory sentence found concerning the parentheses in the Epistle. “As written elsewhere” was not identified.

“Dwelling” must not be reduced to an indication of place alone: the intent is revelation of Divinity within the lower reality that concealed it. Nor should the connection between service, union, and revelation become a chronological journey through three stations; the sources explain a relation of action and result.

Mayin nukvin and “on their own”: Claude’s withdrawal of the claim that mayin nukvin in Or HaTorah קצו [196] applies only after germination is accepted. The page compares the recipient’s growth from below upward to raising mayin nukvin, whereas the Epistle here identifies sowing and planting as raising mayin nukvin. These are different applications of the term. The rule concerning every blade of grass and the explanation following it support applying the response analogy also to that which grows on its own. This is a plausible contextual interpretation; preserve the wording of analogy and do not claim that every detail in the higher order is an identified botanical stage.

“On their own” here distinguishes those growing without sowing and planting from those sown and planted. It does not follow that there is no irrigation, tending, prayer, or any other human action. Nor does it follow that there is no mazal or supernal influence. Conversely, the rain paragraph in Or HaTorah does not prove that the mayin nukvin

there occurs specifically before germination. The attempt to impose a temporal division was withdrawn in both directions.

The printed witness of Shelach: the three new photographs attributed to HB14963 were read. The discourse heading, section 4, and continuation concerning doubled “very” match the digital discourse. The question of locating a printed witness for this discourse is closed. The edition’s dating and source-file attribution were supplied by Bot; no independent verification of complete PDF files or their fingerprints was performed here.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 7. Sowing, Mayin Nukvin, and Gratuitous Kindness

In what is sown and planted there is a prior seed, so the Epistle says “like yesh me-ayin” and explains the relative incommensurability between it and the product. This is not mathematical zero or a scientific statement that matter does not pass over. The analogy in Epistle 8 illuminates the seed’s role as an arouser, but “only if” there still requires a determination of applicability in relation to spontaneous growth in 20. Context supports restriction to the sowing analogy; the restriction is not stated as an explicit qualification.

Or HaTorah קצו [196] adds another analogy for mayin nukvin: the response of growth from below. A plant can thus grow on its own in the sense of not being sown, yet still be included in the analogy of influence and response. This does not identify that mayin nukvin with the kav’s returning light.

“Without any raising of mayin nukvin at all” is said in the parentheses concerning the days of Creation. It must not be transferred as a quotation about all present growth. The question in relation to Adam’s prayer for rain remains open: a distinction between actual coming into being and emergence and growth is possible, but no explicit de-

termination was found here. A general sentence in the later explanation concerning the need for mayin nukvin after the days of Creation must likewise be read within the discussion of the creation utterances and the division of plants, and does not alone decide that every plant requires sowing.

Continuous Explanation of the Unit — 8. "From This We Can Understand" and Humanity's Purpose

The Epistle reasons from the advantage of fruits produced through sowing to drawing down through human Divine service. Do not reverse the inference and say that the fruits are good because we have already proved a higher mechanism. Or HaTorah תשפו–תשפה [785–786] helps distinguish influence sustaining existence from addition through Divine service; applying it to the analogy is an interpretation.

Three distinct contrasts must be kept: Divine service versus influence given without it; action versus thought; and the doubled "very" explained in Likkutei Torah through two kinds of worlds. There is no simple correspondence in which a spontaneously growing plant is thought, and no proof that "very, very superior" in the Epistle is precisely the two aspects of worlds in the Shelach discourse.

The preferred explanation of purpose: human Divine service effects drawings down and unions throughout the full stature of the worlds, and the intent does not stop with revelation in the higher realms, but is realized in the revelation of Divinity in the lower realms. The drawings down and the dwelling are thus connected aspects of the same service. This supplies a positive explanation of the parentheses; it does not identify "elsewhere" or decide here among all formulations of the purpose of creation in the literature.

Dossier 0406 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [265]

ג [3]. The Independent Research Supplied — Complete in Its Claims, Not a Settled Source — A New Preparatory Examination by the Compiler — Limited Anchors That Can Be Reproduced

K1. The digital text of Bava Kamma 71b–72a was opened. The story begins at the end of 71b, and the wording about meat is at the top of 72a; the reference 71a does not locate the wording precisely. Rashi and Tosafot suggest a context of study/fasting. They must be read, and the difference between the Talmud's wording and the wording quoted in Chasidut examined. No photograph of the Talmud was examined here.

K2. The digital text of Zohar III 241a was opened. After the pleasure derived from foundation and root, it asks about the other two figures and describes the participation of lion and human as well. One must therefore investigate why the Epistle chose only ox and eagle; do not say that the others do not participate. The sequence with the previous page also requires reading. No photograph of the Zohar was examined here.

K3. The text of the discourse "Tziyon be-mishpat tipadeh" ("Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice"), תשל"ה [5735], the continuation of the preceding discourse, sections 14–15, was opened. It explicitly says "action is greater" in the future, and in discussing the advantage of action at present refers to Iggeret HaKodesh beginning "Ihu vechayohi" ("He and His Vitality"). This is an important, focused later explanation, not the Alter Rebbe's wording. Its sources and applica-

[265] Document 0406: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

bility must be examined, rather than proceeding from the assumption that the future necessarily ranks Torah above action.

K4. In search results only, the discourse “Pekuda liten machatzit hashekel” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), תשכ”ג [5723], was located. It explicitly asks why angels derive pleasure from sacrifices if both the refiner and the refined belong to Ban. The discourse’s text has not yet been read in the preparatory examination. This is a strong target for examining the limits of the explanation “Tohu is higher than Tikkun.”

Dossier 0389 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [443]

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — A / L1 — Sheshet Yamim ב§§–ג [2–3] (Printed יג [13]; PDF 55)

Opening (around יג [13]): «Six days you shall eat matzot…»

ב§ [2] (from the Kehot photograph/text):

«ב [2]. And to understand all this, one must first introduce the matter of what is written, “For not by bread alone shall [a person] live”… but by every utterance of the mouth of G-d…»

Continuation nearby: Daat of Tohu / the great beast (Etz Chaim, gate 8); ox meat; tasting grain — the two food proofs together in this discourse.

End of the relevant passage: through the end of ג§ [3] in the same page sequence (the entire discourse is not copied here).

Evidence: LT_Tzav_SheshesYamim_printYG_pdf-055.png (+056–057).

[443] Document 0389: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0415 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [455]

Role: verification of witnesses, separating references that became mixed, and focused photographs. No kabbalistic determination in place of the interpretive researchers.

P1 — Five separate Likkutei Torah discourses:

א [1]. Tzav, “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”), ב–ג§§ [2–3] (L1): the two food proofs.

ב [2]. Tzav, “Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo” (“To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, ‘This Matzah’ ”), ב§ [2]: father, immaturity, and faith; do not merge with א [1].

ג [3]. Tzav, “Va-akhaltem akhol” (“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”), L2: eating and elevation, and the future discussion of returning light.

ד [4]. Emor, “Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam” (“Explanation Based on ‘The Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”), ד§ [4] (L3): angels’ pleasure, Zohar, and the reference to the Epistle.

ה [5]. Va’etchanan, “Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom” (“To Understand with Further Explanation Based on ‘You Shall Know Today’ ”), ה§ [5]: Daat of Tohu and wheat.

For each target: full title, opening, section, end of passage, book identifier and edition, PDF page, and printed folio and column only if seen in the photograph. Provide a full page allowing the heading and sequence to be seen, and a readable crop of the passage. OCR is a finding aid, not a photographic witness. Do not turn the website heading Tzav 7 or Va’etchanan 6 into a folio number. Clarify retrospectively the meaning of Tzav יג [13] in the R2 register. Do not

[455] Document 0415: IGK20-Finale-R3_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

attribute the words of Sheshet Yamim to Matzah Zo merely because both speak of matzah. The reference Emor לח ג [38c] still requires correspondence to a photograph; the correct text is in L3, whereas "U-sefartem lakhem" at aid5898837 is another discourse. Begin with the identifying text, not a search for a page without a heading. If your book has different numbering, document it without inventing a fixed offset.

P2 — Mishnat Chasidim: continue from witness HB7122 if available to you. Verify title page, year, tractate, and chapter. Give separate transcriptions of the main text and the Taam Etzo commentary, with visual boundaries. State where the unions appear in the text and where in the commentary. There is no need to regenerate all of Etz Chaim: only an anchor for the animal/speaking comparison if the existing wording is in doubt.

P3 — Note 61 in Hebrew: locate a Hebrew source for the Rebbe's note on superiority in creation and omission of earth. Search Lessons in Tanya, Likkutei Biurim / notes and references according to the reference you find, without inventing a book title. Present the note with the sign connecting it to the text. Separate the note's wording from Weinberg's explanation. If there is no photograph, provide digital Hebrew text and a precise reference; do not translate EN and call it a Hebrew source.

P4 — Zohar: the compiler confirmed a real variant in 241a, line 14, in the Stanford apparatus. Update VARIANTS: location א [1] (line 2, birds), location ב [2] (line 14, all the faces), then variants among witnesses at each location separately. A short table and relevant witnesses suffice; do not interpret higher/lower from the pronoun alone. If a printed photograph is accessible, connect both occurrences to their locations in it. Do not claim this is the copy of the Zohar used by the Alter Rebbe.

P5 — Transmission and secondary tasks: examine “Thus far we have found” in an early printing only if an accessible copy already exists and its title page and year can be verified; do not spend the bulk of the round on this. The wording of the note is not evidence of a physical tear. Do not open new historical dossiers. K3/K4/K5 were read by other researchers, but not necessarily by you. Do not inherit “read” status from them; linking to the references suffices. If a site is blocked, report it once and move on to accessible tasks.

Short REPORT_HE.md; SOURCE_LEDGER with columns for reading mode and degree of verification; SOURCE_READER containing only necessary passages in context; VARIANTS; EVIDENCE folder with photographs and filenames matching the register; a list of missing items. Do not fill S01–S40 anew or invent question numbers. Save in a new IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot folder; do not overwrite R1/R2. Supply a ZIP and an accessible link if the capabilities are available. If saving/uploading is unavailable, provide the report’s contents and a description of files actually created, without reporting a link or action that did not occur. In every transcription from a photograph: original spelling, uncertain readings marked, no silent correction. Entire chapters need not be copied. The goal is a witness that can be rechecked, not another report of the source’s mere existence.

========== R2 review and the new sources ==========

Dossier 0416 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [268]

[268] Document 0416: IGK20-Finale-R3-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Finale-R3 — Compiler's Review and Decisions for R4 — What I Saw in Bot's Photographs

I opened R3's source register and witness folder and saw two photographs:

1. Emor, file marked PDF106: §4 and the reference to the end of Ihu ve-chayohi ("He and His vitality") are visible in the right column. The number 76 appears at the top of the image. This verifies the presence of the reference in the photograph; it does not by itself verify the column letter in לח ג [38c], nor identify the author of the reference. Appearance in the first edition, if found, also does not necessarily distinguish author from editor.
2. Tzav, file PDF055: heading יג [13], opening of Sheshet Yamim ("Six Days") in the right column and the beginning of §2 in the left. The two proofs are not visible in this photograph. The page on which they appear is needed, without confusing the opening folio with the location of the quotations.

Emor photograph; Tzav photograph; R3 register.

In the compiler's round I did not see a Hebrew photograph for note 61, a first printing determining an editorial layer, or a photograph of Zohar 241a. A report about a file is not equivalent to reading it. Do not infer that Bot's entire dossier was examined from these two photographs.

Dossier 0394 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [456]

[456] Document 0394: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only)

Date: 2026-09-23 ~14:35–15:00 ET

Role: verification of witnesses + resolving locations only. No kabbalistic ruling. No reopening of the union of ZON.

Edition: Likkutei Torah, Kehot ©1948 / revision 1998 / 7th edition 2017 — hb58812.pdf.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — What Was Corrected Relative to R3, and Why

Topic	R3	R4	Why
Zohar birds (Place A)	Remained ≈240b for the quotation itself	Quotation ≈241a line 2 (Stanford apparatus sel= 385); 240b = preceding context only	Website paragraph divisions ≠ printed folio; variant assigns it to 241a l.2
Zohar root/ foundation summary	Not clearly separated	≈241a line 14	Same folio; do not apply bird subjects to the summary of four faces
L4 Ki Tetze	No principal printed witness	PDF292 (§1) + PDF293 (§4); TOC לד [34]; Arabic 68 seen	New principal source for the animal–fire / speaking–air pair
L5 Shelach libations	Partial status	PDF111–112; animal=fire visible in parentheses; Shelach→Tetze pointer not isolated	Do not confuse with «the matter of the libations» (מא [41])
L1 Sheshet Yamim, two proofs	PDF55 mainly opens	PDF56–57 cover the proof sentences	Do not attribute to Matzah Zo / Tzav 7
Emor PDF106 ↔ לח ג [38c]	Remained vague	Seen: Arabic 76 + §4 + pointer; inferred: לח [38]; column ג [c] inferred	Three separate fields; presence ≠ authorship

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — Witness Table (Mandatory)

Determination	Read in text	Seen in photograph	Reported/transcription	Inferred
L4 §1: fire=animal nefesh; air=speaking	Yes (chabadpedia Tetze)	Yes PDF292	—	—
L4 pointer (“and see what is written… in the passage on libations in Shelach”)	Yes	Yes PDF292	—	—
L4 §4 embedding / Torah–action	Yes (digital)	Yes PDF293	—	—

Determination	Read in text	Seen in photograph	Reported/transcription	Inferred
L5 animal=fire (parentheses: vegetative=water, animal=fire)	Partial	Yes PDF111	—	—
L5 pointer back to Tetze	Digital/cross-check	Not isolated	—	Open
L1 meat/grain proofs, etc.	Yes (aid/5898814 / digital)	Yes PDF56–57	—	—
Emor §4 + Epistle pointer	Yes (R3+ digital)	Yes PDF106 (Arabic 76)	Line transcription	לח [38]= inferred; ג [c]= inferred
Zohar birds quotation ≈241a l.2	Stanford/Wiki source	Not print	HTML	—
Zohar root/foundation ≈241a l.14	Stanford/Wiki source	Not print	HTML	—
Note 61, animal above vegetative	—	—	EN blocked by Cloudflare	EN-only / open status

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — P2 — L1 — Sheshet Yamim

- Discourse on יג [13] (PDF55 opens + beginning of §2).
- The two proofs (bread/vegetative nourishes the speaking because its root is higher; continuation with meat/grain, etc.) — PDF56–57, not only 55.
- Do not attribute to Matzah Zo / Tzav 7. Discourse-opening locus ≠ loci of the quotations.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — P3 — Emor PDF106 ↔ לח ג [38c]

Seen in photograph (PDF106):

- Arabic heading 76
- Section marker ד [4]
- Opening «And now the matter will also be understood…»
- Pointer to the Epistle in the text (right-column area according to R3/compiler)

Seen in neighboring photograph (PDF107):

- Hebrew folio לט [39] — confirms numbering system

Inferred (not a glyph visible in the same crop):

- PDF106 = printed folio לח [38] (sequence + Arabic print ×2: לח≈76 [38]; Tetze לד≈68 [34])
- Column letter «ג» [c] in the citation «לח ג» [38c] = citation system / column location, not a separately photographed column letter

Transcription (lines around the pointer — parentheses marked):

The pointer's presence in Kehot print is not authorship by the Alter Rebbe. Examination of a first edition helps only as a textual witness — attribution remains open.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — P5 — Note 61

A Hebrew photograph of Lessons in Tanya / the note's source: not obtained.

EN Lessons + Daily Tanya HE: Cloudflare 403 / blocked — EN-only status, not verified live in this round.

If obtained, distinguish the first sentence (elevation in creation — animal above vegetative) from the parentheses (omission of the inanimate / nourishment), and do not present an EN translation as a Hebrew witness.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — What Was Not Done (Intentionally)

No booklet · no «Thus far» task · no "peina"/"elsewhere" · no opening of the union dossier · no rewriting all five LT discourses · no writing to R1–R3 folders.

Dossier 0504 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [457]

The analogy for this is sowing and planting: the seed arouses the vegetative power in the earth, which is the word of G-d, "Let the earth sprout," etc., "fruit tree," etc., through raising mayin nukvin to its root. So too parchment and the etrog arouse up to the highest levels, namely the name Sag before the breaking, which is the nature and essence of the lights in Adam Kadmon, not a mere radiance like the name Mah from its forehead. Likewise, through studying and examining their laws, one arouses the aspect of Chochmah, Binah, and

[457] Document 0504: KA4_Admur_body_excerpt_zriah.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Daat in the ten sefirot of the vessels of ZON, and up to the highest levels as well, the aspect of Chochmah, Binah, and Daat in Sag of the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon, emerging through the eyes, etc. All the above concerns positive mitzvot, but apparently not the study of details of the laws of prohibitions of negative mitzvot, especially those entirely uncommon, such as the details of the laws of pigul and the like. But furthermore, this is equal in all, for

Dossier 0508 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [458]

[Translator's note: The Hebrew research PDF interleaves two columns. Their reading order is restored here from the archived two-column text, with column fragments kept under their original research-page anchors. The excerpt begins and ends mid-text. The recurring OCR forms אור א"ם and ע"ם are rendered as "Ein Sof light" and "ten sefirot"; unresolved readings are marked locally.]

[Earlier printed page, right-column fragment]

compassion is included, like a father striking his son: this striking is cruelty, yet compassion and love are included in it, for he strikes him only because of his love and compassion for him, as it is written, "He who withholds his rod hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him early." Likewise with the other emotive attributes. The inanimate, vegetative, and animal aspects are also included in him (both in his body, in which the hairs are the aspect of

[Earlier printed page, left-column fragment]

in its root, than the aspect of Tikkun (as written in Iggeret HaKodesh near its end, for they are from Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon, while Tikkun through Mah emerges from the forehead as

[458] Document 0508: L3_Emor_Vehenif_§ב_SG_metzach_pointer_excerpt.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

a mere radiance, etc.; see on this in Ramaz, beginning of Vayeshev, discourse beginning “Chochmat ha-misken” [“The Poor Man’s Wisdom”], and end of Korach). But nevertheless, through the aforementioned interinclusion, Tikkun possesses a high advantage not present in Tohu. For in Tikkun there is

[Textual note in the excerpt]

Line beginning “וכמ”ש” (“and as written”) — “Mei Noach” (“The Waters of Noah”): in the manuscript, “in the portion Noach.” So too in Or HaTorah, Naso, p. רפד [284].

[Printed heading: Likkutei Torah, Emor, לח [38]]

[Printed page לח, right-column fragment]

a revelation of the Ein Sof light that is not in Tohu. This is as written in the Zohar, “The Holy One, blessed be He, dwells only in a complete place.” “The Holy One, blessed be He” means the Essence of the Emanator: “You are the completeness of all.” He dwells only in a complete place, that is, when there is interinclusion below and the ten sefirot are linked and joined together, then the Ein Sof light, the completeness of all, dwells in them: that which is above the ten sefirot, and “He is not any of these attributes at all.” By contrast, when each attribute is on its own, this is not at all a complete place in which the completeness of all could dwell, etc. Therefore in Tikkun, through interinclusion in the aspect of the supernal human partzuf, the indwelling of the Ein Sof light is drawn from the completeness of all, unlike the world of Tohu. This is an additional and immense advantage of the human aspect of Tikkun over the world of Tohu (and this is what is meant by “Bless us, our Father, all as one, with the light of Your countenance,” etc.; likewise we find at the giving of the Torah, “And Israel encamped,” in unity, and then the Torah was given. See what is written at the end of the discourse beginning “Shinayikh ke-

eder ha-rechelim” [“Your Teeth Are Like a Flock of Ewes”], and see what is written

[Printed page לח, left-column fragment]

supernal, etc., “Within is the name Mah,” etc., and as written elsewhere in the explanation of the verse “Mi manah afar Yaakov” [“Who Counted the Dust of Jacob”] and of “Har’ini et mar’ayikh” [“Show Me Your Appearance”]. Therefore Keter is called Adam, and in Pardes, entry “Adam,” Keter is called Adam Kadmon, for Adam Kadmon is the Keter of general ABYA, etc. When this aspect is also drawn into Ze’ir Anpin of Atzilut, as mentioned above, through interinclusion an aspect of the completeness of all is drawn down and dwells within it; this is the matter of bringing peace between a person and his fellow. Perhaps this is also the meaning and matter of “What is his name, and what is his son’s name?”: two aspects of Mah, which are the two aspects of Adam mentioned above. These are the two aforementioned kinds of interinclusion: the first through being soft as a reed, the second through revelation of the Ein Sof light from the completeness of all. “Mah is his name”; “within is the name Mah.” See Zohar, Balak, 191b, and Mikdash Melekh there, and Pardes, entry “Mah,” explaining “What is his name?” as supernal Chochmah, etc., as also explained in the discourse beginning “Lehavin biur inyan ha-avot hen hen ha-merkavah” [“To Understand the Explanation of ‘The Patriarchs Are the Chariot’ ”]. It may be said that nevertheless the source of the drawing down is Keter, except that it is [Printed page לח, right-column continuation]

elsewhere in the discourse beginning “Va-yomer Havayah hen am echad” [“And G-d Said, Behold, One People”], etc.: at the place of interinclusion in holiness, light is drawn from the aspect of Akudim in one vessel. This is the completeness of all, above Tohu, for the world of Tohu is the aspect of Nekudim, and the world of Akudim the aspect of cantillation marks; in the matter of cantillation marks, vowel

points, crowns, and letters [TaNTA], cantillation marks are in Keter and vowel points in Chochmah, etc., as written elsewhere):

ג [3]. And now, after a radiance of the Ein Sof light above the ten sefirot dwells in Tikkun, the emotive attributes and sefirot can subsequently become interincluded in actual nullification of existence, more than before, when interinclusion was only due to the weakened revelation of the light, like being soft as a reed, etc., but not the very essence of actual nullification. Yet when the revelation of the Ein Sof light, the completeness of all, is revealed to them, all the attributes are as naught before it. For as its name is, so it is: it is not an attribute, G-d forbid, but infinitely higher even than Chochmah, Binah, and Daat, the source of the attributes. Then the attributes become united and are actually nullified like a candle before a torch in His light, blessed be He, which shines upon them, and have no significance at all. This is the matter of "He makes peace in His heights," between the minister of water and the minister of fire, as written in Iggeret HaKodesh on "And the work of charity shall be peace," etc.; see there (this interinclusion is truly actual nullification, above the nullification of being soft as a reed, etc., to the point that even if the attributes possessed abundant light, they would be nullified and interincluded. Thus in the world of Akudim there was certainly more abundant light than in Nekudim, yet there was no breaking of the vessels, G-d forbid, because of their closeness to the Ein Sof light, through which they are in true nullification, etc., and true interinclusion, until they are bound in one vessel. From this nullification there is afterward drawn

[Printed page לח, left-column continuation]

through Chochmah, as is known concerning the union of Abba and Imma in the Shema, whose drawing down is rooted exceedingly high above, etc. And now, it is explained there in Likkutei HaShas in the name of the Idra Rabba that when Arich gazes upon Ze'ir Anpin, it brings about union between Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva. This is

why bringing peace between a person and his fellow results in eating fruits in this world, according to what is written in the Zohar, Behaalotecha, 156a: "because this principal," etc., "and therefore its fruit"; see Mikdash Melekh there. This is the matter of "Adam" in Chronicles with a large alef [OCR: באלף רבתי], for the large letters are rooted in Keter, and through Keter's radiance the union of ZON is drawn down. This is what is written in Metzora, 53b, "Adam: this is the completeness of all." This is why the Mishnah enumerates, "These are things whose fruits a person eats in this world," etc.: honoring father and mother, acts of kindness, bringing peace, etc., "and Torah study is equivalent to them all." Through all this they draw the light of Arich Anpin into Ze'ir Anpin through Abba and Imma, as above concerning "Mah is his name," etc. Acts of kindness can be understood from what is written elsewhere in explaining "G-d Most High, Who bestows good kindnesses." See also what is written on "Ve-erastikh li le-olam" ["I Will Betroth You to Me Forever"], in the Zohar's name concerning "forever," and in the discourse beginning "Havayah yechatu merivav" ["G-d, May His Adversaries Be Shattered"], how this drawing down from Arich Anpin sweetens all judgments. See Reishit Chochmah, chapter 12 of Shaar HaAhavah, concerning "For the king trusts in G-d, and through the kindness of the Most High he will not falter," etc.; see the discourse beginning "Hineh lehavin shoresh inyan matan Torah" ["To Understand the Root of the Giving of the Torah"], in Yitro, regarding "David [sinned] in two, and it did not avail him." See further on eating their fruits in this world in Iggeret HaKodesh, discourse beginning "Va-yilbash tzedakah kashiryon" ["He Put On Charity as a Coat of Mail"]). Now the matter of "Let us make man," etc., "and let them rule over the fish," etc., will be understood: the human being is of Tikkun, in which the Ein Sof light dwells, and all are interincluded as above. Therefore specifically the human being can govern and rule them all (see Zohar II, end

of 94b; III 48a). (This is also why the human being has free choice, as Rambam writes in Hilkhot Teshuvah, chapter 5, that of this it says, "Behold, the human being [Printed page לח, right-column continuation]

in the world of Tikkun as well, through the indwelling of the Ein Sof light drawn into Tikkun, through which true nullification is drawn into them, etc. See the explanation of "Et Shabtotai tishmoru" ["You Shall Keep My Sabbaths"], concerning the lower Shabbat, the ascent of BYA into Atzilut, nullification of yesh; the higher Shabbat is likewise in Atzilut, true nullification in the aspect of ayin, the source of Chochmah, etc. This is also as explained: through revelation of the Ein Sof light in the world of Tikkun, a higher nullification is drawn down, etc.). This is the matter of "within is the name Mah, which is the path of Atzilut and the watering," etc.: the indwelling of the Ein Sof light in the name Mah of Chochmah, from the aspect of the completeness of all, before whose revelation all lights and attributes are nullified in their existence. Therefore it is the path of Atzilut, linking and connecting all the lights and sefirot of Atzilut so that they join in complete and true interinclusion (perhaps this is the matter of what is written in the Arizal's Likkutei HaShas explaining bringing peace between a person and his fellow: a face-to-face gaze between the person and his fellow, Arich upon Ze'ir. The matter is that relative to Arich Anpin, the attributes of Atzilut are called Ze'ir Anpin, for "Jacob is small"; but "long-suffering and great in kindness" means the attributes are limitless, as written in the discourse beginning "Vayehi be-shalach Paroh" ["When Pharaoh Sent"] and at the end of the discourse beginning "Be-khaf-heh be-Kislev" ["On the Twenty-Fifth of Kislev"]. This is also the difference between Gedulah and Chesed, as written elsewhere. Thus in supernal Keter the attributes possess greatness and force, yet are interincluded in the utmost degree, be-

cause of their intense nullification before Ein Sof, blessed be He, as above concerning Akudim, and this is Keter

[Printed page לח, left-column continuation]

has become as one of us." That is, this human species is unique in the world, with no second species like it in this respect: it knows good and evil of itself and does whatever it desires, etc.; see there. As written elsewhere, this choice is taken from a very high aspect, the aspect of dominion, for kingship and dominion belong to the Life of the Worlds, as when "it arose in His simple will," etc., and none restrains His hand. Likewise is the choice given to the human being, so that no one restrains his hand; but because this lofty aspect and advantage descended and became invested below in a physical body and an animal soul containing good and evil, this dominion can also choose evil, G-d forbid; may G-d protect us. This is "And He formed," etc., "and He breathed into his nostrils," etc.: many contractions until this power of choice and dominion descended below. But the root of this aspect was taken from a very high place; see Pardes, gate 4, chapter 9 [OCR: בפרדם שע"ד פ"ט]. Choice and dominion were given to the human being because the root of the human aspect is very exalted, as above. Therefore, "And now, Israel, what does G-d your G-d ask of you, but to fear," etc.; as Rambam writes there, "Since permission is in our hands," etc.). Books therefore state that the human pulse indicates the radiance of the Ein Sof light within, as written in Likkutei Torah, Taamei Mitzvot, Vayera: the pulse is the back-aspect of Abba, and the vitality within it is the Ein Sof light, for the Ein Sof light is invested in Chochmah; pulsation is the mode of running and returning, namely the "reaching and not reaching" of Chochmah, because the Ein Sof light dwells in Chochmah.

[Textual note in the excerpt]

Line beginning "ממש" ("actually") — "בהגלות" ("when revealed"): in Or HaTorah, Naso, p. רפה [285] (5726 edition), and in the Tzemach Tzedek's own holy handwriting: "בהתגלות" ("in the revelation").

[Printed heading: Likkutei Torah, Emor, 76] [Printed page 76, right-column fragment]

ד [4]. And now the matter of the human being's nourishment and reception of vitality from foods of the inanimate, vegetative, and animal orders will also be understood. Through this he also rectifies and elevates them. This is because the human being is of Tikkun, where, through interinclusion, the Ein Sof light, the completeness of all, dwells, as above: the Ein Sof light dwells in Chochmah. Therefore, in blessing "Blessed are You, Havayah," a person can draw revelation of the Ein Sof light into Chochmah; "through Chochmah they are refined," refining the inanimate, vegetative, and animal orders, for the utterance of G-d's mouth in food is rooted in the world of Tohu. Only because of the breaking of the vessels did the vessels fall below into BYA while the lights departed above into the supernal Emanator. However, after food's refinement and elevation to Tikkun through the blessing, they approach their lights of Tohu that departed above; the lights of Tohu are revealed and united within them. For example, a human soul departs from the body because of death, may G-d protect us, and is bound in the bond of life in Gan Eden; at the resurrection of the dead, when the body is elevated, the neshamah that was in Gan Eden will be revealed and invested within it, etc. Likewise, after the vessels of Tohu that died and fell into BYA are rectified and included in Tikkun, their neshamah, namely the lights of Tohu, is revealed and drawn into them. Through this a great abundance of light is added to Tikkun, which is the human being, for the lights of Tohu that departed and were included in the Essence of the Emanator are much higher than Tikkun's lights, as above; only because of the light's overwhelming force and intensity could the vessel not contain it, etc. Yet after

the vessels have been refined and included in Tikkun, characterized by interinclusion, the human being of Tikkun will live through this: a light greater than the human being of Tikkun is revealed in him, as above (it is from Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon, etc.; thus Tikkun includes the two

[Printed page 76, left-column fragment]

and Rachel. The meaning is that nevertheless the judgments of Leah also require sweetening, etc.; see there. An explanation of the union of Jacob, Rachel, and Leah, and how the two daily offerings came to sweeten the judgments, etc.: it is written, "Like a ewe silent before her shearers." A ewe is a sheep and is the aspect of Malchut, which is compared to a ewe. For we find in the ewe a nature of submission greater than in all animals. It also arouses compassion in everyone who sees it, and its voice arouses compassion. It allows itself to be shorn and does not make a sound, unlike all other animals, which will not be still or at rest when people come to shear them (all this is the aspect of submission and nullification, "May my soul be as dust to everyone," as written elsewhere in the discourse beginning "Im lo tede'i lakh" ["If You Do Not Know"]). The corresponding example is the Shechinah, which descends to impart to BYA, gives life even to the external forces, and endures this; they draw sustenance from the hairs. This is the matter of "silent before her shearers," as written on "Eleh masei Bnei Yisrael" ["These Are the Journeys of the Children of Israel"], etc. To sweeten the judgments of the two Nukvas, Leah and Rachel, to which the external forces cling, it says, "The one lamb you shall offer in the morning"; taaseh ("you shall offer/make") signifies rectification, as in "she shall tend her nails." This rectification is through the daily burnt offering: the physical lamb, whose root is in Tohu, is offered on the altar, thereby raising mayin nukvin from the 288 sparks [OCR: מהרפ"ח]. Through this, mayin duchrin descends and is drawn from above: the supernal fire, "a lion consuming sac-

rifices." אריה ("lion") has the letters of ראיה ("seeing"), the radiance of the name Mah from Chochmah that refines mayin nukvin; thereby Nukva's severities are sweetened. This is the union of Jacob and Rachel, and likewise Leah's union, for every Nukva requires sweetening from the male, namely Jacob, Ze'ir Anpin of Atzilut. Rachel is the letters of speech and Leah the letters of thought; both are therefore called Nukva, because letters are the final aspect. Only in relation to Rachel, which is speech, the revealed world, is [Printed page 76, right-column continuation]

advantages: great lights as in Tohu, yet interinclusion through the radiance of the Ein Sof light, the completeness of all, etc., a likeness of the aspect of Akudim, etc.). Through this the Sages' saying will be understood (Berakhot 55a, on "And he said to me, This is the table that is before G-d," Ezekiel 41:22): "It began with an altar and ended with a table. While the Temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel; now a person's table atones for him." For sacrifices are the elevation of the animal soul through the priest, who is Chesed of Ze'ir Anpin from the world of Tikkun, and "the right hand draws near." Therefore, when he blesses, slaughters it, and offers it on the altar, he refines the animal's spirit that fell in the breaking of the vessels and raises it to its root in the face of the ox in the chariot, until it is included in Malchut of Atzilut. This is called the altar's eating. The altar is Malchut of Atzilut; through this the lights of Tohu are revealed. The angels therefore derive pleasure from the sacrifices through revelation of Tohu's lights, in which their root lies. This is what the holy Zohar says (Pinchas 241a), "And they derive pleasure from their foundation and root," as cited in Iggeret HaKodesh at the end of the discourse beginning Ihu ve-chayohi ("He and His vitality"). This is "a pleasing aroma to Havayah": through the aroma, the raising of mayin nukvin from refining the animal soul, there is drawn nichoach [OCR: ניהוה], meaning "descending a level," a drawing down to Havayah. A new Havayah

comes into being, for there is a name Havayah in the ten sefirot of Tohu as well, and it is revealed and drawn into the ten sefirot of Tikkun, into the aspect of the name Havayah of Tikkun. Therefore the altar atones for the human being of Tikkun by drawing down a pleasing aroma to Havayah [OCR: היח ניחוח], etc. Likewise now a person's table atones for him: through eating with a blessing [OCR: בבדכה] and intention, he likewise refines the inanimate, vegetative, and animal orders, raises mayin nukvin from the breaking of the vessels, and draws revelation of Tohu's lights. But this is through first praying to be nullified before Him, blessed be He, the aspect of the human being of Tikkun, whose advantage is nullification: Adam has the numerical value Mah. Then it is called

[Printed page 76, left-column continuation]

Leah, which is thought, called the concealed world. But nevertheless, thought too is an aspect of letters, etc. And now, the division of voice and breath in pronunciation at the five outlets of the mouth is through the five severities מנצפ"ך, which divide voice and breath into portions, etc. This is why the building of Nukva, letters, is from the severities. Likewise the letters of thought also come in divisions like the letters of speech, through the five severities מנצפ"ך of Imma, etc. (See what is written on "U-gevuratekha yedabberu" ["They Shall Speak of Your Might"], "to make His mighty deeds known to human beings," etc., and the discourse beginning "Adonai sefatai tiftach" ["My L-rd, Open My Lips"; OCR: אדי]). And now, through the hishtalshelut of the severities, sustenance is drawn to the external forces, the harsh judgments; their sustenance comes from the refuse of the severities of holiness (see the discourse beginning "Ve-yikchu elekha farah" ["They Shall Take for You a Cow"], in Chukat). But through Jacob, the aspect of "Then your light will break forth like the dawn," drawing down the Ein Sof light dwelling in supernal Chochmah and from exceedingly high above, etc., the judgments and severities are

sweetened. There will be no aspect of “her shearers” separating the hairs and letters into a yesh and a separate entity, etc., through revelation of nullification from supernal Chochmah, etc. This is what appears in Mishnat Chasidim: “The one lamb, Jacob, you shall offer in the morning,” etc. [OCR: את חכבש אחד יעקב תעשה בבקר], for Jacob draws down the aspect of lamb from its source and root, as will shortly be explained concerning “Jacob separated the lambs”: he draws from Keter and Chochmah into Chesed, Gevurah, and Tiferet of Ze’ir Anpin, which is the matter of lamb. Through this drawing down, which draws this revelation into the letters of thought and speech, the harsh judgments clinging to combinations of letters, between one combination and another, are sweetened, etc. (See what is written in Pinchas on “The one lamb,” etc. The matter of Jacob, “Then it will break forth,” is also explained in the discourse beginning “Lehavin inyan mesameach chatan ve-khallah” [“To Understand the Matter of Rejoicing Bridegroom and Bride”], in Tzav. See further on sweetening Leah’s judgments in the explanation of “Bati le-gani” [“I Have Come to My Garden”], etc.

[Printed page 76, right-column continuation]

the table “a person’s table,” corresponding to the higher aspect: Malchut of Atzilut, which refines the sparks, is called a table for supernal Adam, Ze’ir Anpin of Atzilut. Through this it therefore atones for him like the altar, etc. (See Zohar, Terumah, end of 153b and 133a; and see [OCR: ברע”ט], Ekev, end of 271b, concerning “This is the table”; see what is written in Naso in the discourse beginning “Koh tevarekhu” [“Thus Shall You Bless”], etc.):

[Printed page 76, left-column continuation]

In the Rabbah collections, the matter of “The one lamb you shall offer in the morning, and the second lamb,” etc., is mentioned in Vayechi, chapter 99, concerning “In the morning he shall devour prey”; Naso,

chapter 14, רס"א ד' [261d]; Shir HaShirim Rabbah, end of the passage on “Le-susati” [“To My Mare”]; in Esther, on the verse “Also Vashti”; Zohar I 133a, 229b, 244a; III 242a, 226b in Raaya Mehemna. See Likkutei Torah, Kedoshim, discourse beginning “Azharat shaatnez” [“The Prohibition of Mixed Fabrics”]. It is cited in Mikdash Melekh, Kedoshim, 86b. [The recorded excerpt ends with the uncertain fragment “אי ך”.]

19 · Food and Knowledge: The Higher Receiving from the Lower

The transition from earth to nourishment does not repeat the same analogy. Growth concerns coming into being; sowing adds awakening from below; eating shows that the higher needs the lower and even receives additional knowledge from it. The shared progression emerges from the differences among the examples, not by turning them into a single action.

There is no need to say that bread, as it is manifest, is wiser than a human being. The parallels speak of a high root, descent, and refinement. The research question is how these three stages explain the particular nourishment, and what the relation is between this system and the returning light described in the Epistle.

A mismatch was also found here that is important to preserve. The order pairing the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking with the elements in the Epistle is supported by parallels in Likkutei Torah, but is not identical to the mapping in Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10. Locating a suitable source does not reconcile the different source. Before proposing “two axes,” identify them explicitly and show why each source belongs to its axis.

The conclusion dossiers in this chapter break down the progression into its questions: what "And from this" refers back to, what grain and meat prove, how the addition of knowledge is understood, and what role is played by repeating the bottom of Asiyah and the endpoint of the kav. Each question is read within a single sequence, but is not absorbed into a slogan that everything is drawn from the higher root.

The Wording of the Epistle — Source Units

W15-01 · 1–13

And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, and air:

W15-02 · 14–21

although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal,

W15-03 · 22–30

nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both,

W15-04 · 31–39

and also wisdom and knowledge, for an infant does not know how to call "father" and "mother"

W15-05 · 40–50

until it tastes the taste of grain, etc., and "I had not yet eaten ox meat," etc.,

W15-06 · 51–59

for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah,

W15-07 · 60–70

where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds,

W15-08 · 71–81

and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light, as above.

The word ranges preserve the local count in the earlier division of the source; W identifiers are fixed. Word count of the working text: 1,640 words.

Mapping the Question and Its Clarification

Why is the higher nourished by the lower, and what do the examples of grain and ox meat prove about wisdom and knowledge?

From the advantage revealed at the lowest point, the Epistle moves to the order of created beings. The inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking correspond to earth, water, fire, and air. This is not an identity between every physical substance and a class of creatures: water in a cup is inanimate, even though the vegetative is characterized by water. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael” (“Command the Children of Israel”), §3, gives reasons: water causes growth; animal souls are drawn from the attendants of the chariot, described as fire; the speaking is a “speaking spirit” in Onkelos’s translation. Earth is given there without a separate explanation.

Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10, assigns to the animal the air portion in all the elements and to the speaking the fire portion. This reverses the order of the two higher pairs. The parallels in Likkutei Torah prove that the Epistle need not be emended according to Etz Chaim. It may be proposed that the mappings answer different questions — internal composition versus characterization of the levels of created beings — but no sentence of the author was found explicitly reconciling the two maps.

The animal is higher than the vegetative and the speaking higher than both, yet they receive vitality and even knowledge from the lower. Grain exemplifies recognition and speech in their beginnings, and ox meat exemplifies an addition to the power of study. Likkutei Torah, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot"), brings both proofs and explains that food's root in Tohu is higher than the Chochmah of Tikkun. Manifest food is not wiser than the person; its high root explains how it adds to him. There is no source here assigning grain to Daat and meat to Chochmah, and no proved reason for choosing specifically ox beyond the Talmudic saying.

"For it is the aspect of returning light" is a causal explanation given by the Epistle itself. The lower adds to the higher because at the lowest point a radiance is revealed with greater force from the sovev and from the kav in the mode of returning light. In context, the final return is attributed to the kav; the sovev shines there. The explanation of food in the language of Tohu and Sag joins this explanation as a parallel, but no sentence identifies Sag with the kav's return. Nor should a condition of blessing and prayer be inserted into every instance of natural nourishment: in the parallel, the transition to serving G-d is marked as an additional stage.

S01 · From What Is the Order of Nourishment Learned?

What precisely does "And from this" refer back to: growth, the advantage of mayin nukvin, the bottom of Asiyah, returning light, or the whole sequence? What does "will be well understood" add?

The question seeks to identify the premise from which the argument begins. If "from this" refers only to sowing, one must explain how human action becomes an explanation for ordinary eating as well; if it refers to the advantage of the lowest point, sowing is part of the broader context.

The preferred reading refers “from this” back to the advantage of the lowest point and the explanation of light given in the earth unit. Sowing and planting, mentioned nearby, add the role of raising mayin nukvin; there is no evidence that they are the sole referent. “Will be well understood” indicates applying the explanation to another phenomenon: the higher is nourished by the lower, extending to additional knowledge in the human being.

Syntactic proximity is important evidence, but insufficient on its own. The adjacent sentence concerns the superior fruits produced through sowing and planting. If the reading disconnected “And from this” from everything before that sentence, a narrow transition would result: from agricultural action to human nutrition. Yet the continuation of the Epistle’s own sentence returns to the bottom of Asiyah, sovev, and the endpoint of the kav. That return is an internal test of the reference’s scope: what explicitly recurs is the structure of light, not only the advantage of cultivated fruit.

Three levels must therefore be separated. The vegetative power in earth exemplifies a capacity present at the lowest point. Sowing exemplifies an addition drawn down through awakening from below.

The food chain exemplifies the dependence of a higher level on one below it. All three can fit into one progression without being the same action. Producing growth, nourishing, and drawing down are not synonyms; the explanation seeks the structure enabling their connection.

The initial research aptly identified continuity from earth to mitzvot, but the expression “one chain of proofs” can blur the difference between evidence and application. The Epistle does not infer returning light from an independent nutritional investigation. It uses what was explained earlier to interpret the familiar relationship between

levels. The examples of grain and meat sharpen the point that the relationship includes knowledge as well. They do not by themselves prove the whole account of the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet.

The last round added an important parallel in Kuntres Acharon 4: inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods, refinement, raising mayin nukvin, and the sowing analogy occur in the same discussion. This strengthens the correspondence of the topics, but does not automatically identify "as written elsewhere." Correspondence between a sequence of subjects can explain why the parallel helps the reader; it is still not an explicit reference specified by the author.

A useful counter-test is to ask whether every act of eating first requires personal sowing. The sentence does not say this. The narrow reading must therefore not become a condition of the phenomenon. Conversely, sowing must not be erased from the context merely because it is not such a condition: it prepares the transition from the structure of creation to human action and the conclusion concerning mitzvot. The answer is contextual and reasoned, not a proved decoding of a pronoun explained by the author himself.[459]

S02 · Four Levels and Four Elements

What is the source of the precise correspondence inanimate/earth, v egetative/water, animal/fire, speaking/air? Give an inward explanation and a reference for each pair. Why does water's being inanimate not contradict this? Do not supply only associations.

[459]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/admor haz/tanya/5/4.htm

A glass of water belongs to the inanimate, but the Epistle parallels water with the vegetative. The difficulty arises if the correspondence is read as material identity. What characterizes each level must be clarified, especially whether there is a source for all four pairs together.

Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael” (“Command the Children of Israel”), §3, gives the four pairs. Water is connected with the vegetative because it causes growth; fire with the animal because animal souls are rooted in the attendants of the chariot, described as fire; air/spirit with the speaking according to “a speaking spirit.” Earth–inanimate is given without a separate reason. “Aspects” here indicates correspondence and characterization, not a claim that all water is a plant.

The demand for one system changed the investigation. Initially four plausible explanations were offered: earth as permanence, water as growth, fire as heat and movement, air as speech. These explanations could serve as an opening, but did not prove that the Epistle’s author uses precisely this system. It is easy to recognize kabbalistic symbols separately and mistakenly suppose that their combination has already been documented. A witness presenting the levels and elements together was therefore required.

The first witness to change the situation was Ki Tetze §1, explicitly stating that fire is the aspect of the animal soul and air/spirit the aspect of the speaking, together with Onkelos. Shelach, the discourse on libations, reinforced animal–fire. The complete Pinchas paragraph was then located. The sequence of correction matters: the discovery canceled the claim that no Chasidic source exists for the upper pairs; it did not cancel the question of their relation to Etz Chaim.

Pinchas gives an explanation not limited to body heat. It moves from “His attendants, a blazing fire” to the face of the lion and face of the ox, and from them to the hishtalshelut of animal souls. Fire characterizes

the soul's source in the chariot, not only a quality measurable in the living body. Heat, desire, and movement may illuminate the connection in human Divine service, but must not replace the source's explicit reason.

The reason concerning water must also be preserved precisely. The source connects water to the vegetative through the action of producing growth. It does not classify a sample of water as a plant, or claim that a plant consists of water alone. A physical created being can include several elements, while the correspondence points to a characteristic aspect. This resolves the apparent contradiction without requiring a change in the meaning of the inanimate.

Earth is the case where one may stop. The paragraph says that it is inanimate, but does not add "because," as in the explanation of fire. Permanence and absence of self-movement are a possible conceptual explanation, not an explicit reason found in that paragraph. Four explicit pairs and three explicit reasons are a strong finding; there is no need to turn it into four reasons to present a symmetrical system.

A bibliographical error occurred in reporting: the discourse was called "Tzav" because its opening is "Tzav et Bnei Yisrael." It belongs to the Torah portion Pinchas, not Tzav. The error did not change the text read, but disrupted the route by which another reader could find it. The correction therefore belongs in the body of the research and the source register, not merely in a marginal technical note.[460]

[460]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened at the editorial stage. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et Bnei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the Torah portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "Ki tetze la-milchamah" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and photographic witnesses. Distinguish root, Divine service, and result. h ttps://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "Be-parashat nesakhim ketiv ki tavo'u" ("In the Passage of Libations It Is Written, 'When You Come' ") — §1 and the reference to Ki Tetze; PDF 109–112; digital witness reported by the compiler and photograph-

S03 · The Reversed Order in Etz Chaim

Is this an order of levels, an order of coming into being, or a functional correspondence? Compare other orders of the four elements; why does air follow fire here? Is the wording stable?

This is a different question from the need for a source: even after a source for the Epistle's map was found, Etz Chaim presents animal–air and speaking–fire. One must clarify whether it maps the same thing, rather than simply declaring the two lists different.

In Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10, the levels are connected to the portions of earth, water, air, and fire in each of the elements. In the Epistle and its parallels, animal is fire and speaking is air. A distinction between compositional constituents and a characteristic aspect permits a reconciliation, but no sentence of the Alter Rebbe was found explicitly reconciling the reversal. Do not emend the Epistle or write that the difficulty has certainly been resolved.

One of the important retractions in the research occurred here. A general reference to Etz Chaim and Mishnat Chasidim was initially used as though it confirmed the Epistle's order. Reading gate 50, chapter 10, showed that this confirmation was incorrect for the two higher pairs. An explicit retraction matters: a source can support the principle of composition and inclusion while contradicting the order attributed to it. Neither erase its entire contribution nor preserve the erroneous attribution.

Etz Chaim speaks of an internal portion in each element. According to the account read, the inanimate is constructed from the earth portion of all four; the vegetative from the water portions; the animal from the air portion; and the speaking from the fire portion. A vege-

s. Access status differed among readers. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898890; Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10 — portions of the four elements and composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking; digital witness reported as "not checked" on the site; animal–air and speaking–fire. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/שער_נ_פרק_י

tative, animal, and speaking soul is added according to level. This is a more complex system than four labels on four kinds of matter. In comparing it with the Epistle, the expression “in each element” must be preserved, because it is the key to the proposed reconciliation.

The “two axes” proposal thus seeks to distinguish what composes a level from what characterizes its vitality. It is not wholly arbitrary: L6 explains fire through the souls’ source in the chariot and air through speech; Etz Chaim details components in a composition. But a verbal difference does not necessarily prove the absence of conceptual tension. The same names of levels appear in both sources, and both concern a connection to the elements. This is the strong difficulty that remains against the reconciliation.

An explanation through yosher and igulim arose as a possible direction and was withdrawn. The mere fact that the Epistle discusses yosher and igulim does not suffice to attribute the interchange of fire and air to them. A source applying the distinction specifically to the two mappings is needed. Such a witness was not found in the material examined. This direction is therefore preserved as research history, not as a current solution.

Mishnat Chasidim must remain a separate book. There is no “Mishnat Chasidim, gate 50” in the sense of the mixed reference supplied. There is Masechet HaHarkavah, and the printed text must distinguish the mishnah from the Taam Etzo commentary. The passage on the speaking as the fire portion is close to Etz Chaim’s map. The location of the evidence and what was read in each round are not uniform; do not retroactively attribute reading a complete chapter to a researcher who saw only a secondary excerpt.

The positive finding is that the Epistle does not stand alone: several discourses repeat animal–fire and speaking–air. Difference from Etz Chaim is therefore insufficient grounds for textual suspicion. Yet a

multiplicity of parallels proves consistent use of a map, not the mechanism of its correspondence with the other map. This distinction allows a clear answer even when part remains a proposed reconciliation.[461]

S04 · The Inanimate Left Outside the Examples

Why does the nourishment chain not begin with the inanimate? What precisely does note 61 resolve, and what remains concerning water and salt that a person eats/drinks? Distinguish earth in general from the inanimate as a class.

Earth was discussed extensively earlier, but the nourishment examples begin with the vegetative. Water and salt sharpen the point that the inanimate does not actually disappear from nutrition. The question concerns the choice of examples and the scope of the explanation given for it.

The chain in the Epistle exemplifies the animal's dependence on the vegetative and the human being's dependence on both; it does not enumerate all foods. Kuntres Acharon 4 explicitly mentions inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods. Note 61 proposes a connection to everything's coming from earth and qualifies the extension to nourishment after creation. The precise reason for the omission remains partial. The subject "It" in the English sentence means the animal, not the vegetative.

[461]Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10 — portions of the four elements and composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking; digital witness reported as "not checked" on the site; animal–air and speaking–fire. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/י_קרפ/נ_רעש/מייח_זעץ; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et Bnei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the Torah portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "Ki tetze la-milchamah" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and photographic witnesses. Distinguish root, Divine service, and result. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974; Mishnat Chasidim, Masechet HaHarkavah — Krakow 5649; צא–צב [91–92]; PDF 210–213; initially a secondary excerpt, then photographs. Main text above, Taam Etzo below. https://hebrewbooks.org/7122

There are two questions here that must not be substituted for each other. The first is whether the Epistle claims that a person is not nourished by the inanimate. The second is why it does not exemplify this. For the first, reading the sentence's scope suffices: it states that the human being receives from the two sources mentioned, and does not say "only from both." The second requires additional evidence. Absence of a nutritional contradiction does not by itself explain the author's choice.

In the initial research, the Rebbe's note was presented almost as a complete answer: earth is the foundation of everything, so need not be mentioned again. The reading then became complicated because of the English pronoun. R3 said that the lower is superior in respect of its creation. R4 restored the subject to its proper place: the animal is higher than the vegetative also in respect of its creation, yet is nourished by it. This is not a minor grammatical correction; it restores the paradox the note explains.

Three layers of the note must be preserved. First, the animal's advantage is not limited to its present state. Second, the omission of earth is discussed in parentheses against the background of "everything is from earth." Third, the extension to dependence and nourishment after creation is formulated as a proposal. When the three layers are combined into one categorical sentence, both the correct subject and the qualification disappear. The original Hebrew wording was not verified, so our back-translation must not be presented as a Hebrew quotation from the Rebbe.

L7 contributed a direct Chasidic test here: the human being lives through inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods. Thus this threefold category can include the inanimate specifically in a discussion of food and a higher root. There is no need to invent an exception for water and salt to preserve the argument. Nevertheless, the parallel

does not say why only the other two examples were chosen in Epistle 20.

A contextual proposal remains useful: earth already occupied the preceding paragraph, while here a transition through animal and speaking to knowledge is required. Grain and meat supply two Talmudic proofs for an addition in the human being. This proposal explains the economy of the argument, but must not be turned into a proved motive. The explanation that the chain begins with beings possessing a vegetative and animal soul is also not an explicit rule in the Epistle.

Hence the precise concluding formulation: the scope of the illustration is clearer than the reason for the omission. A researcher can fulfill the demand for an explanation without settling every literary question. Water and salt are preserved as a counter-test to the claim that the list is exhaustive; once that claim is not made, they do not refute the structure of the higher's nourishment from the lower.[462]

S05 · Manifestly Higher, Receiving from Below

"Above" in what sense: vitality, coming into being, knowledge, revelation, or root? Why does dependence on lower food require an additional kabbalistic explanation? Is nourishment an analogy, evidence, or an application?

[462]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened at the editorial stage. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation; later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note's Hebrew source was not verified. https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm

If one says only “the lower is higher in its root,” it is easy to forget that at the sentence’s beginning it really is lower. One must establish what each comparison measures and what the Epistle contributes beyond knowing that a person needs to eat.

“Above” describes the level of manifest vitality and knowledge: animal above vegetative, speaking above animal. The recipient can remain higher in its level while receiving an addition from a source situated below. Nourishment applies the preceding explanation; grain and meat extend it to intellect as well. The Epistle interprets the dependence through returning light, without making every food higher in every respect.

The ladder of inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking is a premise of the argument, not a conclusion refuted by eating. The vegetative has growth; the animal, an additional kind of vitality and movement; the speaking, knowledge and speech. Even if the parallels reveal a high root for food, the difference in the manifest state remains. “Nevertheless” therefore must not be read as though the Alter Rebbe erred at the sentence’s beginning and corrected himself at its end. He sets two aspects of the relation together.

The question about the nature of the explanation is not superfluous. Nourishment can be described in bodily terms without using a map of lights; but the Epistle seeks to understand why an order in which the higher depends on the lower accords with the structure of creation already presented. This is an explanation within the language of the Epistle. No new empirical datum need be invented to justify it, and the Sages’ sayings must not be presented as a modern experiment in nutrition or child development.

L1 adds a distinction between manifest food and its root. Food is lower than the human being and needs his refinement, yet can add to him through its root. The proposal is not that bread can think in place of

a person. It explains a capacity to impart power that cannot be assessed solely by the giver's present form. L7 formulates this conceptual proximity through Sag and Mah. These are descriptions of root and refinement, not the Epistle's words in the sentence under discussion.

During the rounds an overly sharp division arose: L1 explains "why," while the Epistle only explains "where." This division was withdrawn in R4. The word "for" in the Epistle gives a causal explanation, and the specification of location is part of the reason. The lowest place is not a neutral address; the endpoint and the radiance there make the explanation possible. Two explanatory formulations should therefore be compared, rather than an explanatory source with a source merely indicating location.

The final limit concerns the advantage itself. "Low in revelation" does not license inferring that everything lower than another necessarily nourishes it. The Epistle gives particular relations and interprets them. It does not propose a formula replacing examination of every spiritual connection. The useful generalization is that power can be revealed in a low level that is not measured by its manifest rank; its applicability in each case must rest on wording and source.[463]

---

[463]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened at the editorial stage. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation; later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note's Hebrew source was not verified. https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431

S06 · “Is Nourished and Lives” and “Receives Its Vitality from Both”

“Is nourished and lives” versus “receives its vitality”: is there a distinction? Are the vegetative nourished by the inanimate, a human being from plants without animals, and animals from animals missing? Do not divert to a modern nutritional discussion not required for the plain meaning.

The question examines whether the change of verbs bears additional meaning and whether the chain of examples is supposed to cover every possibility. It is primarily about what the sentence does and does not claim, rather than which food a person must eat.

For the animal, its existence’s dependence on the vegetative is emphasized. For the speaking, vitality is received from both sources, and wisdom and knowledge are added to it. “From both” prepares the two proofs, grain and meat. There is no source for assigning the verbs to sefirot. The list exemplifies the relationship between levels and does not claim that every person actually needs both kinds of food in every situation.

“Is nourished and lives” can be read as a pair describing existence through nourishment. There is no need to assign “is nourished” to the body and “lives” to the soul as a separate map of levels. Such an interpretation requires evidence, since in ordinary language the verbs can elaborate the same relationship. The changed wording for the speaking allows two sources to be added, followed by an intellectual result; this is a more economical syntactic explanation.

“And also wisdom and knowledge” is the clear addition. Here there is more than stylistic variation: the Epistle says that the lower’s imparting touches what distinguishes the speaking. Had only vitality and existence appeared, the dependence could have been read as a need of the lower bodily aspect within the person. The addition of knowl-

edge expands the claim, so the examples immediately following are chosen from intellect and recognition.

The possibilities enumerated by the question test applicability. An animal preying upon another animal does not invalidate the dependence of the animal level on the vegetative described here, but the Epistle does not detail every food chain. A person who eats plants does not refute the possibility of receiving from animals. Do not add "without them a person cannot live" where it says "receives its vitality from both." A small change in quantification would create a different claim.

Conversely, saying the list is not exhaustive does not license emptying it of meaning. The two proofs are not merely arbitrary examples: they correspond explicitly to the two kinds mentioned. The vegetativ e–animal–speaking structure therefore remains meaningful even if it does not enumerate edible inanimate matter or predation among animals. A partial list with an order differs from a list with no function at all.

Here the usefulness of comparing L1 is evident. Both proofs are brought there together concerning an addition to the power of Chochmah, but in reverse order. This reinforces that they can participate in a common argument without requiring a one-to-one correspondence between the examples' order and the order of names of the soul's faculties. The Epistle permits a sound reading of "from both"; it does not supply a hidden table of every verb and sefirah.[464]

---

[464]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened at the editorial stage. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a

S07 · Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in the Berakhot Passage

Read Berakhot 40a in the context of the Tree of Knowledge; compare parallels and wordings of father/mother. Precisely what is proved by the saying, and what does it not prove?

The quotation sounds like an independent saying about infants, but occurs within a discussion of the Tree of Knowledge's identity. The context explains why grain was chosen and what was taken from the Talmudic discussion into the Epistle.

In Berakhot 40a Rabbi Yehudah identifies the Tree of Knowledge with wheat and adduces calling "father" and "mother" after tasting grain. The Epistle uses the connection between vegetative food and human knowledge. This supplies no evidence specifically for the partzufim Abba and Imma, for every detail of the development of knowledge, or for a claim that all kinds of food are equivalent to grain.

Reading the context prevents two erroneous shortcuts. This is not a statement cited in order to decide the Tree of Knowledge's identity in the Epistle, nor a contextless saying composed specifically to prove food's advantage. Rabbi Yehudah uses a datum about knowledge to explain his identification of wheat. The Epistle uses the same datum in a different direction of discussion: to show that even the speaking being's knowledge receives from the vegetative. The quotation's function changes without its words becoming a new invention.

"Knows how to call" does not alone require a full theory of understanding parental relationships. The initial research said that the infant understands its relation to its parents. Likkutei Torah, Matzah Zo ("This Matzah"), required narrowing this: there knowledge serves as an analogy for immaturity and knowledge above developed apprehension. The book therefore speaks of recognition and calling,

Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm

and does not construct from the Talmud a mature conceptual understanding of fatherhood and motherhood.

The double wording matters as a finding, not necessarily as an interpretation. The Epistle gives father and mother; L1 and Matzah Zo give father alone. Do not infer that Chasidut does not recognize the word "mother," or that omitting it in one discourse interprets its presence in another. Each discourse selects the portion its argument requires. Precise comparison of wording establishes a limit on transferring an explanation from the partzuf Abba to the whole sentence of the Epistle.

Distinguishing the Sages' wording from its Chasidic use also matters in assessing the reports. When a researcher says that the saying proves the vegetative adds knowledge, this accords with the Epistle's use. When the researcher says that the Gemara already explains Daat of Tohu, an explanation appearing in a Chasidic parallel is being attributed to it. The three layers — the Talmud, the Epistle, and the parallel discourse — all deserve study, but are not a single quotation.

The positive conclusion suffices: grain is chosen not only because it is common food, but because the cited source explicitly connects it to knowledge. There is no need to load it with an additional sefirah calculation to explain its placement. The specific investigation of why wheat belongs to Daat receives an additional answer in Va'etchanan and is discussed in the next question.[465]

[465] Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother; reading of the text reported in the research. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–53; father and mochin in immaturity; not the shared source of the two food proofs. https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא%22רזקוה)/וצ

S08 · Wheat, Grain, Bread, and Matzah

Why specifically grain, the "taste" of grain, rather than every food? Distinguish food, wheat, the five grain species, and bread. Look for a local Chasidic/kabbalistic explanation, not merely a repetition of the Sages' saying.

A general explanation that food's root is high does not necessarily explain why grain specifically is connected with knowledge. Moreover, wheat, grain, bread, and matzah appear in different sources and are not interchangeable everywhere.

Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, the additional explanation of "Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("You Shall Know Today"), §5, assigns wheat specifically a root in Daat of Tohu. L1 gives a general explanation for inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods, while Matzah Zo uses grain to explain the mochin of Abba in immaturity. These are different contributions. Do not transfer a quality of wheat to every food, or turn "the taste of grain" into a quantity of eating not stated in the source.

The investigation advanced when the general explanation was distinguished from the particular one. "Every food has a high root" explains the possibility of an addition from the lower, but does not yet distinguish grain. Va'etchanan yielded wording placing wheat's root specifically in Daat of Tohu. This is therefore not merely repetition of the fact that the infant calls "father" after grain, but a proposed spiritual mechanism suited to the faculty of Daat.

The sentence there describes descent: although wheat's root is above the human being, it becomes lower in its manifest state, yet gives him life and draws knowledge into him. This prevents the thought that food itself possesses superior intellect. The added power comes from the root, and the low state is part of the explanation. This is the same kind of distinction required by the investigation of the general relation between nourisher and recipient.

L1 discusses bread and foods and also brings meat. Here the significance of the comparison is the reverse: inclusion of two proofs in a general mechanism does not turn every food into wheat or every intellectual addition into Daat of Tohu in the same specific sense. A shared explanation can encompass several different cases. An additional sentence is required to establish that every detail of one case applies to the other.

Matzah Zo adds a different dimension: father, immaturity, and faith. It is not the paragraph where both proofs appear together. In R2, website designations, folio, and titles became mixed; R3 separated Matzah Zo from Sheshet Yamim. This correction enables proper use of each source: one explains the use of "father," another the addition of wisdom from grain and meat, and the third wheat's distinctiveness.

"Taste" too remains within its limits. In the Epistle this is the quotation's wording; it must not be turned into an instruction concerning a quantity of eating or a physiological condition we ourselves established. The linguistic connection to "good taste and knowledge" may be attractive, but does not replace the explicit explanation. At the close of the dossier, we have a particular explanation for wheat, a general explanation for foods, and a special context for matzah, not a unification of all three into one term.[466]

---

[466] Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'You Shall Know Today' ") — §5, wheat's root in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context; reported digital text and photographs; do not infer a column letter from an index alone. https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/(וקזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל/זנחתאו; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–53; father and mochin in immaturity; not the shared source of the two food proofs. https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/(וקזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל/וצ; Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother; reading of the text reported in the research. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תוכרב_מ_א

S09 · Two Parents in the Quotation, Father in the Parallels

Why both father and mother? What is the relation to sources mentioning father alone and to recognition/attachment/Chochmah and Binah/mochin? Is there a source applying an Abba-and-Imma interpretation to the wording of this Epistle?

For a student of Kabbalah, “father” and “mother” can evoke the designations of Chochmah and Binah. The question is not whether the resonance is possible, but whether it is the meaning of this sentence and whether the parallels prove it.

The Epistle gives the double expression in the Gemara. The parallels L1 and Matzah Zo have father alone; Matzah Zo explicitly explains the mochin of Abba in immaturity. The material found contains no local interpretation applying both partzufim, Abba and Imma, together to the Epistle’s sentence. A resonance may be noted, but not presented as a proved decoding.

A first proposal distinguished relational recognition from accumulating information: the infant calls those close to it by names, so the example concerns Daat as connection. This has explanatory force but requires caution. “To call” does not imply that the infant understands an abstract concept of parenthood. The matzah parallel presents knowledge that is not mature apprehension. A possibility of recognition and connection is therefore preserved without attributing to the infant the explanation’s entire conceptual content.

A second proposal saw Chochmah and Binah in father and mother. The difficulty is not merely lack of a source: the Epistle first says “Chochmah and Daat,” not “Chochmah and Binah.” This does not refute every possible allusion, but prevents an easy pairing of two names with two sefirot. If the correspondence were explicit in a discourse concerning the Epistle, one could explain how it fits the pre-

ceding expression. Without it, the structure must not be completed on the strength of the word count.

A third proposal was to transfer the entire matzah explanation. It appears strong because father and grain occur there in the Alter Rebbe's own text. Yet the parallel operates in the context of matzah and immaturity and omits mother. This is no reason to erase its contribution; it shows a real kabbalistic use of one of the designations. The limit is that proving father's meaning in that discourse does not prove the double expression in the Epistle.

The record across rounds shows progress even without a full solution. Initially there was only suspicion of an allusion. Then a source for father was found. Finally L1 was found, also giving father without mother and containing both food proofs together. Each discovery added a distinction rather than supplying the system proposed in advance. Such an outcome is not a failure of research: it defines exactly which question was answered and which remains.

The reader's wording must be positive and precise: both parents appear because this is how the Sages' wording is quoted; the quotation's function is to show knowledge dependent on grain. "Because this is the wording" explains the verbal source, but does not prove that there was no additional intent. A sweeping denial of every allusion is therefore also unjustified. The requirement is not to turn possibility into proved intent, or lack of evidence into a prohibition on interpretation.[465]

---

[465] Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother; reading of the text reported in the research. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c];

S10 · Chochmah and Daat without Binah

Why “Chochmah and Daat,” without Binah? Are the two proofs divided between them, or do they illuminate both? Mark whether this is only an inference.

Two examples and two names of faculties invite a table: grain corresponds to Daat and meat to Chochmah. But numerical correspondence and word order are insufficient to create a sefirah-based interpretation.

The sources confirm additional intellect from grain and meat, and wheat’s distinctiveness in Daat of Tohu. They do not divide grain= Daat and meat=Chochmah in the Epistle. L1 even presents the examples in reverse order and uses Chochmah and intellect. No focused source found explains Binah’s omission; do not invent a missing faculty or an additional level to complete the triad.

The proposed mapping has real appeal. Grain is connected to the Tree of Knowledge, and in Va’etchanan wheat’s root is called Daat of Tohu. Meat is mentioned concerning a sage whose study lacked precision. Grain may therefore be seen as the beginning of recognition and meat as an addition to study. But distinguishing two types of recipients — an infant and a sage — is not identical to a technical division between Daat and Chochmah.

The test of order does not decide in favor of the mapping. In the Epistle grain precedes meat, while in “Chochmah and Daat,” Chochmah precedes Daat. Anyone seeking correspondence must therefore already cross the word order. In L1, meat precedes grain, and “Chochmah and intellect” applies to the addition from foods in general. The data fit two proofs of a shared claim better than two separate keys.

PDF 51–53; father and mochin in immaturity; not the shared source of the two food proofs. https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/וצ/(זקזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל

The particular explanation for wheat is also insufficient. Saying its root is Daat of Tohu can explain why it adds Daat; it does not say that meat does not add Daat or that its addition belongs only to Chochmah. Moving from a positive claim about one case to a negation concerning the other is an unproved addition. The research preserves the particular explanation without extending it to an exclusive division.

The question of Binah remains a question about the Epistle's wording. One may propose that "Chochmah and Daat" here denotes intellect and recognition without enumerating all faculties. This is a plain reading, but it too must not be presented as though a source had been found stating that this is the reason for the omission. Every pair of names in the Epistle need not be an incomplete list of three sefirot, just as every three verbs later need not be three sefirot.

The search limit was established in the final rounds: after the principal parallels were found and their differences documented, no new focused target was defined that would decide the mapping. The question is therefore preserved as open without becoming an endless search task. It is included in full in the research book, while in the reader's book it suffices to explain why an unproved division should not be relied upon.[467]

[467]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'You Shall Know Today' ") — §5, wheat's root in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context; reported digital text and photographs; do not infer a column letter from an index alone. https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/יטוקל_זנחתאו/(וקזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות

S11 · What Happened on the Night without Ox Meat?

Bisra de-tora (“ox meat”): locate the folio, speaker, context, Rashi’s and Tosafot’s explanations, and the Epistle’s wording versus the Gemara’s. Does it concern additional intellect, prevention of fasting weakness, a figure of speech, or a Chasidic interpretation beyond the plain meaning?

Understanding the proof requires more than “I did not eat meat.” The Talmudic story, its interpretations, and the Epistle’s use of it concerning additional Chochmah and Daat must be distinguished.

The wording in Bava Kamma 72a, continuing from the end of 71b, is Rav Nachman’s words to Rava about his answer at night: “דלא אכלי בשרא דתורא” (“because I did not eat ox meat”). Rashi explains that he did not examine the matter’s reason precisely; Tosafot mentions a fast. The Epistle uses different, abbreviated wording. L1, Sheshet Yamim §2, explicitly adduces the proof for food’s addition to the power of Chochmah and intellect.

Location is part of the clarification. The initial research gave 71a following a reported reference. The preparatory examination located the wording about meat at the top of 72a and its context at the end of 71b. A reader opening only the wrong page may not find the sentence and suppose the quotation lacks a source. A general heading “Bava Kamma” is therefore insufficient when the dossier’s goal is comparison of wording and context.

The Gemara’s wording must be distinguished from the Epistle’s. The Talmud says “דלא אכלי” (“because I did not eat”) within an explanation of an answer given at night; the Epistle gives “ועדיין לא אכילנא” (“and I had not yet eaten”) with abbreviation. This change does not alone establish that the Alter Rebbe deliberately sought to change the passage’s plain meaning. There may be quotation practices and wording traditions, but the investigation did not determine a complete textu-

al history. What is proved is the present use of the proof within the sentence about Chochmah and Daat.

Rashi and Tosafot help distinguish intellectual activity from its circumstances. Lack of precision concerns the quality of study; fasting concerns the speaker's condition. There is no necessity to decide that the whole expression is a figure of speech with no connection to food, nor to decide that the Gemara's plain meaning already teaches the Tohu–Tikkun mechanism. The description of the circumstance and the spiritual explanation are not the same textual layer.

In R2 the claim remained that no precise Alter Rebbe witness for meat adding intellect existed outside the Epistle. L1 changed this in R3. It quotes the sentence together with the grain saying and explains an addition to the power of Chochmah and intellect from the foods' root. There is therefore no longer any need to rely only on Lessons, or attribute to later explanation the creation of a connection already presented by the Epistle and the discourse.

The comparison does not erase differences. L1 uses wording closer to the nighttime context and brings meat before grain. The Epistle arranges the examples as vegetative followed by animal. This change suits the "from both" argument, but the intention behind the arrangement is a contextual conclusion. The important finding is an explicit shared witness for food and intellect, alongside clear limits concerning why specifically ox and the mapping of faculties.[468]

---

[468] Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; sentence on 72a, preceding context on 71b. Do not give 71a. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אבב_אמק_בע_א; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814

S12 · Why Ox, and Why Two Proofs?

Why specifically ox meat? Are infant/sage, vegetative/animal, beginning of knowledge/addition to study proved pairs? Do the two proofs explain “from both”?

The question joins two precise points that do not receive the same answer. The two proofs together have a relatively clear structural role; no additional local reason was found for choosing the ox species beyond the Gemara’s wording.

Grain exemplifies the vegetative and meat the animal, so both proofs fit “from both.” One can also distinguish the beginning of recognition in an infant from a sage’s study, but this is an explanatory proposal, not a mapping of Chochmah and Daat. The ox comes from the quoted Talmudic discussion. The linguistic connection to the faces in the chariot is possible; it does not prove the reason for choosing the species.

Had only grain been brought, it would have been proved within the discussion that the vegetative adds to the speaking being’s knowledge. The meat proof extends the illustration to the animal as well. This directly connects to “from both,” so the second example should not be seen as superfluous decoration. The structure does not require the two examples to prove two distinct kinds of intellect; it suffices that each fills a different side of the two sources of food.

The infant–sage distinction is attractive because it shows the addition is not limited to the beginning of life. In one case knowledge appears at the beginning of recognition; in the other, the quality of study of someone already versed in Torah changes. Wording nevertheless requires care: the Talmudic passage is not an experimental account of before and after eating, and the Epistle does not define the examples as developmental stages. This is an interpretation of their rhetorical contribution based on the recipients’ identities.

The species-specific reason for ox remains absent. A general statement that “ox is Gevurah” is insufficient, because it has not been proved why this specifically is the intellectual addition discussed. The claim that animal food has a high root likewise explains the category, not the choice of ox rather than sheep. The user’s question requires distinguishing the two kinds of answer, rather than presenting a general explanation as though it resolved the detail.

The transition from ox meat to the ox’s face can connect the examples in the reading sequence: meat nourishes a human and an animal’s spirit nourishes an angel. Yet the face of the ox is also the source of other animal species mentioned in the Zohar. The resonance therefore does not prove that additional knowledge from meat depends specifically on the ox species. The secure parallel is between animal nourishing speaking and the spirit of a sacrifice nourishing the higher beings.

The closing decision is not to ignore the detail, but to give it a precise status. A Talmudic source for the wording was found, explicit Chasidic use concerning intellect was found, and a role for both examples together was found. No additional species-specific explanation was found. These are four different results; presenting them separately protects both the strength of the finding and the unanswered question.[469]

---

[469]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; sentence on 72a, preceding context on 71b. Do not give 71a. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle’s quotation is close to 537; Aramaic text distinct from the site’s translation and commentary. Printed photograph not verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84

S13 · Tohu, Refinement, and Returning Light: What Is Connected?

What is the relation between refining food, its root in Tohu, its power to add knowledge, and returning light? Look for a connecting source, not merely four sources using similar terms. Does the addition apply to every eater, or to service with intention/refinement?

Several sources explain how the lower adds to the higher, but use different names. The question is whether this is the same mechanism in different words or parallels sharing a structure but differing in details.

L1 explains food and intellect through Tohu and refinement; L7 through Sag and Mah; L3 through sacrifice and revelation of Tohu's lights; L2 describes future returning light in Malchut. The Epistle itself explains through the kav's returning light and the sovev's radiance at the lowest point. The connections are real, but no sentence was found identifying Sag or Daat of Tohu with the kav's return at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet.

This dossier moved from lack of a precise parallel to a network of parallels, but not to complete identity. R1 and R2 required a source for both food proofs together. L1 supplied it: foods rooted in Tohu add to the human being in the Chochmah of Tikkun. In R3, L3 was added for sacrifice and the angels' pleasure. In R5, L7 identified the content to which L3 refers concerning Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and Mah from the forehead. Each stage strengthened a defined connection; none supplied the sought Tohu–kav equation.

Proper comparison requires recording, for each source, the recipient, source of power, action, and time. In L1 the human being receives vitality and intellect; refinement reveals food's root. In L3 the chariot angels derive pleasure after offering the animal's spirit. In L7 food, action, and drawing down come together. In the Epistle the discus-

sion is explained through the place of the endpoint and the kav's return. Similarity of result does not erase differences in the described route.

L2 is a particularly important test because the words "returning light" occur in it. The return there concerns Malchut, the future, and the time after refinements. There is a connection to the language of Keter from below upward and embedding, but the sentence's subject and time are not identical to the Epistle's description of the kav. The abbreviations were also checked: א"ח עט"ב means eshet chayil ateret baalah, "a woman of valor is her husband's crown," not an abbreviation of returning light. The connection to returning light must be based on the explicit words in the continuation.

K5 adds another component: human vitality from the body of the food, and the connection to sovev. This must not be set up as a disagreement with the spirit of the sacrifice, because recipient and subject differ. Conversely, the body must not be transferred to the angels in place of the spirit specified by the Epistle. The parallel can explain an aspect of human food without replacing the conclusion's entire mechanism. This exemplifies how a direct source referring to the Epistle still does not coincide with all its details.

There is another limit within L1: after the proofs comes the transition "And likewise, now, this will be understood in the service of G-d." The layer of eating for the sake of Heaven, the Shema, and prayer is not a condition the Epistle imposes on every reception of vitality. Refinement is already mentioned before the transition, so the opposite exaggeration — saying that the first layer contains no refinement at all — is also incorrect. The two layers must be read continuously, without planting the second's conditions in every sentence of the first.

The useful conclusion is positive: the parallels teach why a root low in revelation may add to the recipient above it, and show how this is realized in food and sacrifice. They enrich the Epistle's explanation. The limit is that we are not entitled to present Sag, Tohu, sovev, and returning light as interchangeable words. Precision about the limit is not an artificial separation between sources; it is the condition for a combination that can be examined.[470]

S14 · What Does "For It Is" Refer Back To?

What is the subject of "for it is," and what is the subject of "which is revealed there"? Propose alternative punctuation for every plausible reading, and state its advantage and difficulty.

"It" comes after two proofs and before a kabbalistic explanation. One must clarify whether it summarizes the phenomenon or denotes the food. This is separate from the question of which source of light "returning light" applies to at the sentence's end.

---

[470]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Va-akhaltem akhol" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation, and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; digital text and photographs; no proved identity with the kav's returning light. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'The Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, particularly §4; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm; "Ve-niglah kevod Havayah" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), תשכ"ב [5722] — §§3–8, particularly the body of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; unreviewed transcript; access status varied among rounds. https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm

Preferred reading: the fact that the higher receives from the lower is an aspect of returning light. Food can also be read as the subject. “Is revealed” refers to the radiance later in the sentence. The grammatical gender of “nourishment” does not decide the matter, because that word does not appear in the sentence. The determination is contextual, not absolute grammatical proof.

The preferred punctuation is: the two examples — “for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward” — followed by the detailing of the radiance. “It” thus summarizes a whole matter, like “this, then, is.” The advantage is that it includes both kinds of food and the intellectual addition without selecting one as the exclusive referent. It also continues the causal explanation given in the earth unit.

On the alternative reading, the nourishing lower entity is an aspect of returning light. Grain and meat can be included under “food,” even though that noun is not explicit here. The advantage is a concrete subject close to the examples; the difficulty is that the general concept must be supplied. Also in the preferred reading a whole matter is summarized, rather than a single noun referred back to. There is therefore no grammatical rule here invalidating either reading.

In R2 an argument was made that masculine hu excludes feminine “nourishment.” It was withdrawn in R3. It examined the commentator’s word instead of the author’s words. If the intended subject is “the matter” or “the fact that the higher is nourished,” the masculine can be used without changing the phenomenon summarized. This small case shows why syntactic analysis must begin with the actual wording.

Another correction separated two decisions. Initially the food reading was rejected because it was thought to require attributing returning light to sovev as well. There is no such necessity. “It” can refer to food while the final “in the mode of returning light” still attaches to the

kav. The syntax contains several local connections; deciding the first pronoun does not automatically determine the final phrase's scope.

"Is revealed" has an explicit candidate: the radiance. The feminine form agrees with it, and "there" refers back to the bottom of Asiyah. The verb need not be assigned to human knowledge or an act of eating. The distinction matters for the continuation: what is revealed with greater force is the radiance; vitality and knowledge are the domains in which the Epistle applies its explanation of the relationship.[471]

S15 · Two Occurrences of Returning Light

Does the first "returning light" describe the phenomenon of nourishment, or precisely the same technical radiance? What does the last apply to? Is sovev included in the return, or only a source of radiance at the lowest point? Do not establish that the user's assumption is correct without examining the wording and the parallel.

The sentence mentions returning light at its beginning and end, with two sources between them: sovev and kav. The question is how the detailing returns to the preceding explanation without turning both sources into the same action.

The first occurrence gives the explanation for nourishment from below upward. On the preferred reading, the last attaches to the kav at the endpoint of the feet of yosher. "As above" refers back to the paragraph in which sovev shines at the lowest point, whereas the kav shines from below upward in returning light. The sentence gives no permission to write that sovev itself returns in the same technical sense.

[471]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

The strongest evidence is not merely word proximity. In the earth paragraph, sovev and kav receive different descriptions. Sovev shines beneath Adam Kadmon's feet without a great interruption; the kav, ending there, shines from below upward. When the conclusion repeats both sources and adds "as above," the preceding context is the key to the applicability of returning light. A punctuation possibility is not equivalent to every contextual possibility.

The first occurrence is not merely a heading without explanatory force. "For it is" explains why the higher receives from the lower. One can say that it describes the general relation while the second occurrence details the kav's return. But no rigid rule should be established that "the first is only an analogy and the second the reality." The Epistle presents nourishment as an aspect of the structure already explained; a precise division between analogy and technical identity is not explicit in it.

A counter-test is the wording "returning light from the kav and sovev." It sounds like a convenient summary, but changes the scope: two sources of radiance become two sources of return. The secure wording is "the sovev's radiance, and the kav in the mode of returning light." This is not a prohibition on using returning light concerning sovev throughout kabbalistic literature; it limits what can be proved from the present sentence.

K5 explains sovev in the lower realm and the body of food. It can therefore contribute to interpreting one component of the sentence without mentioning the kav. Its silence about the kav does not cancel the kav in the Epistle or license inserting an undescribed return into it. L2, by contrast, includes returning light in another, future context. Together the two parallels teach that one must not choose a single shared term and erase its surrounding details.

The syntactic clarification also preserves the distinction between light and the source of creation. The Epistle's text discusses the Essence and creation ex nihilo; here a radiance from sovev and kav is stated. This must not be shortened to "the Essence returns." The advantage of the lowest point can be explained from the broader context, but the levels of expression remain distinct. Such precision is especially essential in translation, where an overly short sentence can merge several Hebrew concepts.[472]

S16 · What Does "Etc." Abbreviate?

What does "a radiance of a radiance, etc." abbreviate? The third radiance alone, "all the above," or further detail? Why abbreviation here versus elaboration in describing the kav? Distinguish plausible decoding from a proved intention behind the abbreviation.

The abbreviation כו' invites completion from earlier wording, but does not itself state how many words were omitted. Identifying a backward reference must be distinguished from precisely reconstructing the whole abbreviation.

The plausible decoding returns to the earlier description of radiance, especially "a radiance of a radiance of a radiance." The later explanation expands the abbreviation this way. It may also intend a broader continuation of the preceding sequence. No fourth level was proved, nor was it proved that the reason for abbreviation is a separate mys-

[472]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; "Ve-niglah kevod Havayah" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), תשכ"ב [5722] — §§3–8, particularly the body of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; unreviewed transcript; access status varied among rounds. https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Va-akhaltem akhol" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation, and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; digital text and photographs; no proved identity with the kav's returning light. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808

tery. The amount of detail remaining in the sentence serves to apply the explanation to nourishment.

The initial research called the solution almost certain: “etc.” replaces the third radiance already mentioned. This has a clear contextual basis, so there is no need to return to zero and say we have no idea about the abbreviation. The later correction concerns the extent of certainty: correspondence to an earlier expression does not prove that the abbreviation covers only one word rather than “all the above” or the adjacent sequence of explanation as well.

A useful decoding must be distinguished from a diplomatic edition. An explanation for the reader may say that the Epistle abbreviates the description of radiance already explained. If one wishes to print additional words within a quotation, they must be marked as an editorial supplement, not manuscript wording. Even a small abbreviation requires this, because adding a word inside the quotation can look like textual evidence not in our possession.

Why the radiance is abbreviated while the endpoint of the feet of yosher is elaborated receives a contextual answer. The radiance was just described and can be mentioned briefly; the place where the kav ends and the direction of return are needed again to explain how the lower adds to the higher. This does not prove the intention behind every letter. It shows that a difference in length can serve the progression without assuming a new hidden level.

The proposal of a fourth level rests on no explicit word. “Etc.” can abbreviate content already stated, so there is no need to add an undocumented stage to the radiances’ count. Conversely, no rule should be established that every כו׳ in the Alter Rebbe abbreviates only the last word. The determination concerns this location and context, not a universal dictionary of Tanya abbreviations.

The English translation preserves this caution: “etc.” must not disappear while only the preferred decoding is printed as though it were the source. The abbreviation may be translated and then explained. Thus the translation is no more categorical than the Hebrew, and the reader can see where the wording ends and the proposed explanation begins.[473]

S17 · Repetition That Applies the Explanation

Why repeat the bottom of Asiyah, sovev, the endpoint of the feet of yosher, and the kav after they have already been detailed? What changes in applying this to food rather than only growth?

The detail appears superfluous to a reader remembering the preceding paragraph. The question seeks to understand the repetition’s function in the argument, not merely decode the names of the levels again.

The Epistle applies the preceding explanation to a new relation: the lower not only produces growth but gives vitality and knowledge to what is above it. Repeating the endpoint’s location and the light’s direction explains the transition. “As above” indicates the same explanatory foundation presented earlier; it does not prove that every result of growth, nourishment, and sacrifice is the same action.

The sentence could have been shortened to “so too concerning foods.” The author chose to repeat the bottom of Asiyah and the sources of radiance. This lets the reader follow the application: what is placed below in the order of levels is not enclosed within its level. Where the

[473]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — “It” refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation; a later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note’s Hebrew source has not been verified. https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431

kav ends is also where a return upward is described. There is thus no arbitrary transition from the earth image to the food image.

The result explained also changes. In the preceding paragraph, the power of growth and bringing forth yesh me-ayin are prominent. Here the relation between two already existing levels is prominent. Creation and nourishment are not the same claim. By detailing the light again, the Epistle supplies the connecting link instead of assuming that both being physical already explains their similarity.

Additional knowledge increases the need for repetition. Not only does the body receive vitality from food; the faculty identified with the speaking being's advantage is also presented as receiving from the lower. Detailing the light prevents this dependence from being read as a bodily compromise unrelated to the human advantage. It permits the advantage of the lowest point to be applied precisely where independent superiority might have been expected.

The research proposed that the Epistle supplies only a location map while L1 supplies causation. The repetition itself challenges that division: it follows "for" and ends "as above." This uses an earlier explanation; it is not a list of addresses. Nevertheless, the sources need not compete over who gives the true explanation. They emphasize different data of the relation, and both can help.

The limit concerns the reason for each detail of wording. Explaining the overall repetition does not prove why each name and abbreviation was chosen separately. This question must therefore be separated from the questions of "etc." and "with greater force." It answers the detailing's function in the argument, not supplies a key making all other precise questions unnecessary.[459]

[459]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements") and continuation; reported digital text and a

S18 · What Is Revealed with Greater Force?

Does “with greater force” mean revelation of power, light, root, or apprehension? Do not automatically apply the earth dossier’s determination to nourishing human knowledge or to angels. What bridge is needed?

The words resemble the earth unit’s wording, but the subject has changed. One must clarify what is the subject of revelation in the sentence itself and how it leads to vitality, knowledge, and the angels’ pleasure.

Syntactically, the radiance is what is revealed with greater force. In the earth unit its strength and ability are seen in growth; at the conclusion, nourishment and knowledge are explained through it. Do not infer that every recipient consciously apprehends the light’s source or that every result bears the same degree of revelation. The bridge is the application of the lowest-point structure marked by the Epistle itself.

The preparatory review demanded that the earth dossier’s conclusion not be automatically transferred to every subsequent subject. This demand is correct because the same description can participate in several sentences with different results. Vegetative power, human knowledge, and an angel’s pleasure are not one thing. Reading therefore begins with local syntax: “where a radiance is revealed with greater force.” What is revealed is explicitly named.

The syntax does not imply that knowledge is unrelated. The Epistle introduced it immediately before as a result of receiving from food. But “a radiance is revealed and explains additional knowledge” differs from “the person apprehends the supernal radiance.” The saying about Rav Nachman does not state that he contemplated the endpoint

---

Wikisource image; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/admor_haz/tanya/5/4.htm

of Adam Kadmon's feet while studying the Talmudic issue. The kabbalistic explanation of the addition's source does not describe the recipient's awareness.

A high root is likewise not identical to high revelation. L1 distinguishes food's root from its state after falling; L3 speaks of revelation of Tohu's lights after refinement. When the book says that the lower bears a high power, it must add at which stage and in what relation. Otherwise a claim would arise that manifest food surpasses the human being in apprehension, precisely the claim the parallels seek to prevent.

The application to angels is marked by the transition "And through this will be well understood." This is permission from the Epistle to see a connection, but not erase the difference between eating and sacrifice. A person receives vitality and knowledge from food; angels receive from the spirit of animal and bird ascending through Divine service. "Is revealed" gives an explanatory principle, while each case's account of the action determines how the principle appears.

The conclusion preserves both sides: do not divide the unit into unrelated passages, and do not combine it into unqualified identity. "With greater force" preserves the radiance's advantage at the lowest point; how this advantage appears in growth, intellect, and sacrifice requires the particular description supplied by the Epistle and its parallels.[474]

---

[474]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved photographic witnesses; not Matzah Zo. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'The Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, particularly §4; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840

S19 · “Good Taste and Knowledge” as a Transitional Sentence

“And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge”: syntax, source of the expression, and whether there is a proved connection to the taste of grain/knowledge/mitzvot or only literary resonance.

Earlier “taste” was the taste of grain; now it can mean reason and explanation. The similarity is attractive, but first the transition must be understood plainly and its function in moving the discussion to the chariot established.

The expression echoes Psalms 119:66. In the Epistle it introduces a reasoned understanding of the angels’ pleasure from sacrifice on the basis of the preceding explanation. A connection to the taste of grain and knowledge is possible, as is a connection to the verse’s continuation about mitzvot; no evidence establishes an intentional literary design or the name of an additional kabbalistic level.

Reading the transition plainly already yields a result: what was explained about nourishing the speaking being also enables understanding the chariot. “Through this” and “will be understood” preserve continuity, while “good taste and knowledge” stresses an understanding with a reason. The expression need not become a technical term to contribute to the progression.

The initial research proposed a sequence actual taste–knowledge–m itzvot, because the verse in Psalms continues “for I have believed in Your commandments.” The proposal is not linguistically baseless: the words are indeed close to the Epistle’s themes. Yet the Epistle does not quote the verse’s continuation here or explain that it alludes to it. The question is therefore not whether the reader can hear the echo, but whether a proved design can be attributed to the author.

There is also a difference between the source of the wording and the source of the idea. Identifying the verse explains where the expression comes from; it does not prove that the kabbalistic explanation of sacrifice is found in the verse. Transferring the entire sequence from the Epistle into the verse creates a circle in which similarity itself proves content introduced by the reader. The dossier preserves the biblical identification and contextual explanation as two different pieces of evidence.

The simple alternative is a biblical expression well suited to the transition. This does not diminish its literary value. An expression can deepen the reading sequence even without our proving a calculated allusion in every word. The reader's book can present the resonance briefly; the research book must also preserve the broader proposal and the reason for narrowing it.

The test for determination remains clear: an Alter Rebbe source or focused interpretation explaining this connection could strengthen the claim of intent. In its absence, the present conclusion is not that the allusion is wrong, but that it is proposed. The same rule was needed for ox meat and the ox's face, but resemblance does not turn the two cases into cumulative proof.[475]

The Topic's Conclusion: Nourishment, Root, and Revelation of Knowledge

The innovation is not that bread in its manifest state apprehends more than the person. The human being is speaking, while food is lower in the manifest order. The difficulty arises precisely by preserving

[475] Psalms 119:66 — "Teach me good taste and knowledge, for I have believed in Your commandments"; source of the expression; the full allusion's intendedness is unproved. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/וס_טיק_מילהת; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

this difference: how does the lower give life to the higher and even participate in the development of its knowledge?

The parallels divide the explanation into root, descent, and refinement. A high root can appear below as food, and the person elevates it and receives from it. Without the stage of appearance and refinement, "its root is high" remains a heading; without preserving the root, the account becomes metabolism that does not explain the spiritual discussion.

The grain and meat examples are not claims that every act of eating produces the same addition of knowledge in the same measure. Every saying of the Sages must be read in context, as must the Epistle's use of it within its progression. In particular, nutritional details or an Amora's expressions must not become a practical prescription originating in the kabbalistic explanation.

The topic prepares sacrifice: the lower bears a relation to a root from which the higher too can receive. Nourishment is not identical to producing growth or sowing, but all three teach the capacity to reveal at the lowest point something not discernible from its manifest level alone.

The Research Questions in This Topic

The wording of the questions is preserved so that the completeness of the discussion can be checked. The mere appearance of a question in the register does not constitute a decision about it; the investigation and the limit of its conclusion must be read. The identifiers here form the edited map of questions and are not an automatic merger with the earlier numbering of other reports.

S01 — What precisely does "And from this" refer back to: growth, the advantage of mayin nukvin, the bottom of Asiyah, returning light, or the whole sequence? What does "will be well understood" add?

S02 — What is the source of the precise correspondence inanimate /earth, vegetative/water, animal/fire, speaking/air? Give an inward explanation and a reference for each pair. Why does water's being inanimate not contradict this? Do not supply only associations.

S03 — Is this an order of levels, an order of coming into being, or a functional correspondence? Compare other orders of the four elements; why does air follow fire here? Is the wording stable?

S04 — Why does the nourishment chain not begin with the inanimate? What precisely does note 61 resolve, and what remains concerning water and salt that a person eats/drinks? Distinguish earth in general from the inanimate as a class.

S05 — "Above" in what sense: vitality, coming into being, knowledge, revelation, or root? Why does dependence on lower food require an additional kabbalistic explanation? Is nourishment an analogy, evidence, or an application?

S06 — "Is nourished and lives" versus "receives its vitality": is there a distinction? Are the vegetative nourished by the inanimate, a human being from plants without animals, and animals from animals missing? Do not divert to a modern nutritional discussion not required for the plain meaning.

S07 — Read Berakhot 40a in the context of the Tree of Knowledge; compare parallels and wordings of father/mother. Precisely what is proved by the saying, and what does it not prove?

S08 — Why specifically grain, the "taste" of grain, rather than every food? Distinguish food, wheat, the five grain species, and bread. Look for a local Chasidic/kabbalistic explanation, not merely a repetition of the Sages' saying.

S09 — Why both father and mother? What is the relation to sources mentioning father alone and to recognition/attachment/Chochmah

and Binah/mochin? Is there a source applying an Abba-and-Imma interpretation to the wording of this Epistle?

S10 — Why "Chochmah and Daat," without Binah? Are the two proofs divided between them, or do they illuminate both? Mark whether this is only an inference.

S11 — Bisra de-tora ("ox meat"): locate the folio, speaker, context, Rashi's and Tosafot's explanations, and the Epistle's wording versus the Gemara's. Does it concern additional intellect, prevention of fasting weakness, a figure of speech, or a Chasidic interpretation beyond the plain meaning?

S12 — Why specifically ox meat? Are infant/sage, vegetative/animal, beginning of knowledge/addition to study proved pairs? Do the two proofs explain "from both"?

S13 — What is the relation between refining food, its root in Tohu, its power to add knowledge, and returning light? Look for a connecting source, not merely four sources using similar terms. Does the addition apply to every eater, or to service with intention/refinement ?

S14 — What is the subject of "for it is," and what is the subject of "which is revealed there"? Propose alternative punctuation for every plausible reading, and state its advantage and difficulty.

S15 — Does the first "returning light" describe the phenomenon of nourishment, or precisely the same technical radiance? What does the last apply to? Is sovev included in the return, or only a source of radiance at the lowest point? Do not establish that the user's assumption is correct without examining the wording and the parallel.

S16 — What does "a radiance of a radiance, etc." abbreviate? The third radiance alone, "all the above," or further detail? Why abbreviation here versus elaboration in describing the kav? Distinguish plausible decoding from a proved intention behind the abbreviation.

S17 — Why repeat the bottom of Asiyah, sovev, the endpoint of the feet of yosher, and the kav after they have already been detailed? What changes in applying this to food rather than only growth?

S18 — Does “with greater force” mean revelation of power, light, root, or apprehension? Do not automatically apply the earth dossier’s determination to nourishing human knowledge or to angels. What bridge is needed?

S19 — “And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge”: syntax, source of the expression, and whether there is a proved connection to the taste of grain/knowledge/mitzvot or only literary resonance.

The Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism, and Alternatives

The dossiers are arranged here by family of investigation and round, within the topic. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Designations such as PASS, SEALED, and the like are historical determinations by the dossier’s author; they are not an independent endorsement by the editor. English passages were preserved in their own language so as not to replace original evidence with a conjectural translation. Document identifiers make it possible to return to the archive.

Dossier 0074 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [30]

[30] Document 0074: E1.4 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 18-21 md.וסיום [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 18–21 and Conclusion]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Terms

דצח"מ abbreviates the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking. The Epistle uses these four levels to illustrate how vitality passes from the lower to the higher.

This does not mean merely a biological division. Within the Epistle's progression, each level receives vitality from the level beneath it and passes it to the level above it.

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — What Remains Open?

The precise relation between the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking and the levels of the sefirot is not detailed here in every kabbalistic particular. Stay with the local plain meaning: a sequence of reception, transmission, and ascent.

Dossier 0122 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [6]

ג [3] — Grok R01's Response as Received — What Was Actually Read

This reading is from digital transcriptions and printed translations. No first printing, manuscripts, or the Rebbe's glosses on the page were scanned.

[6]Document 0122: 06 — R02 ARCHIVE — Packet. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Code	What was opened	Mode
S01	Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — from the opening «He and His vitality are one» through «And behold, the beginning», «But the souls of the angels», the worlds in the skull, «He alone, by His power», «And in order that this yesh… to create in them and through them»	Hebrew transcription (Wikisource / Ashuvah / Chabad) + Kehot translation
S01-C	Lessons in Tanya on the same page: thirty vessels, igulim, palaces, references	Rabbi Weinberg's printed explanation and identified notes; not all the Rebbe's wording

Code	What was opened	Mode
S02	Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 39, «the abode of the angels» and the gloss «ordinary angels»	Hebrew transcription
S03	Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 52, investment of Malchut of Atzilut in the Holy of Holies palace of each world	Hebrew transcription
S04	Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 18, nefesh–ruach–neshamah from the four worlds ABYA	Transcription / printed explanation
S05	Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 36, a dwelling in the lower realms and concealment of light	Transcription / summary
S06	Job 4:18 and Rashi	Transcription
S07	Rambam, Hilkhot Yesodei HaTorah 4:12: «the holy and great bodies»	Transcription
S09′	Etz Chaim, gate 42, chapter 5 (vessels of Ze'ir Anpin of Atzilut = nefesh–ruach–neshamah of BYA); gate 47, chapters 1, 6; gate 42, chapter 4 (igulim / palaces)	Wikisource transcription. Gate 47, chapter 12 was not found in this edition (only six chapters)
S10	Chabadpedia, «Malchut of Atzilut», «The Power of the Essence»; hidush.co.il on three aspects of yesh	Mediated summary, not a complete original discourse

Continuity with the previous booklet («Apprehension and Coming into Being in Atzilut», reader 1.5 / research 1.6): T04 (relative yesh ≠

created yesh), T10–T12 (yesh me-ayin includes spirituality; the angels example at the opening did not identify them as angels of Atzilut), T13–T14 (chapter 39 = abode and exceptions), and T31/T34 (not every hishtalshelut is to be identified with cause and effect) are preserved; the difficulty concerning the inner dimension of Netzach, Hod, Yesod, and Malchut remains open. The definition of "light" given there in the context of Atzilut is explicitly expanded here.

ג [3] — Grok R01's Response as Received — Decisive Sources for This Round

1. S01 — the Epistle's own wording: «beginning… and were created»; distinction between Divine vessels and palaces/bodies; «but souls»; negation of the worlds; «He alone… and in order that… to create in them and through them»; the sun-ray analogy before the passage.
2. S02 — the qualification «ordinary angels» in chapter 39.
3. S03 — Malchut of Atzilut becomes invested and remains Divinity.
4. S01-C — explanation of the thirty vessels and igulim; tag as printed explanation.
5. S06–S07 — limit of the verse's evidence; "bodies" that are not corpses.
6. S09′, gate 42:5 — Atzilut's vessels as nefesh–ruach–neshamah of BYA, without ceasing to be Divinity.

Model agreement is not evidence. A logical proposal is not an explicit source.

ג [3]. ChatGPT's Response — First Research — 1. Four Distinctions before Building the Map

The source is Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20. The main question is justified: there is a power unique to Him Whose existence is from

His Essence, an order of investment, and differences among spiritual realities. But four different things must not be identified in advance: the thing's existence itself; its being defined; its being distinct from its source; and its feeling of itself. "Finitude" does not prove that something is created: Atzilut's vessels are limited, yet the Epistle calls them Divinity. Likewise "light" does not by itself prove Divinity: the Epistle calls nefesh and ruach of BYA created lights. [S01]

My working proposal is therefore not to arrange everything solely by "how much nullification there is." One must also clarify what the thing is, how it comes into being, and its relation to its source. This analytically formulates the Epistle's data; it is not its quoted terminology.

ג [3]. ChatGPT's Response — First Research — 2. "Beginning" Is Not the First Source of the Creating Power

"The beginning of created yesh" denotes the beginning of created yesh's appearance in the described order. It does not mean that BYA's vessels possess an independent power of creation. They themselves are created from the Divine aspect bringing them into being. This distinction is learned from syntax: the same things called "the beginning" are immediately said to "have been created." [S01]

Nor does yesh me-ayin mean "there is no power bringing it into being." Before our passage, the Epistle explains that the power flowing to bring yesh into being is not apprehended by it, and that the nature of yesh is incommensurate with the nature of the power and light bringing it into being. By contrast, an effect has a relation to and apprehension of its cause. Ayin is not an absolute void of Divinity, and the creature does not possess an existence independent of its Creator. [S01]

ג [3]. ChatGPT's Response — First Research — 5. Created Lights — and an Aspect of Neshamah That Is Divinity

In the paragraph's terms, "light" denotes the life-giving side relative to a vessel; "Divinity" and "created" denote a different distinction. Something can therefore be light relative to a vessel receiving from it, yet created relative to its source. There is no logical contradiction between the two descriptions. The local evidence is the Epistle's own statement: "and also the lights, nefesh and ruach," within "the beginning of created yesh." [S01]

The sharp distinction is not sufficiently explained by saying "neshamah is higher." The Epistle identifies neshamah here with the vessels of Malchut of Atzilut serving as a Divine aspect within BYA's order. That is, this is the Divinity animating and bringing created reality into being, not merely a more refined creature of the same kind. Chapter 52 describes Malchut of Atzilut invested in Malchut of each world and drawn into the world below. Investment in a created world does not require the invested aspect to cease being Divinity. [S01, S03]

This also clarifies how the neshamah aspect in Asiyah's sefirot can be Divinity. But do not thereby turn every use of "neshamah" into Divinity and every "nefesh" into a creature: identify the world and system under discussion. Chapter 18 speaks of nefesh–ruach–neshamah drawn from the four worlds ABYA, and our Epistle too mentions nefesh–ruach–neshamah of Atzilut. [S04, S01]

In particular, the extension "even in Atzilut, nefesh and ruach are yesh" does not follow from our sentence, which is limited to BYA's sefirot. At the Epistle's beginning, Atzilut's lights and vessels are included in Divinity. A separate source is required before creating another rule. [S01]

What is still missing? The precise explanation in the Arizal's writings for the transition between neshamah and nefesh and ruach; the definition of the lights at each level; and the full reason for their names. Do not replace what is missing with a psychological statement such as "intellect is more nullified than emotion." Such correspondence does not prove the distinction between Divinity and a created being.

ג [3]. ChatGPT's Response — First Research — 10. Angels of Atzilut versus Chapter 39

Chapter 39 does not say that every angel in every context belongs to Yetzirah. After "the abode of the angels is in the world of Yetzirah," the clarification follows: "This means ordinary angels, but there are higher angels in the world of Beriah." The rule is therefore already qualified there. This suffices to remove the formal contradiction with additional levels of angels in Epistle 20; their nature still requires explanation. [S02] Moreover, "abode" is not automatically identical to "root." Chapter 39 discusses souls' abodes and the character of Divine service; Epistle 20 discusses the manner of coming into being and the body–soul relation. The subject must not be changed without examination.

ג [3]. ChatGPT's Response — First Research — 15. What Does "And in His Angels He Places Folly" Prove?

The verse is Job 4:18, within Eliphaz's words. Rashi interprets "toholah" as folly. In the Epistle's use, the verse supports the determination that angels too possess an aspect of deficiency and incomplete nullification. [S06, S01]

But the verse's plain meaning mentions neither Atzilut nor bodies as distinct from souls. One must therefore distinguish evidence against attributing absolute perfection to angels from kabbalistic identification of the level to which the verse is applied. The printed explanation

proposes deriving from “His angels” a reference to angels close to Him; this must be identified as an interpretation, not explicit content of the verse. [S01-C]

Dossier 0227 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [34]

E1 — Editorial QC for Booklet — 3. Stylistic Improvements

- E1-QC-S01: consistency of Handoff tags ([E-subresearch] / [E-primary reported]).
- E1-QC-S02: proofreading against Kehot print before finalization — a mandatory process, not R16.

Dossier 0345 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [35]

Sources Read — R03 Package — S15 — Reexamination: Zohar III 292b, Idra Zuta

292b

The context before and after the worlds was read. Anchor: “In this skull of Ze’ir Anpin”; later: “Nine thousand myriads of worlds are borne and supported upon this skull.” This is explicitly Ze’ir Anpin. The reading does not verify the Epistle’s entire wording as one

[34] Document 0227: 199 — E1 — Editorial QC for Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[35] Document 0345: 08 — R04 ARCHIVE — Packet. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

verbatim quotation, and does not determine the interpretation of the worlds' status.

Sources Read — R03 Package — S17 — Reexamining an Attribution to Iggeret HaKodesh 11

The Epistle's wording · Tanya La'am: the page with the explanation and summary

The Epistle's wording, explanatory paragraph, and chapter summary were examined separately. Claude R02's alternative quotation was also taken from the summary rather than the Epistle's wording. The R03 report identifies the difference; the commentator's correct wording need not be corrected, only its attribution.

Dossier 0575 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [476]

S01 · From What Is the Order of Nourishment Learned?

What precisely does "And from this" refer back to: growth, the advantage of mayin nukvin, the bottom of Asiyah, returning light, or the whole sequence? What does "will be well understood" add?

The question seeks to identify the premise from which the argument begins. If "from this" refers only to sowing, one must explain how human action becomes an explanation for ordinary eating as well; if it refers to the advantage of the lowest point, sowing is part of the broader context.

Status: Preferred reading

[476] Document 0575: IGK20-From-Lower-to-Higher-Research-HE.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

S02 · Four Levels and Four Elements

What is the source of the precise correspondence inanimate/earth, v egetative/water, animal/fire, speaking/air? Give an inward explanation and a reference for each pair. Why does water's being inanimate not contradict this? Do not supply only associations.

A glass of water belongs to the inanimate, but the Epistle parallels water with the vegetative. The difficulty arises if the correspondence is read as material identity. What characterizes each level must be clarified, especially whether there is a source for all four pairs together.

Status: Supported; detail open

S03 · The Reversed Order in Etz Chaim

Is this an order of levels, an order of coming into being, or a functional correspondence? Compare other orders of the four elements; why does air follow fire here? Is the wording stable?

This is a different question from the need for a source: even after a source for the Epistle's map was found, Etz Chaim presents animal–air and speaking–fire. One must clarify whether it maps the same thing, rather than simply declaring the two lists different.

Status: Supported difference; proposed reconciliation

S04 · The Inanimate Left Outside the Examples

Why does the nourishment chain not begin with the inanimate? What precisely does note 61 resolve, and what remains concerning water and salt that a person eats/drinks? Distinguish earth in general from the inanimate as a class.

Earth was discussed extensively earlier, but the nourishment examples begin with the vegetative. Water and salt sharpen the point that the inanimate does not actually disappear from nutrition. The ques-

tion concerns the choice of examples and the scope of the explanation given for it.

Status: Partial

S05 · Manifestly Higher, Receiving from Below

“Above” in what sense: vitality, coming into being, knowledge, revelation, or root? Why does dependence on lower food require an additional kabbalistic explanation? Is nourishment an analogy, evidence, or an application?

If one says only “the lower is higher in its root,” it is easy to forget that at the sentence’s beginning it really is lower. One must establish what each comparison measures and what the Epistle contributes beyond knowing that a person needs to eat.

Status: Supported

S06 · “Is Nourished and Lives” and “Receives Its Vitality from Both”

“Is nourished and lives” versus “receives its vitality”: is there a distinction? Are the vegetative nourished by the inanimate, a human being from plants without animals, and animals from animals missing? Do not divert to a modern nutritional discussion not required for the plain meaning.

The question examines whether the change of verbs bears additional meaning and whether the chain of examples is supposed to cover every possibility. It is primarily about what the sentence does and does not claim, rather than which food a person must eat.

Status: Preferred syntactic interpretation

S07 · Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in the Berakhot Passage

Read Berakhot 40a in the context of the Tree of Knowledge; compare parallels and wordings of father/mother. Precisely what is proved by the saying, and what does it not prove?

The quotation sounds like an independent saying about infants, but occurs within a discussion of the Tree of Knowledge's identity. The context explains why grain was chosen and what was taken from the Talmudic discussion into the Epistle.

Status: Supported

S08 · Wheat, Grain, Bread, and Matzah

Why specifically grain, the "taste" of grain, rather than every food? Distinguish food, wheat, the five grain species, and bread. Look for a local Chasidic/kabbalistic explanation, not merely a repetition of the Sages' saying.

A general explanation that food's root is high does not necessarily explain why grain specifically is connected with knowledge. Moreover, wheat, grain, bread, and matzah appear in different sources and are not interchangeable everywhere.

Status: Supported within the parallel's limits

S09 · Two Parents in the Quotation, Father in the Parallels

Why both father and mother? What is the relation to sources mentioning father alone and to recognition/attachment/Chochmah and Binah/mochin? Is there a source applying an Abba-and-Imma interpretation to the wording of this Epistle?

For a student of Kabbalah, "father" and "mother" can evoke the designations of Chochmah and Binah. The question is not whether the

resonance is possible, but whether it is the meaning of this sentence and whether the parallels prove it.

Status: Supported wording; interpretation open

S10 · Chochmah and Daat without Binah

Why "Chochmah and Daat," without Binah? Are the two proofs divided between them, or do they illuminate both? Mark whether this is only an inference.

Two examples and two names of faculties invite a table: grain corresponds to Daat and meat to Chochmah. But numerical correspondence and word order are insufficient to create a sefirah-based interpretation.

Status: Limit of knowledge

S11 · What Happened on the Night without Ox Meat?

Bisra de-tora ("ox meat"): locate the folio, speaker, context, Rashi's and Tosafot's explanations, and the Epistle's wording versus the Gemara's. Does it concern additional intellect, prevention of fasting weakness, a figure of speech, or a Chasidic interpretation beyond the plain meaning?

Understanding the proof requires more than "I did not eat meat." The Talmudic story, its interpretations, and the Epistle's use of it concerning additional Chochmah and Daat must be distinguished.

Status: Supported

S12 · Why Ox, and Why Two Proofs?

Why specifically ox meat? Are infant/sage, vegetative/animal, beginning of knowledge/addition to study proved pairs? Do the two proofs explain "from both"?

The question joins two precise points that do not receive the same answer. The two proofs together have a relatively clear structural role; no additional local reason was found for choosing the ox species beyond the Gemara's wording.

Status: Partial

S13 · Tohu, Refinement, and Returning Light: What Is Connected?

What is the relation between refining food, its root in Tohu, its power to add knowledge, and returning light? Look for a connecting source, not merely four sources using similar terms. Does the addition apply to every eater, or to service with intention/refinement?

Several sources explain how the lower adds to the higher, but use different names. The question is whether this is the same mechanism in different words or parallels sharing a structure but differing in details.

Status: Supported parallels; identity unproved

S14 · What Does "For It Is" Refer Back To?

What is the subject of "for it is," and what is the subject of "which is revealed there"? Propose alternative punctuation for every plausible reading, and state its advantage and difficulty.

"It" comes after two proofs and before a kabbalistic explanation. One must clarify whether it summarizes the phenomenon or denotes the food. This is separate from the question of which source of light "returning light" applies to at the sentence's end.

Status: Preferred reading

S15 · Two Occurrences of Returning Light

Does the first “returning light” describe the phenomenon of nourishment, or precisely the same technical radiance? What does the last apply to? Is sovev included in the return, or only a source of radiance at the lowest point? Do not establish that the user’s assumption is correct without examining the wording and the parallel.

The sentence mentions returning light at its beginning and end, with two sources between them: sovev and kav. The question is how the detailing returns to the preceding explanation without turning both sources into the same action.

Status: Strong preferred reading

S16 · What Does “Etc.” Abbreviate?

What does “a radiance of a radiance, etc.” abbreviate? The third radiance alone, “all the above,” or further detail? Why abbreviation here versus elaboration in describing the kav? Distinguish plausible decoding from a proved intention behind the abbreviation.

The abbreviation כו׳ invites completion from earlier wording, but does not itself state how many words were omitted. Identifying a backward reference must be distinguished from precisely reconstructing the whole abbreviation.

Status: Partial

S17 · Repetition That Applies the Explanation

Why repeat the bottom of Asiyah, sovev, the endpoint of the feet of yosher, and the kav after they have already been detailed? What changes in applying this to food rather than only growth?

The detail appears superfluous to a reader remembering the preceding paragraph. The question seeks to understand the repetition’s

function in the argument, not merely decode the names of the levels again.

Status: Contextual interpretation

S18 · What Is Revealed with Greater Force?

Does “with greater force” mean revelation of power, light, root, or apprehension? Do not automatically apply the earth dossier’s determination to nourishing human knowledge or to angels. What bridge is needed?

The words resemble the earth unit’s wording, but the subject has changed. One must clarify what is the subject of revelation in the sentence itself and how it leads to vitality, knowledge, and the angels’ pleasure.

Status: Supported

S01 · From What Is the Order of Nourishment Learned?

The preferred reading refers “from this” back to the advantage of the lowest point and the explanation of light given in the earth unit. Sowing and planting, mentioned nearby, add the role of raising mayin nukvin; there is no evidence that they are the sole referent. “Will be well understood” indicates applying the explanation to another phenomenon: the higher is nourished by the lower, extending to additional knowledge in the human being. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements”) and continuation.

Syntactic proximity is important evidence, but insufficient on its own. The adjacent sentence concerns the superior fruits produced

through sowing and planting. If the reading disconnected “And from this” from everything before that sentence, a narrow transition would result: from agricultural action to human nutrition. Yet the continuation of the Epistle’s own sentence returns to the bottom of Asiyah, sovev, and the endpoint of the kav. That return is an internal test of the reference’s scope: what explicitly recurs is the structure of light, not only the advantage of cultivated fruit.

Three levels must therefore be separated. The vegetative power in earth exemplifies a capacity present at the lowest point. Sowing exemplifies an addition drawn down through awakening from below. The food chain exemplifies the dependence of a higher level on one below it. All three can fit into one progression without being the same action. Producing growth, nourishing, and drawing down are not synonyms; the explanation seeks the structure enabling their connection.

The initial research aptly identified continuity from earth to mitzvot, but the expression “one chain of proofs” can blur the difference between evidence and application. The Epistle does not infer returning light from an independent nutritional investigation. It uses what was explained earlier to interpret the familiar relationship between levels. The examples of grain and meat sharpen the point that the relationship includes knowledge as well. They do not by themselves prove the whole account of the endpoint of Adam Kadmon’s feet.

The last round added an important parallel in Kuntres Acharon 4: inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods, refinement, raising mayin nukvin, and the sowing analogy occur in the same discussion. This strengthens the correspondence of the topics, but does not automatically identify “as written elsewhere.” Correspondence between a sequence of subjects can explain why the parallel helps the reader; it is still not an explicit reference specified by the author.

A useful counter-test is to ask whether every act of eating first requires personal sowing. The sentence does not say this. The narrow reading must therefore not become a condition of the phenomenon. Conversely, sowing must not be erased from the context merely because it is not such a condition: it prepares the transition from the structure of creation to human action and the conclusion concerning mitzvot. The answer is contextual and reasoned, not a proved decoding of a pronoun explained by the author himself.

S02 · Four Levels and Four Elements

Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael” (“Command the Children of Israel”), §3, gives the four pairs. Water is connected with the vegetative because it causes growth; fire with the animal because animal souls are rooted in the attendants of the chariot, described as fire; air/spirit with the speaking according to “a speaking spirit.” Earth–inanimate is given without a separate reason. “Aspects” here indicates correspondence and characterization, not a claim that all water is a plant. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “Ki tetze la-milchamah” (“When You Go Out to War”) — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, “Beparashat nesakhim ketiv ki tavo’u” (“In the Passage of Libations It Is Written, ‘When You Come’ ”) — §1 and the reference to Ki Tetze; PDF 109–112; Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10 — portions of the four elements and composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking.

The demand for one system changed the investigation. Initially four plausible explanations were offered: earth as permanence, water as

growth, fire as heat and movement, air as speech. These explanations could serve as an opening, but did not prove that the Epistle's author uses precisely this system. It is easy to recognize kabbalistic symbols separately and mistakenly suppose that their combination has already been documented. A witness presenting the levels and elements together was therefore required.

The first witness to change the situation was Ki Tetze §1, explicitly stating that fire is the aspect of the animal soul and air/spirit the aspect of the speaking, together with Onkelos. Shelach, the discourse on libations, reinforced animal–fire. The complete Pinchas paragraph was then located. The sequence of correction matters: the discovery canceled the claim that no Chasidic source exists for the upper pairs; it did not cancel the question of their relation to Etz Chaim.

Pinchas gives an explanation not limited to body heat. It moves from "His attendants, a blazing fire" to the face of the lion and face of the ox, and from them to the hishtalshelut of animal souls. Fire characterizes the soul's source in the chariot, not only a quality measurable in the living body. Heat, desire, and movement may illuminate the connection in human Divine service, but must not replace the source's explicit reason.

The reason concerning water must also be preserved precisely. The source connects water to the vegetative through the action of producing growth. It does not classify a sample of water as a plant, or claim that a plant consists of water alone. A physical created being can include several elements, while the correspondence points to a characteristic aspect. This resolves the apparent contradiction without requiring a change in the meaning of the inanimate.

Earth is the case where one may stop. The paragraph says that it is inanimate, but does not add "because," as in the explanation of fire. Permanence and absence of self-movement are a possible conceptu-

al explanation, not an explicit reason found in that paragraph. Four explicit pairs and three explicit reasons are a strong finding; there is no need to turn it into four reasons to present a symmetrical system.

A bibliographical error occurred in reporting: the discourse was called “Tzav” because its opening is “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael.” It belongs to the Torah portion Pinchas, not Tzav. The error did not change the text read, but disrupted the route by which another reader could find it. The correction therefore belongs in the body of the research and the source register, not merely in a marginal technical note.

S03 · The Reversed Order in Etz Chaim

In Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10, the levels are connected to the portions of earth, water, air, and fire in each of the elements. In the Epistle and its parallels, animal is fire and speaking is air. A distinction between compositional constituents and a characteristic aspect permits a reconciliation, but no sentence of the Alter Rebbe was found explicitly reconciling the reversal. Do not emend the Epistle or write that the difficulty has certainly been resolved. Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10 — portions of the four elements and composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “Tzav et Bnei Yisrael” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “Ki tetze la-milchamah” (“When You Go Out to War”) — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Mishnat Chasidim, Masechet HaHarkavah — Krakow 5649; צא–צב [91–92]; PDF 210–213.

One of the important retractions in the research occurred here. A general reference to Etz Chaim and Mishnat Chasidim was initially used as though it confirmed the Epistle’s order. Reading gate 50, chapter 10, showed that this confirmation was incorrect for the two higher pairs. An explicit retraction matters: a source can support the principle of composition and inclusion while contradicting the order

attributed to it. Neither erase its entire contribution nor preserve the erroneous attribution.

Etz Chaim speaks of an internal portion in each element. According to the account read, the inanimate is constructed from the earth portion of all four; the vegetative from the water portions; the animal from the air portion; and the speaking from the fire portion. A vegetative, animal, and speaking soul is added according to level. This is a more complex system than four labels on four kinds of matter. In comparing it with the Epistle, the expression “in each element” must be preserved, because it is the key to the proposed reconciliation.

The “two axes” proposal thus seeks to distinguish what composes a level from what characterizes its vitality. It is not wholly arbitrary: L6 explains fire through the souls’ source in the chariot and air through speech; Etz Chaim details components in a composition. But a verbal difference does not necessarily prove the absence of conceptual tension. The same names of levels appear in both sources, and both concern a connection to the elements. This is the strong difficulty that remains against the reconciliation.

An explanation through yosher and igulim arose as a possible direction and was withdrawn. The mere fact that the Epistle discusses yosher and igulim does not suffice to attribute the interchange of fire and air to them. A source applying the distinction specifically to the two mappings is needed. Such a witness was not found in the material examined. This direction is therefore preserved as research history, not as a current solution.

Mishnat Chasidim must remain a separate book. There is no “Mishnat Chasidim, gate 50” in the sense of the mixed reference supplied. There is Masechet HaHarkavah, and the printed text must distinguish the mishnah from the Taam Etzo commentary. The passage on the speaking as the fire portion is close to Etz Chaim’s map. The location

of the evidence and what was read in each round are not uniform; do not retroactively attribute reading a complete chapter to a researcher who saw only a secondary excerpt.

The positive finding is that the Epistle does not stand alone: several discourses repeat animal–fire and speaking–air. Difference from Etz Chaim is therefore insufficient grounds for textual suspicion. Yet a multiplicity of parallels proves consistent use of a map, not the mechanism of its correspondence with the other map. This distinction allows a clear answer even when part remains a proposed reconciliation.

S04 · The Inanimate Left Outside the Examples

The chain in the Epistle exemplifies the animal's dependence on the vegetative and the human being's dependence on both; it does not enumerate all foods. Kuntres Acharon 4 explicitly mentions inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods. Note 61 proposes a connection to everything's coming from earth and qualifies the extension to nourishment after creation. The precise reason for the omission remains partial. The subject "It" in the English sentence means the animal, not the vegetative. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah shekatuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and continuation.

There are two questions here that must not be substituted for each other. The first is whether the Epistle claims that a person is not nourished by the inanimate. The second is why it does not exemplify this. For the first, reading the sentence's scope suffices: it states that

the human being receives from the two sources mentioned, and does not say “only from both.” The second requires additional evidence. Absence of a nutritional contradiction does not by itself explain the author’s choice.

In the initial research, the Rebbe’s note was presented almost as a complete answer: earth is the foundation of everything, so need not be mentioned again. The reading then became complicated because of the English pronoun.

R3 said that the lower is superior in respect of its creation. R4 restored the subject to its proper place: the animal is higher than the vegetative also in respect of its creation, yet is nourished by it. This is not a minor grammatical correction; it restores the paradox the note explains.

Three layers of the note must be preserved. First, the animal’s advantage is not limited to its present state. Second, the omission of earth is discussed in parentheses against the background of “everything is from earth.” Third, the extension to dependence and nourishment after creation is formulated as a proposal. When the three layers are combined into one categorical sentence, both the correct subject and the qualification disappear. The original Hebrew wording was not verified, so our back-translation must not be presented as a Hebrew quotation from the Rebbe.

L7 contributed a direct Chasidic test here: the human being lives through inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods. Thus this threefold category can include the inanimate specifically in a discussion of food and a higher root. There is no need to invent an exception for water and salt to preserve the argument. Nevertheless, the parallel does not say why only the other two examples were chosen in Epistle 20.

A contextual proposal remains useful: earth already occupied the preceding paragraph, while here a transition through animal and speaking to knowledge is required. Grain and meat supply two Talmudic proofs for an addition in the human being. This proposal explains the economy of the argument, but must not be turned into a proved motive. The explanation that the chain begins with beings possessing a vegetative and animal soul is also not an explicit rule in the Epistle.

Hence the precise concluding formulation: the scope of the illustration is clearer than the reason for the omission. A researcher can fulfill the demand for an explanation without settling every literary question. Water and salt are preserved as a counter-test to the claim that the list is exhaustive; once that claim is not made, they do not refute the structure of the higher's nourishment from the lower.

S05 · Manifestly Higher, Receiving from Below

"Above" describes the level of manifest vitality and knowledge: animal above vegetative, speaking above animal. The recipient can remain higher in its level while receiving an addition from a source situated below. Nourishment applies the preceding explanation; grain and meat extend it to intellect as well. The Epistle interprets the dependence through returning light, without making every food higher in every respect. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and continuation; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret

HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — “It” refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation.

The ladder of inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking is a premise of the argument, not a conclusion refuted by eating. The vegetative has growth; the animal, an additional kind of vitality and movement; the speaking, knowledge and speech. Even if the parallels reveal a high root for food, the difference in the manifest state remains. “Nevertheless” therefore must not be read as though the Alter Rebbe erred at the sentence’s beginning and corrected himself at its end. He sets two aspects of the relation together.

The question about the nature of the explanation is not superfluous. Nourishment can be described in bodily terms without using a map of lights; but the Epistle seeks to understand why an order in which the higher depends on the lower accords with the structure of creation already presented. This is an explanation within the language of the Epistle. No new empirical datum need be invented to justify it, and the Sages’ sayings must not be presented as a modern experiment in nutrition or child development.

L1 adds a distinction between manifest food and its root. Food is lower than the human being and needs his refinement, yet can add to him through its root. The proposal is not that bread can think in place of a person. It explains a capacity to impart power that cannot be assessed solely by the giver’s present form. L7 formulates this conceptual proximity through Sag and Mah. These are descriptions of root and refinement, not the Epistle’s words in the sentence under discussion.

During the rounds an overly sharp division arose: L1 explains “why,” while the Epistle only explains “where.” This division was withdrawn in R4. The word “for” in the Epistle gives a causal explanation, and the specification of location is part of the reason. The lowest place is

not a neutral address; the endpoint and the radiance there make the explanation possible. Two explanatory formulations should therefore be compared, rather than an explanatory source with a source merely indicating location.

The final limit concerns the advantage itself. "Low in revelation" does not license inferring that everything lower than another necessarily nourishes it. The Epistle gives particular relations and interprets them. It does not propose a formula replacing examination of every spiritual connection. The useful generalization is that power can be revealed in a low level that is not measured by its manifest rank; its applicability in each case must rest on wording and source.

S06 · "Is Nourished and Lives" and "Receives Its Vitality from Both"

For the animal, its existence's dependence on the vegetative is emphasized. For the speaking, vitality is received from both sources, and wisdom and knowledge are added to it. "From both" prepares the two proofs, grain and meat. There is no source for assigning the verbs to sefirot. The list exemplifies the relationship between levels and does not claim that every person actually needs both kinds of food in every situation. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and continuation.

"Is nourished and lives" can be read as a pair describing existence through nourishment. There is no need to assign "is nourished" to the body and "lives" to the soul as a separate map of levels. Such

an interpretation requires evidence, since in ordinary language the verbs can elaborate the same relationship. The changed wording for the speaking allows two sources to be added, followed by an intellectual result; this is a more economical syntactic explanation.

“And also wisdom and knowledge” is the clear addition. Here there is more than stylistic variation: the Epistle says that the lower’s imparting touches what distinguishes the speaking. Had only vitality and existence appeared, the dependence could have been read as a need of the lower bodily aspect within the person. The addition of knowledge expands the claim, so the examples immediately following are chosen from intellect and recognition.

The possibilities enumerated by the question test applicability. An animal preying upon another animal does not invalidate the dependence of the animal level on the vegetative described here, but the Epistle does not detail every food chain. A person who eats plants does not refute the possibility of receiving from animals. Do not add “without them a person cannot live” where it says “receives its vitality from both.” A small change in quantification would create a different claim.

Conversely, saying the list is not exhaustive does not license emptying it of meaning. The two proofs are not merely arbitrary examples: they correspond explicitly to the two kinds mentioned. The vegetativ e–animal–speaking structure therefore remains meaningful even if it does not enumerate edible inanimate matter or predation among animals. A partial list with an order differs from a list with no function at all.

Here the usefulness of comparing L1 is evident. Both proofs are brought there together concerning an addition to the power of Chochmah, but in reverse order. This reinforces that they can participate in a common argument without requiring a one-to-one cor-

respondence between the examples' order and the order of names of the soul's faculties. The Epistle permits a sound reading of "from both"; it does not supply a hidden table of every verb and sefirah.

S07 · Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in the Berakhot Passage

In Berakhot 40a Rabbi Yehudah identifies the Tree of Knowledge with wheat and adduces calling "father" and "mother" after tasting grain. The Epistle uses the connection between vegetative food and human knowledge. This supplies no evidence specifically for the partzufim Abba and Imma, for every detail of the development of knowledge, or for a claim that all kinds of food are equivalent to grain. Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah shekatuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–53.

Reading the context prevents two erroneous shortcuts. This is not a statement cited in order to decide the Tree of Knowledge's identity in the Epistle, nor a contextless saying composed specifically to prove food's advantage. Rabbi Yehudah uses a datum about knowledge to explain his identification of wheat. The Epistle uses the same datum in a different direction of discussion: to show that even the speaking being's knowledge receives from the vegetative. The quotation's function changes without its words becoming a new invention.

"Knows how to call" does not alone require a full theory of understanding parental relationships. The initial research said that the infant understands its relation to its parents. Likkutei Torah, Matzah

Zo (“This Matzah”), required narrowing this: there knowledge serves as an analogy for immaturity and knowledge above developed apprehension. The booklet therefore speaks of recognition and calling, and does not construct from the Talmud a mature conceptual understanding of fatherhood and motherhood.

The double wording matters as a finding, not necessarily as an interpretation. The Epistle gives father and mother; L1 and Matzah Zo give father alone. Do not infer that Chasidut does not recognize the word “mother,” or that omitting it in one discourse interprets its presence in another. Each discourse selects the portion its argument requires. Precise comparison of wording establishes a limit on transferring an explanation from the partzuf Abba to the whole sentence of the Epistle.

Distinguishing the Sages’ wording from its Chasidic use also matters in assessing the reports. When a researcher says that the saying proves the vegetative adds knowledge, this accords with the Epistle’s use. When the researcher says that the Gemara already explains Daat of Tohu, an explanation appearing in a Chasidic parallel is being attributed to it. The three layers — the Talmud, the Epistle, and the parallel discourse — all deserve study, but are not a single quotation.

The positive conclusion suffices: grain is chosen not only because it is common food, but because the cited source explicitly connects it to knowledge. There is no need to load it with an additional sefirah calculation to explain its placement. The specific investigation of why wheat belongs to Daat receives an additional answer in Va’etchanan and is discussed in the next question.

S08 · Wheat, Grain, Bread, and Matzah

Likkutei Torah, Va’etchanan, the additional explanation of “Ve-yadata ha-yom” (“And You Shall Know Today”), §5, assigns wheat specifical-

ly a root in Daat of Tohu. L1 gives a general explanation for inanimate, vegetative, and animal foods, while Matzah Zo uses grain to explain the mochin of Abba in immaturity. These are different contributions. Do not transfer a quality of wheat to every food, or turn "the taste of grain" into a quantity of eating not stated in the source. Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'And You Shall Know Today' ") — §5, wheat's root in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context. Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–53; Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother.

The investigation advanced when the general explanation was distinguished from the particular one. "Every food has a high root" explains the possibility of an addition from the lower, but does not yet distinguish grain. Va'etchanan yielded wording placing wheat's root specifically in Daat of Tohu. This is therefore not merely repetition of the fact that the infant calls "father" after grain, but a proposed spiritual mechanism suited to the faculty of Daat.

The sentence there describes descent: although wheat's root is above the human being, it becomes lower in its manifest state, yet gives him life and draws knowledge into him. This prevents the thought that food itself possesses superior intellect. The added power comes from the root, and the low state is part of the explanation. This is the same kind of distinction required by the investigation of the general relation between nourisher and recipient.

L1 discusses bread and foods and also brings meat. Here the significance of the comparison is the reverse: inclusion of two proofs in

a general mechanism does not turn every food into wheat or every intellectual addition into Daat of Tohu in the same specific sense. A shared explanation can encompass several different cases. An additional sentence is required to establish that every detail of one case applies to the other.

Matzah Zo adds a different dimension: father, immaturity, and faith. It is not the paragraph where both proofs appear together. In R2, website designations, folio, and titles became mixed; R3 separated Matzah Zo from Sheshet Yamim. This correction enables proper use of each source: one explains the use of "father," another the addition of wisdom from grain and meat, and the third wheat's distinctiveness.

"Taste" too remains within its limits. In the Epistle this is the quotation's wording; it must not be turned into an instruction concerning a quantity of eating or a physiological condition we ourselves established. The linguistic connection to "good taste and knowledge" may be attractive, but does not replace the explicit explanation. At the close of the dossier, we have a particular explanation for wheat, a general explanation for foods, and a special context for matzah, not a unification of all three into one term.

S09 · Two Parents in the Quotation, Father in the Parallels

The Epistle gives the double expression in the Gemara. The parallels L1 and Matzah Zo have father alone; Matzah Zo explicitly explains the mochin of Abba in immaturity. The material found contains no local interpretation applying both partzufim, Abba and Imma, together to the Epistle's sentence. A resonance may be noted, but not presented as a proved decoding. Berakhot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat, and father and mother; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") —

§§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo” (“To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, ‘This Matzah’ ”) — §2; discourse begins at יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–53.

A first proposal distinguished relational recognition from accumulating information: the infant calls those close to it by names, so the example concerns Daat as connection. This has explanatory force but requires caution. “To call” does not imply that the infant understands an abstract concept of parenthood. The matzah parallel presents knowledge that is not mature apprehension. A possibility of recognition and connection is therefore preserved without attributing to the infant the explanation’s entire conceptual content.

A second proposal saw Chochmah and Binah in father and mother. The difficulty is not merely lack of a source: the Epistle first says “Chochmah and Daat,” not “Chochmah and Binah.” This does not refute every possible allusion, but prevents an easy pairing of two names with two sefirot. If the correspondence were explicit in a discourse concerning the Epistle, one could explain how it fits the preceding expression. Without it, the structure must not be completed on the strength of the word count.

A third proposal was to transfer the entire matzah explanation. It appears strong because father and grain occur there in the Alter Rebbe’s own text. Yet the parallel operates in the context of matzah and immaturity and omits mother. This is no reason to erase its contribution; it shows a real kabbalistic use of one of the designations. The limit is that proving father’s meaning in that discourse does not prove the double expression in the Epistle.

The record across rounds shows progress even without a full solution. Initially there was only suspicion of an allusion. Then a source for father was found. Finally L1 was found, also giving father without

mother and containing both food proofs together. Each discovery added a distinction rather than supplying the system proposed in advance. Such an outcome is not a failure of research: it defines exactly which question was answered and which remains.

The reader's wording must be positive and precise: both parents appear because this is how the Sages' wording is quoted; the quotation's function is to show knowledge dependent on grain. "Because this is the wording" explains the verbal source, but does not prove that there was no additional intent. A sweeping denial of every allusion is therefore also unjustified. The requirement is not to turn possibility into proved intent, or lack of evidence into a prohibition on interpretation.

S10 · Chochmah and Daat without Binah

The sources confirm additional intellect from grain and meat, and wheat's distinctiveness in Daat of Tohu. They do not divide grain= Daat and meat=Chochmah in the Epistle. L1 even presents the examples in reverse order and uses Chochmah and intellect. No focused source found explains Binah's omission; do not invent a missing faculty or an additional level to complete the triad. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'And You Shall Know Today' ") — §5, wheat's root in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context.

The proposed mapping has real appeal. Grain is connected to the Tree of Knowledge, and in Va'etchanan wheat's root is called Daat of Tohu. Meat is mentioned concerning a sage whose study lacked precision. Grain may therefore be seen as the beginning of recogni-

tion and meat as an addition to study. But distinguishing two types of recipients — an infant and a sage — is not identical to a technical division between Daat and Chochmah.

The test of order does not decide in favor of the mapping. In the Epistle grain precedes meat, while in “Chochmah and Daat,” Chochmah precedes Daat. Anyone seeking correspondence must therefore already cross the word order. In L1, meat precedes grain, and “Chochmah and intellect” applies to the addition from foods in general. The data fit two proofs of a shared claim better than two separate keys.

The particular explanation for wheat is also insufficient. Saying its root is Daat of Tohu can explain why it adds Daat; it does not say that meat does not add Daat or that its addition belongs only to Chochmah. Moving from a positive claim about one case to a negation concerning the other is an unproved addition. The research preserves the particular explanation without extending it to an exclusive division.

The question of Binah remains a question about the Epistle’s wording. One may propose that “Chochmah and Daat” here denotes intellect and recognition without enumerating all faculties. This is a plain reading, but it too must not be presented as though a source had been found stating that this is the reason for the omission. Every pair of names in the Epistle need not be an incomplete list of three sefirot, just as every three verbs later need not be three sefirot.

The search limit was established in the final rounds: after the principal parallels were found and their differences documented, no new focused target was defined that would decide the mapping. The question is therefore preserved as open without becoming an endless search task. It is included in full in the study booklet, while in the reader’s booklet it suffices to explain why an unproved division should not be relied upon.

S11 · What Happened on the Night without Ox Meat?

The wording in Bava Kamma 72a, continuing from the end of 71b, is Rav Nachman's words to Rava about his answer at night: "דלא אכלי בשרא דתורא" ("because I did not eat ox meat"). Rashi explains that he did not examine the matter's reason precisely; Tosafot mentions a fast. The Epistle uses different, abbreviated wording. L1, Sheshet Yamim §2, explicitly adduces the proof for food's addition to the power of Chochmah and intellect. Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57.

Location is part of the clarification. The initial research gave 71a following a reported reference. The preparatory examination located the wording about meat at the top of 72a and its context at the end of 71b. A reader opening only the wrong page may not find the sentence and suppose the quotation lacks a source. A general heading "Bava Kamma" is therefore insufficient when the dossier's goal is comparison of wording and context.

The Gemara's wording must be distinguished from the Epistle's. The Talmud says "דלא אכלי" ("because I did not eat") within an explanation of an answer given at night; the Epistle gives "ועדיין לא אכילנא" ("and I had not yet eaten") with abbreviation. This change does not alone establish that the Alter Rebbe deliberately sought to change the passage's plain meaning. There may be quotation practices and wording traditions, but the investigation did not determine a complete textual history. What is proved is the present use of the proof within the sentence about Chochmah and Daat.

Rashi and Tosafot help distinguish intellectual activity from its circumstances. Lack of precision concerns the quality of study; fasting concerns the speaker's condition. There is no necessity to decide that the whole expression is a figure of speech with no connection to food, nor to decide that the Gemara's plain meaning already teaches the Tohu–Tikkun mechanism. The description of the circumstance and the spiritual explanation are not the same textual layer.

In R2 the claim remained that no precise Alter Rebbe witness for meat adding intellect existed outside the Epistle. L1 changed this in R3. It quotes the sentence together with the grain saying and explains an addition to the power of Chochmah and intellect from the foods' root. There is therefore no longer any need to rely only on Lessons, or attribute to later explanation the creation of a connection already presented by the Epistle and the discourse.

The comparison does not erase differences. L1 uses wording closer to the nighttime context and brings meat before grain. The Epistle arranges the examples as vegetative followed by animal. This change suits the "from both" argument, but the intention behind the arrangement is a contextual conclusion. The important finding is an explicit shared witness for food and intellect, alongside clear limits concerning why specifically ox and the mapping of faculties.

S12 · Why Ox, and Why Two Proofs?

Grain exemplifies the vegetative and meat the animal, so both proofs fit "from both." One can also distinguish the beginning of recognition in an infant from a sage's study, but this is an explanatory proposal, not a mapping of Chochmah and Daat. The ox comes from the quoted Talmudic discussion. The linguistic connection to the faces in the chariot is possible; it does not prove the reason for choosing the species. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmit-

ted text; Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; discourse begins at א יג [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle’s quotation is close to 537.

Had only grain been brought, it would have been proved within the discussion that the vegetative adds to the speaking being’s knowledge. The meat proof extends the illustration to the animal as well. This directly connects to “from both,” so the second example should not be seen as superfluous decoration. The structure does not require the two examples to prove two distinct kinds of intellect; it suffices that each fills a different side of the two sources of food.

The infant–sage distinction is attractive because it shows the addition is not limited to the beginning of life. In one case knowledge appears at the beginning of recognition; in the other, the quality of study of someone already versed in Torah changes. Wording nevertheless requires care: the Talmudic passage is not an experimental account of before and after eating, and the Epistle does not define the examples as developmental stages. This is an interpretation of their rhetorical contribution based on the recipients’ identities.

The species-specific reason for ox remains absent. A general statement that “ox is Gevurah” is insufficient, because it has not been proved why this specifically is the intellectual addition discussed. The claim that animal food has a high root likewise explains the category, not the choice of ox rather than sheep. The user’s question requires distinguishing the two kinds of answer, rather than presenting a general explanation as though it resolved the detail.

The transition from ox meat to the ox’s face can connect the examples in the reading sequence: meat nourishes a human and an animal’s

spirit nourishes an angel. Yet the face of the ox is also the source of other animal species mentioned in the Zohar. The resonance therefore does not prove that additional knowledge from meat depends specifically on the ox species. The secure parallel is between animal nourishing speaking and the spirit of a sacrifice nourishing the higher beings.

The closing decision is not to ignore the detail, but to give it a precise status. A Talmudic source for the wording was found, explicit Chasidic use concerning intellect was found, and a role for both examples together was found. No additional species-specific explanation was found. These are four different results; presenting them separately protects both the strength of the finding and the unanswered question.

S13 · Tohu, Refinement, and Returning Light: What Is Connected?

L1 explains food and intellect through Tohu and refinement; L7 through Sag and Mah; L3 through sacrifice and revelation of Tohu's lights; L2 describes future returning light in Malchut. The Epistle itself explains through the kav's returning light and the sovev's radiance at the lowest point. The connections are real, but no sentence was found identifying Sag or Daat of Tohu with the kav's return at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Va-akhaltem akhol" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation, and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, par-

ticularly §4; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements”) and continuation; “Ve-niglah kevod Havayah” (“And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed”), תשכ”ב [5722] — §§3–8, particularly the body of food and sovev; notes 49, 54.

This dossier moved from lack of a precise parallel to a network of parallels, but not to complete identity. R1 and R2 required a source for both food proofs together. L1 supplied it: foods rooted in Tohu add to the human being in the Chochmah of Tikkun. In R3, L3 was added for sacrifice and the angels’ pleasure. In R5, L7 identified the content to which L3 refers concerning Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and Mah from the forehead. Each stage strengthened a defined connection; none supplied the sought Tohu–kav equation.

Proper comparison requires recording, for each source, the recipient, source of power, action, and time. In L1 the human being receives vitality and intellect; refinement reveals food’s root. In L3 the chariot angels derive pleasure after offering the animal’s spirit. In L7 food, action, and drawing down come together. In the Epistle the discussion is explained through the place of the endpoint and the kav’s return. Similarity of result does not erase differences in the described route.

L2 is a particularly important test because the words “returning light” occur in it. The return there concerns Malchut, the future, and the time after refinements. There is a connection to the language of Keter from below upward and embedding, but the sentence’s subject and time are not identical to the Epistle’s description of the kav. The abbreviations were also checked: א”ח עט”ב means eshet chayil ateret baalah, “a woman of valor is her husband’s crown,” not an abbre-

viation of returning light. The connection to returning light must be based on the explicit words in the continuation.

K5 adds another component: human vitality from the body of the food, and the connection to sovev. This must not be set up as a disagreement with the spirit of the sacrifice, because recipient and subject differ. Conversely, the body must not be transferred to the angels in place of the spirit specified by the Epistle. The parallel can explain an aspect of human food without replacing the conclusion's entire mechanism. This exemplifies how a direct source referring to the Epistle still does not coincide with all its details.

There is another limit within L1: after the proofs comes the transition "And likewise this will be understood in the service of G-d." The layer of eating for the sake of Heaven, the Shema, and prayer is not a condition the Epistle imposes on every reception of vitality. Refinement is already mentioned before the transition, so the opposite exaggeration — saying that the first layer contains no refinement at all — is also incorrect. The two layers must be read continuously, without planting the second's conditions in every sentence of the first.

The useful conclusion is positive: the parallels teach why a root low in revelation may add to the recipient above it, and show how this is realized in food and sacrifice. They enrich the Epistle's explanation. The limit is that we are not entitled to present Sag, Tohu, sovev, and returning light as interchangeable words. Precision about the limit is not an artificial separation between sources; it is the condition for a combination that can be examined.

S14 · What Does "For It Is" Refer Back To?

Preferred reading: the fact that the higher receives from the lower is an aspect of returning light. Food can also be read as the subject. "Is revealed" refers to the radiance later in the sentence. The grammati-

cal gender of “nourishment” does not decide the matter, because that word does not appear in the sentence. The determination is contextual, not absolute grammatical proof. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text.

The preferred punctuation is: the two examples — “for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward” — followed by the detailing of the radiance. “It” thus summarizes a whole matter, like “this, then, is.” The advantage is that it includes both kinds of food and the intellectual addition without selecting one as the exclusive referent. It also continues the causal explanation given in the earth unit.

On the alternative reading, the nourishing lower entity is an aspect of returning light. Grain and meat can be included under “food,” even though that noun is not explicit here. The advantage is a concrete subject close to the examples; the difficulty is that the general concept must be supplied. Also in the preferred reading a whole matter is summarized, rather than a single noun referred back to. There is therefore no grammatical rule here invalidating either reading.

In R2 an argument was made that masculine הוא (hu, “it”) excludes feminine ההזנה (“nourishment”). It was withdrawn in R3. It examined the commentator’s word instead of the author’s words. If the intended subject is “the matter” or “the fact that the higher is nourished,” the masculine can be used without changing the phenomenon summarized. This small case shows why syntactic analysis must begin with the actual wording.

Another correction separated two decisions. Initially the food reading was rejected because it was thought to require attributing returning light to sovev as well. There is no such necessity. “It” can refer to food while the final “in the mode of returning light” still attaches to the

kav. The syntax contains several local connections; deciding the first pronoun does not automatically determine the final phrase's scope.

"שמתגלית" ("is revealed") has an explicit candidate: the radiance. The feminine form agrees with it, and "there" refers back to the bottom of Asiyah. The verb need not be assigned to human knowledge or an act of eating.

The distinction matters for the continuation: what is revealed with greater force is the radiance; vitality and knowledge are the domains in which the Epistle applies its explanation of the relationship.

S15 · Two Occurrences of Returning Light

The first occurrence gives the explanation for nourishment from below upward. On the preferred reading, the last attaches to the kav at the endpoint of the feet of yosher. "As above" refers back to the paragraph in which sovev shines at the lowest point, whereas the kav shines from below upward in returning light. The sentence gives no permission to write that sovev itself returns in the same technical sense. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; "Ve-niglah kevod Havayah" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), תשכ"ב [5722] — §§3–8, particularly the body of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Va-akhaltem akhol" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation, and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45.

The strongest evidence is not merely word proximity. In the earth paragraph, sovev and kav receive different descriptions. Sovev shines beneath Adam Kadmon's feet without a great interruption; the kav, ending there, shines from below upward. When the conclusion repeats both sources and adds "as above," the preceding context is

the key to the applicability of returning light. A punctuation possibility is not equivalent to every contextual possibility.

The first occurrence is not merely a heading without explanatory force. "For it is" explains why the higher receives from the lower. One can say that it describes the general relation while the second occurrence details the kav's return. But no rigid rule should be established that "the first is only an analogy and the second the reality." The Epistle presents nourishment as an aspect of the structure already explained; a precise division between analogy and technical identity is not explicit in it.

A counter-test is the wording "returning light from the kav and sovev." It sounds like a convenient summary, but changes the scope: two sources of radiance become two sources of return. The secure wording is "the sovev's radiance, and the kav in the mode of returning light." This is not a prohibition on using returning light concerning sovev throughout kabbalistic literature; it limits what can be proved from the present sentence.

K5 explains sovev in the lower realm and the body of food. It can therefore contribute to interpreting one component of the sentence without mentioning the kav. Its silence about the kav does not cancel the kav in the Epistle or license inserting an undescribed return into it. L2, by contrast, includes returning light in another, future context. Together the two parallels teach that one must not choose a single shared term and erase its surrounding details.

The syntactic clarification also preserves the distinction between light and the source of creation. The Epistle's text discusses the Essence and creation ex nihilo; here a radiance from sovev and kav is stated. This must not be shortened to "the Essence returns." The advantage of the lowest point can be explained from the broader context, but the levels of expression remain distinct. Such precision

is especially essential in translation, where an overly short sentence can merge several Hebrew concepts.

S16 · What Does “Etc.” Abbreviate?

The plausible decoding returns to the earlier description of radiance, especially “a radiance of a radiance of a radiance.” The later explanation expands the abbreviation this way. It may also intend a broader continuation of the preceding sequence. No fourth level was proved, nor was it proved that the reason for abbreviation is a separate mystery. The amount of detail remaining in the sentence serves to apply the explanation to nourishment. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — “It” refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation.

The initial research called the solution almost certain: “etc.” replaces the third radiance already mentioned. This has a clear contextual basis, so there is no need to return to zero and say we have no idea about the abbreviation. The later correction concerns the extent of certainty: correspondence to an earlier expression does not prove that the abbreviation covers only one word rather than “all the above” or the adjacent sequence of explanation as well.

A useful decoding must be distinguished from a diplomatic edition. An explanation for the reader may say that the Epistle abbreviates the description of radiance already explained. If one wishes to print additional words within a quotation, they must be marked as an editorial supplement, not manuscript wording. Even a small abbreviation requires this, because adding a word inside the quotation can look like textual evidence not in our possession.

Why the radiance is abbreviated while the endpoint of the feet of yosher is elaborated receives a contextual answer. The radiance was just described and can be mentioned briefly; the place where the kav ends and the direction of return are needed again to explain how the lower adds to the higher. This does not prove the intention behind every letter. It shows that a difference in length can serve the progression without assuming a new hidden level.

The proposal of a fourth level rests on no explicit word. “Etc.” can abbreviate content already stated, so there is no need to add an undocumented stage to the radiances’ count. Conversely, no rule should be established that every כו׳ in the Alter Rebbe abbreviates only the last word. The determination concerns this location and context, not a universal dictionary of Tanya abbreviations.

The English translation preserves this caution: “etc.” must not disappear while only the preferred decoding is printed as though it were the source. The abbreviation may be translated and then explained. Thus the translation is no more categorical than the Hebrew, and the reader can see where the wording ends and the proposed explanation begins.

S17 · Repetition That Applies the Explanation

The Epistle applies the preceding explanation to a new relation: the lower not only produces growth but gives vitality and knowledge to what is above it. Repeating the endpoint’s location and the light’s direction explains the transition. “As above” indicates the same explanatory foundation presented earlier; it does not prove that every result of growth, nourishment, and sacrifice is the same action. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “Lehavin mah she-katuv be-Pri Etz Chaim” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת

שבאמת הבירורין” (“And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements”) and continuation.

The sentence could have been shortened to “so too concerning foods.” The author chose to repeat the bottom of Asiyah and the sources of radiance. This lets the reader follow the application: what is placed below in the order of levels is not enclosed within its level. Where the kav ends is also where a return upward is described. There is thus no arbitrary transition from the earth image to the food image.

The result explained also changes. In the preceding paragraph, the power of growth and bringing forth yesh me-ayin are prominent. Here the relation between two already existing levels is prominent. Creation and nourishment are not the same claim. By detailing the light again, the Epistle supplies the connecting link instead of assuming that both being physical already explains their similarity.

Additional knowledge increases the need for repetition. Not only does the body receive vitality from food; the faculty identified with the speaking being’s advantage is also presented as receiving from the lower. Detailing the light prevents this dependence from being read as a bodily compromise unrelated to the human advantage. It permits the advantage of the lowest point to be applied precisely where independent superiority might have been expected.

The research proposed that the Epistle supplies only a location map while L1 supplies causation. The repetition itself challenges that division: it follows “for” and ends “as above.” This uses an earlier explanation; it is not a list of addresses. Nevertheless, the sources need not compete over who gives the true explanation. They emphasize different data of the relation, and both can help.

The limit concerns the reason for each detail of wording. Explaining the overall repetition does not prove why each name and abbreviation was chosen separately. This question must therefore be separated

from the questions of “etc.” and “with greater force.” It answers the detailing’s function in the argument, not supplies a key making all other precise questions unnecessary.

S18 · What Is Revealed with Greater Force?

Syntactically, the radiance is what is revealed with greater force. In the earth unit its strength and ability are seen in growth; at the conclusion, nourishment and knowledge are explained through it. Do not infer that every recipient consciously apprehends the light’s source or that every result bears the same degree of revelation. The bridge is the application of the lowest-point structure marked by the Epistle itself. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from “ועוד זאת” (“And furthermore, this”) to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; discourse begins at יג א [13a]; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “Biur al pi Vehenif ha-kohen otam” (“Explanation Based on ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, particularly §4; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107.

The preparatory review demanded that the earth dossier’s conclusion not be automatically transferred to every subsequent subject. This demand is correct because the same description can participate in several sentences with different results. Vegetative power, human knowledge, and an angel’s pleasure are not one thing. Reading therefore begins with local syntax: “where a radiance is revealed with greater force.” What is revealed is explicitly named.

The syntax does not imply that knowledge is unrelated. The Epistle introduced it immediately before as a result of receiving from food. But “a radiance is revealed and explains additional knowledge” differs from “the person apprehends the supernal radiance.” The saying about Rav Nachman does not state that he contemplated the endpoint

of Adam Kadmon's feet while studying the Talmudic issue. The kabbalistic explanation of the addition's source does not describe the recipient's awareness.

A high root is likewise not identical to high revelation. L1 distinguishes food's root from its state after falling; L3 speaks of revelation of Tohu's lights after refinement. When the booklet says that the lower bears a high power, it must add at which stage and in what relation. Otherwise a claim would arise that manifest food surpasses the human being in apprehension, precisely the claim the parallels seek to prevent.

The application to angels is marked by the transition "And through this will be well understood." This is permission from the Epistle to see a connection, but not erase the difference between eating and sacrifice. A person receives vitality and knowledge from food; angels receive from the spirit of animal and bird ascending through Divine service. "Is revealed" gives an explanatory principle, while each case's account of the action determines how the principle appears.

The conclusion preserves both sides: do not divide the unit into unrelated passages, and do not combine it into unqualified identity. "With greater force" preserves the radiance's advantage at the lowest point; how this advantage appears in growth, intellect, and sacrifice requires the particular description supplied by the Epistle and its parallels.

Dossier 0170 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [47]

[47] Document 0170: ZZ - SUPERSEDED — 197 E1 Editorial QC (pre-Grok critique; see 199). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

E1 — Editorial QC for Booklet — 2. Stylistic Improvements (Not Factual)

- E1-QC-S01: consistency of evidence tags with Handoff ([E-primary] / [E-secondary] versus [E-primary] in the draft) — cosmetic.
- E1-QC-S02: Q42/Q70 numbering in the draft matches the research; preserve consistency with ledger R15/R17.
- E1-QC-S03: the division into stations is marked as an editor's structure [I] — good; do not present it as the Alter Rebbe's division.

Dossier 0052 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [103]

2. Corrections — E1-QC-## — E1-QC-13 — Stations 18–19: Few Quotations from the Text

- Location: stations 18–19
- Claim: the paraphrase on the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking / elevation of vitality / sacrifices is sparse in [E-subresearch] quotations against the text
- Problem: may look like a continuous gloss without a verbal anchor
- Correct tag: add 1–2 short quotations from the conclusion with [E-subresearch], or explicitly mark «editorial paraphrase [I] of the conclusion's progression»
- Corrected wording: either an anchored quotation or a clear [I] heading for the sequence
- Type: editorial

[103] Document 0052: 201 — E1 — Editorial QC for Complete Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0268 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or testimony from the history of the research [122]

128 — R16-GB07 SUMMARY — Proposed

ID	Claim
R16-T38	TO Esther ב׳ [2] — souls elevate by day; angels' song/food at night
R16-T39	LT Song of Songs ח״י [18] — unembodied souls receive OS as OS; elemental-bodied angels only middah

Dossier 0012 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [134]

6. Continuous peshat — טו [15] (Conclusion: Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking / Practical Mitzvot) — 6.3 Link

- From יד [14]'s or chozer / earth power.
- Next: none in body — colophon ends the handwritten discourse. Further research = other clusters (R17-C/D/H), not more continuous peshat of this letter's body.

Dossier 0103 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or testimony from the history of the research [140]

[122] Document 0268: 128 — R16-GB07 SUMMARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[134] Document 0012: 154 — R17-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[140] Document 0103: 155 — R17 SCOUT יא–טו CORROBORATE-ONLY.md [sections 11–15]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

טו [15] — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking / Angels / Practical Mitzvot — 1) Exact [E]

«And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking… the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge… for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah»

«…supernal angels in the chariot, the face of the ox and face of the eagle, derive pleasure… from the spirit of the animal and the bird… and as is precise in the holy Zohar's wording, "and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root"» «…the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world, as written, "today, to perform them," and "One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come"»

«Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting»

טו [15] — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking / Angels / Practical Mitzvot — 2) Plain peshat

Inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking paradox (higher lives from lower) = or chozer from bottom of Asiyah. Merkavah angels fed from korbanot spirit (Zohar yesod/ikkar). Practical mitzvot = purpose of souls' descent. Colophon ends letter.

טו [15] — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking / Angels / Practical Mitzvot — 3) Neighbors

- From יד [14] + earlier ח/ט [8/9] mitzvot-telos now cosmologically grounded

- Letter end — continuous peshat א–טו [1–15] complete for this scout lane

טו [15] — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking / Angels / Practical Mitzvot — 4) Open Qs

- Zohar/Talmud exact daf via Admur only [U]
- Moses forever-OPEN (not litigated in טו [15])

Dossier 0066 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [27]

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S1 — Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת · https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

Field	Value
Title	Tanya, Part IV, 20 / Tanya — Iggeret HaKodesh 20
Author	The Alter Rebbe (R. Shneur Zalman of Liadi)
Printed folio vs PDF	Printed folio not verified in this round; complete digital text
Reading mode	Digital text (Wikisource + abc770) · witness tag: not checked / digital
Proves	Wording of the central passage on ZON of BYA, neshamah-light, kav radiance, parsa, a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, Nehemiah, sovev, letters — in corresponding digital wording on both sites
Does not prove	Exact printed folio; glyphs; manuscript variants; authoritative explanation beyond the wording itself

[27] Document 0066: IGK20-Focused-F1 — Grok Bot — Sources and Questions.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Hebrew block verified against S1 (quotation; working punctuation only):

And behold, likewise, from the union of ZON of BYA, all the created, formed, and made beings were created from nothing into something through the neshamah-light within them, which is Divinity from the vessels of the ten sefirot of Malchut of Atzilut. Also within it is the radiance of the kav of the Ein Sof light invested in Atzilut as far as the parsa; and the radiance of the kav that shone in the vessels of the ten sefirot of Malchut pierced the parsa with them and shines within them in BYA just as in Atzilut itself. And likewise also the kav itself, invested in the termination and endpoint of Netzach, Hod, and Yesod of Adam Kadmon, which is the end of his feet of yosher, ending in Malchut of Asiyah: the radiance of the kav shines from there and becomes invested in the neshamah-light of the ten sefirot of BYA, which is Divinity. A radiance of a radiance becomes invested in the nefesh and ruach of the ten sefirot of BYA, and also even in all their vessels; a radiance of a radiance of a radiance is in all the created, formed, and made beings, as written, “the seas and all that is in them, and You give life to them all.”

All this is in the mode of the extension of vitality to give them life. However, the existence and nature of the Ein Sof light is not in the category of place at all, and encompasses all worlds equally; “I fill the heavens and the earth” with one equality, and “there is no place devoid of Him,” even in this physical earth. Only, it is in an encompassing and surrounding mode, as the explanation is written in Likkutei Amarim, and not an extension and investment of vitality to give them life and bring them into being from nothing into something, except through a radiance of a radiance of a radiance, etc., from the kav as above. Also, from the Ein Sof light encompassing and surrounding the four worlds ABYA equally, there shines to the internal kav through the vessels of the ten sefirot of BYA; in its radiance within the ves-

sels it gives them strength and force to create yesh me-ayin. Since creation is through the vessels, the created beings are therefore in a state of multiplicity, differentiation, finitude, and limit, especially through the letters, as above.

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S2 — Bereishit Rabbah 8:7

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ז_ח_הבר_תישארב
Title	Bereishit Rabbah 8:7
Author	Midrash Rabbah (tradition)
Mode	Digital text · not checked
Proves	«He consulted the souls of the righteous» / «With the King in His work dwelt the souls of the righteous, with whom the Holy One, blessed be He, consulted and created the world»
Does not prove	Identification of “before the first tzimtzum”; mechanism of ZON’s union; map of nefesh–ruach–neshamah of BYA

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S3 — Igeret HaKodesh 31

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אל_ד_קלח_אינת
Title	Tanya, Part IV, 31
Author	The Alter Rebbe
Mode	Digital text · not checked
Proves	Israel’s souls as «limbs of the Shechinah»; vitality of BYA through investment in souls «that arose in thought and preceded the creation of worlds through the aspect of speech»; the Sages’ saying «with whom did He consult»
Does not prove	Closure of F1-01 on the tzimtzum axis; identity of neshamah of sefirot = human soul

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S4 — The Rebbe, 20 Elul 5734

Field	Value
URL	https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/6131939/jewish/page.htm

Field	Value
Status	Blocked by Cloudflare (WebFetch + curl + chrome headless)
Mode	Not read · lead only
Proves/does not	No reading in this round

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S5 — Shaar HaYichud VehaEmunah 2

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת
Author	The Alter Rebbe
Mode	Digital text · not checked
Proves	«And You give life to them all» → do not read mechayeh (“gives life”) but mehaveh (“brings into being”); letters of the ten utterances; the agent’s power continually in its effect
Does not prove	The three degrees of radiance in Iggeret HaKodesh 20 in themselves

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S6 — Shaar HaYichud VehaEmunah 12

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בי_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת
Author	The Alter Rebbe

Field	Value
Mode	Digital text · not checked
Proves	Multiplicity/combinations of letters; analogy of «the light of the sun's light»; «a radiance of a radiance of a radiance of the letters' radiances» down to the inanimate
Does not prove	Full identity between the ladder of letters in Shaar HaYichud VehaEmunah 12 and the three radiances in Iggeret HaKodesh 20 (structural similarity only until explicitly explained)

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S7 — Nehemiah 9:6

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_ט_הימחנ
Mode	Digital text (Masoretic)
Proves	Wording of the complete verse: heavens/earth/seas + «and You give life to them all»
Does not prove	Terminology of a radiance of a radiance; kav/parsa map

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S8 — Likkutei Torah, Song of Songs

Field	Value
URL	https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5899043
Status	Blocked by Cloudflare
Mode	Not read · lead

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S9 — The Rebbe, 5728

Field	Value
URL	https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3140178
Status	Blocked by Cloudflare
Mode	Not read · lead

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S10 — Lessons in Tanya (Daily, September 21, 2026)

Field	Value
URL	https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026
Status	Blocked by Cloudflare
Mode	Not read · lead · Note: separate Tanya's text from Kehot's explanation if opened

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — S11 — Likkutei Amarim 48

Field	Value
URL	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת
Author	The Alter Rebbe
Mode	Digital text · not checked
Proves	Sovev = concealed influence not invested in revelation; memale = scant invested radiance; «I fill the heavens and the earth»; no place in spirituality

Field	Value
Does not prove	Closure of the syntax «and not… except… from the kav» without reading Iggeret HaKodesh itself

א [1]. Witness Register S1–S11 (+ Further Study) — Routes for Further Study (Not Opened — Leads)

Or Torah of the Maggid §6; Shaar HaYichud of the Mitteler Rebbe from §16; Hemshech תרס"ו [5666], end of p. 21; תער"ב [5672], volume I, §129; Sefer HaMaamarim תש"ג [5703], end of p. 131; Etz Chaim, Order of ABYA, chapters 4–5; Pri Etz Chaim, Shema, chapter 11 — not read in this round.

Additional digital aid (does not replace S1): Chabadpedia, «Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20» — secondary summary; tag: secondary explanation / not checked; used only to guide reading, not as independent evidence.

ה [5]. New-Findings Register + Source Register — Source Register (Summary)

S1–S11 as detailed in section א [1]; Chabadpedia secondary; further-study leads were not opened.

Dossier 0538 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [28]

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — The Epistle's Wording

«And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, and air: although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge, for an infan-

[28] Document 0538: E1.6-HY1-Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

t does not know how to call “father” and “mother” until it tastes the taste of grain, etc., and “I had not yet eaten ox meat,” etc., for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward.»

Quotation from the Epistle’s text: [E-subresearch]; Kehot print: [U].

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — The Station’s Function

The station gives the Epistle’s own text the example of returning light. Describing the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking as a chain of receiving and transmitting vitality is the wording’s plain meaning; expanding “the ascent of vitality” into a general structure is an editorial explanation [I].

Station 18 — Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, and Speaking — Which Question Does the Station Leave Open?

The precise relation between the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking and the levels of the sefirot is not detailed here in all particulars. We remain with the Epistle’s local plain meaning.

Station 19 — Sacrifices and the Vitality Ascending through Human Divine Service — The Station’s Function

The station shows how returning light appears in Temple service: vitality in the inanimate, vegetative, and animal does not remain at its level, but ascends and becomes spiritual nourishment for the angels in the chariot.

Dossier 0667 · The Focused Studies · Round 1

Combined dossier: findings must be distinguished from the follow-up brief [244]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, Kehot, Daily Passage for 10 Tishrei. Separate Tanya's Text from the Explanation:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

S11 — The Alter Rebbe, Likkutei Amarim 48:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת

Routes for further study: Or Torah of the Maggid, section 6; Shaar HaYichud of the Mitteler Rebbe, chapter 16 onward (references in S4); Hemshech תרס"ו [5666], end of p. כא [21]; תער"ב [5672], volume I, chapter 129; Sefer HaMaamarim תש"ג [5703], end of p. 131 onward (references in S9); Etz Chaim, gate of the Order of ABYA, chapters 4–5, and Pri Etz Chaim, gate of the Shema, chapter 11 (references in S8). Open the sources themselves. References are not evidence that these texts were read in this package. Expand to discourses of the Alter Rebbe, Tzemach Tzedek, and Mitteler Rebbe as needed, prioritizing an explicit parallel to the Epistle.

Hypotheses to examine — not binding conclusions:

- Examine whether the first contradiction arises from identifying the soul's root with its birth at a particular level.
- The passage may distinguish the source of power, its garments, and degrees of reception, so not all additions should be read as separate acts of coming into being.
- Do not assume that the parsa first creates the status "radiance of the kav"; examine the wording of the preceding sentence.

[244] Document 0667: 02_Claude_F1.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- The verse's evidence may concern vitality's scope rather than proof of every detail of the kabbalistic hierarchy.
- The two descriptions of the kav may serve two different roles; a source is needed

to clarify the relationship.

- Do not assume four levels corresponding to the four concluding words. Examine literal meaning, pairs, and parallels. None of the hypotheses must be agreed with. A substantiated refutation is an important result.

Required deliverable:

א [1]. Open with a sentence identifying the task, input read, and limits of source access. Do not declare "all questions resolved" in advance.

ב [2]. Write a continuous explanation of the progression, 800–1,500 words as needed, from souls in thought to vessels and letters. It must show why every addition is necessary and what remains unknown.

ג [3]. Answer each F1-01–22 separately: question; short answer; source wording and reference; interpretation; evidence versus inference; possible objection; conclusion and what remains open.

ד [4]. Add two tables: (1) pronouns and sentence subjects; (2) source of radiance / manner of drawing down / recipient / function / what was not proved. If a diagram helps, mark a proved arrow versus an interpretive arrow, and do not present physical space.

ה [5]. Compile a register of new findings only and a source register: author, work, page/chapter, sufficiently short quotation, URL, reading mode, what the source proves and does not prove. Do not fill in "read" based on the package's report.

ו [6]. State explicitly which assumptions in the questions need correction without canceling the question that gave rise to them. Add up to five necessary questions not previously asked.

ז [7]. Finish with a list of focused openings for the next round, ordered by likelihood of changing an answer. State the threshold for change beside each. Do not repeat a general research plan.

ח [8]. Give up to three sample explanatory passages, marked "candidate for the booklet — not yet approved," based only on what was actually clarified. Do not rewrite the booklet. Return the complete response in the conversation body. A file may be added, but a link alone is insufficient, so that we do not again get stuck transferring material.

Mandatory conclusion: booklet production remains on hold. No general R16, no halachic ruling, and no determination by model agreement. Present what was clarified, inferred, refuted, and left open, followed by the precise next research step.

Dossier 0026 · The Focused Studies · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [246]

S10: Lessons in Tanya, 10 Tishrei; text and explanation must be separated:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

S11: Likkutei Amarim 48:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת

S12: Shaar HaYichud VehaEmunah 6, and separately 7:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ז_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת

Target sources whose text must still be opened: תרס"ו [5666], end of p. כא [21] and context; תער"ב [5672], volume I, chapter 129; תש"ג

[246] Document 0026: IGK20-F2-05_Gemini_F2.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[5703], end of p. 131 onward; Or Torah, section 6; Shaar HaYichud of the Mitteler Rebbe, chapter 16; Etz Chaim, gate of the Order of ABYA, 4–5; Pri Etz Chaim, gate of the Shema, 11; Sefer HaGilgulim 20. First verify book and edition, then location. If a reference proves erroneous, correct it in the documentation; do not create a guessed address as though opened.

In preparing F2, S1 on Wikisource, S9 to the extent relevant to the dossiers, and S10 were reread. The other links here are working routes supplied in F1, not a declaration that they have now been re-opened. Failure to open in the current round does not erase a documented earlier reading, but another model's report is not your reading.

1. Rules of Evidence and Explanation

א [1]. Separate three axes: who said it; how you read it; what the claim proves. A Rebbe discourse is a primary source for his words and a later explanation relative to the Epistle; a digital transcription is not a printed glyph.

ב [2]. For every decisive piece of evidence: author, work, chapter/page or paragraph, link, a sufficiently short quotation, and context before/after. Do not splice sentence fragments without marking it.

ג [3]. [E-subresearch] for the Epistle's text in the unchecked witness according to the dossier's method; "attributed explanation" / [E-secondary] where appropriate; [I] for inference; [U] for an undecided point. All qualifications need not be repeated in every line.

ד [4]. "I did not examine," "I did not find," "does not follow from the source," and "is contradicted by the source" are four different states. "There is no source" requires a specified search scope.

ה [5]. Parsa, encompassing, face-aspect, above/below are not physical space. Nevertheless, do not replace precise kabbalistic details with a general philosophical expression.

ו [6]. Do not assume that the text itself proves every causal explanation that seems to fit it. A good explanation must answer why the addition is necessary.

ז [7]. A diagram is possible and useful: a solid arrow only for a written relation, a dashed arrow for inference; do not mark the same connection as both a proved route and open. Do not invent chronology from arrows.

ח [8]. Q42 (transition from a likeness of Divinity to separate yesh), Q70 (status/degree of the kav after souls leave the vessels), and N etzach–Hod–Yesod–Malchut/Moses are existing dossiers. They are not new names for every kav problem. Do not close them because a neighboring question was resolved. If new relevant evidence is found, present it and explain precisely what it closes; there is no principled prohibition on resolving a question.

ט [9]. There is no need now to investigate Hayom Yom or edit a booklet. If a side question does not change an answer here, record it in one line for continuation and return to the task.

י [10]. Do not stop at a work plan or book list. Perform the study possible and return a result, including reasoned partial answers where something remains missing.

1. Requested Answer Structure

א [1]. Result first: what changed since F1, what needs correction, and what is still undecided.

ב [2]. Short reading register: text read / photograph examined / explanation / reference / blocked. No claim that all witnesses are independent unless examined.

ג [3]. A continuous, clear explanation of the round's focal points, deep but in plain language. Explanation for the reader first, then analysis of evidence and alternatives. Do not reconstruct all of F1.

ד [4]. Nine F2-A–I dossiers: preferred answer, source, serious alternative, limit of the determination. Go especially deep in your particular assignment, but omit no other dossiers.

ה [5]. A 22-row change table, F1-01–22: previous state according to the summary / new in the round / status / source / what remains missing. Where there is nothing new, state this briefly.

ו [6]. Two checking tables: (1) kav–sovev–vessels: source of power / route / recipient / vitality or being, and in what sense; (2) three radiances: light's status / recipient's status / proved or conjectural manner of passage.

ז [7]. Corrections to the previous report: claim / confirm, qualify, retract, or cannot examine / reason. Do not defend an error to maintain consistency.

ח [8]. At most five openings for continuation, only those changing a particular question. For each: precise location and the sentence needed for progress. Finish by explaining which difficulties received a real answer and which were merely formulated better.

Name the report IGK20-Focused-F2-[model name]. If able, create a complete text file alongside the response. There is no dependence on a booklet file or approval to continue. No determination by agreement.

Dossier 0033 · The Focused Studies · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [252]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, 10 Tishrei:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

E47D — Etz Chaim, gate 47, chapter 4: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ

E47E — Etz Chaim, gate 47, chapter 5: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ה_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ E5C — Etz Chaim, gate 5, chapter 3: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ג_קרפ/ה_רעש/מייח_זעץ

S8 — Likkutei Torah, Song of Songs, additional explanation of "Yonati" ("My Dove"): https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5899043

S4 — "Et Havayah he'emarta" ("You Have Declared G-d"), תשל"ד [5734], section 3 and notes; unreviewed transcript: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/6131939/jewish/page.htm

The souls' precedence — Bereishit Rabbah 8:7 and Iggeret HaKodesh 31:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ז_ח_הבר_תישארב

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אל_ד_קלח_אינת

Continual coming into being, radiances and letters, sovev:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בי_הנומאהו_דוחיה_רעש_אינת

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_ט_הימחנ

[252] Document 0033: 03_Grok_F3.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Scan lead — Sefer HaGilgulim, HB23822, according to Grok Bot's report alone: https://hebrewbooks.org/23822

Complete Grok Bot F2 report:

Further text targets: Hemshech תרס"ו [5666], end of p. כא [21]; תער"ב [5672], volume I, chapter 129; Sefer HaMaamarim תש"ג [5703], end of p. 131 onward; Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20; Or Torah of the Maggid, section 6; Shaar HaYichud of the Mitteler Rebbe, chapter 16. These additional locations are references, not a declaration that they were read. In preparing F3, the text of S1, relevant passages in S9 and S10, and E47D/E47E/E5C were reread digitally. Wikisource pages are marked "not checked." No scans of תרס"ו, תער"ב, Gilgulim, or Tanya were examined here. The discourse "Va-yered Havayah al Har Sinai" ("And G-d Descended upon Mount Sinai"), תשכ"ז [5727], supplied by Claude was not located in full text in this examination; an exact link and location are required.

ח [8]. Individual role — Grok: the text supplied to the research coordinator in your name was YA-IGK20-E1-BIKOROT, concerning a booklet. A file may have been substituted during transfer; we do not assume this was your F2 response. In any event, do not work on the booklet's stations. Return to the research detailed here and submit F3. Your three in-depth dossiers: F3-04, F3-03, F3-05. תרס"ו, end of 21, תער"ב I 129, and תש"ג 131 are real targets for reading the text. If found, bring context, not only an agreeable sentence. Compare coming into being, vitality, and revelation rather than assuming they are always synonyms. Your central question: what precisely does sovev add to the kav, and what does the description of Adam Kadmon add if the radiance in Malchut's vessels is already active? Propose a reasoned answer, and two possibilities only where the source does not decide. In the souls sentence, do not be satisfied with "departure without separation" against "departed and became separated"; distinguish separation from the vessels from the status of separate yesh.

For F3-01, give a short response to the new tension in Etz Chaim, without presenting it as an already known solution.

Submit a complete research response now on the basis of accessible sources; no further approval is needed to begin.

Dossier 0088 · The Focused Studies · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [477]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, 10 Tishrei:

ח [8]. Individual role — Claude: your three in-depth dossiers: F3-02, F3-03, F3-01.

א [1]. Examine your light/recipient reconciliation against the explanation's complete syntax; do not replace it with a distinction between individual creature/sefirot without identifying a change of argument.

ב [2]. Bring the discourse "Va-yered" ("And He Descended"), תשכ"ז [5727], with address and section, and show whether it discusses light within the vessels or revelation in BYA themselves. If there is no evidence for the second, withdraw the determination about the intensity of revelation and retain only what was proved.

ג [3]. The source concerning Abba and Imma of Beriah was verified; now address the continuation of the same chapter denying generation in Yetzirah and Asiyah. Correcting a claim's scope is no less important than finding a supporting sentence.

In F3-04, briefly examine whether you inferred a complete solution concerning coming into being from a discourse about revelation; and in F3-05 whether you transferred "but they are not" to an unproved

[477] Document 0088: 02_Claude_F3.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

stage. The package's criticism is not a ruling: bring counterevidence if it exists.

Dossier 0089 · The Focused Studies · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [478]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, 10 Tishrei:

ח [8]. Individual role — Gemini: your three in-depth dossiers: F3-04, F3-05, F3-01. Every [cite] in your F2 report arrived empty. Each decisive claim requires a real, reproducible source; this is not merely a demand to change note formatting. If a source was not opened, downgrade its status. You removed "necessary bypass route," but returned to a first role of vitality and a second of force of being, and to a "necessary bipolar structure." Prove the necessity or replace it with a distinction the source actually formulates. Also prove the claim that vessels moderate sovev to prevent nullification. Correct the scope of "but they are not actual Divinity, to create yesh me-ayin" according to the unit before descent; do not turn denial of the power of creation into an unqualified denial of every connection to Divinity. End with a clear conceptual explanation preserving distinctions even without a closed mechanism. Hi/hu was not finally resolved by a grammatical-gender rule in light of "the neshamah… which is" (הנשמה…שהוא). In the change table, do not attribute to F1 a mapping of three radiances to three worlds or a chronology if your F1 already rejected them. If you do not have the complete F1 before you, write that the delta cannot be verified.

[478] Document 0089: 05_Gemini_F3.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0273 · The Focused Studies · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [479]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, 10 Tishrei:

ה [8]. Individual role — Grok Bot: your three in-depth dossiers: F3-06, F3-01, F3-03. Continue from your reported achievement: HB23822. This time an identified page and a transcription compared against the image are required, not a general OCR description. If the identification of edition or page area changes, record a correction. Do not replace Sefer HaGilgulim with Shaar HaGilgulim. In Etz Chaim, read 47:4–5 with the distinction between generating new beings and vitality; present Abba and Imma of Beriah, Yetzirah, and Asiyah separately, and the denial of generation in ZON of Yetzirah. For "mamash," try a new source text, not merely repetition of the S9 block. Report access limits precisely. Preserve the six F3 dossier identifiers. In F2 you changed the meanings of dossiers A–I, making comparison difficult. Do not call the created nefesh–ruach nefesh–ruach–neshamah, and do not restrict all BYA creatures to physical ones. One verified new sentence is preferable to a repeated list of twenty leads.

Dossier 0053 · The Focused Studies · Round 4

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [253]

S10 — Lessons in Tanya, 10 and 11 Tishrei:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026

[479] Document 0273: 04_Grok_Bot_F3.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[253] Document 0053: IGK20-Focused-F4-Grok-Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

V67 — “Va-yered Havayah al Har Sinai” (“And G-d Descended upon Mount Sinai”), תשכ”ז [5727], section 4, unreviewed transcript: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4385854. Address 4385854 was opened in preparing F4. Do not automatically replace it with 4385855.

E47D / E47E — Etz Chaim, gate 47, 4–5:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ה_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ

New parallel for examination: Tanya 52: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בנ_א_קלח_אינת

Sovev: Tanya 48;

do not confuse it with the reference “cited in Likkutei Amarim” concerning Sefer HaGilgulim: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/קלח_אינת_חמ_א

S8 — Likkutei Torah, additional explanation of “Yonati” (“My Dove”): https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5899043

S4 — “Et Havayah he’emarta” (“You Have Declared G-d”), תשל”ד [5734], section 3: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/6131939/jewish/page.htm

Scan leads according to Grok Bot, not the compiler’s independent verification: https://hebrewbooks.org/31623 — תרס”ו [5666], p. כא [21], and another location תכד [424], according to its report. https://hebrewbooks.org/23822 — Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20; according to its report, scans 30–31. Separate text targets: תער”ב [5672], volume I, chapter 129; Sefer HaMaamarim תש”ג [5703], end of p. 131 onward (S9 note 41); תער”ב, volume II, p. תתקנ [950] (V67 note 38). Grok Bot F3 report, read in full by the compiler: Grok Bot F2 report. To preserve document identity: the E1 review previously sent was under Grok’s

name, not Grok Bot's F2 report. In F3, a complete research report from Grok also arrived. Do not continue the old intake error.

Dossier 0008 · The Focused Studies · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [256]

S10 — Explanation for 10 Tishrei, including the subsequent summary of radiances:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

S11 — Explanation for 11 Tishrei, order of ABYA within Asiyah:

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026

S9 — "Ve-chazakta ve-hayita le-ish" ("Be Strong and Be a Man"), תשכ"ח [5728], 2–4, notes 34 and 41: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3140178

V67 — "Va-yered Havayah al Har Sinai" ("And G-d Descended upon Mount Sinai"), תשכ"ז [5727], 4, unreviewed transcript: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4385854

Etz Chaim 47:4–5:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ה_קרפ/זמ_רעש/מייח_זעץ

Tanya 52 — a parallel, not a proved identification of "cited in Likkutei Amarim": https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בנ_א_קלח_אינת

Bot F4 folder, open and read in preparing F5: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1E1e5bmNGs7TdCplrKmaE4b6FAuDQ3xrj

A1 — כא ,[5666] תרס"ו [21], printed number checked in the image; PDF32 according to Bot. A2 — תכד ,[5666] תרס"ו [424], printed number checked in the image; PDF435 according to Bot. Previous pages

[256] Document 0008: IGK20-Focused-F5-Source-Links.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

according to Bot's package, not yet viewed by the compiler: Sefer HaGilgulim, title page and scans 30–31. Bot's transcription, input for review against images: תער"ב [5672] link supplied by Claude; not opened by the compiler: https://chabadlibrary.org/books/maharshab/terav/2/8/index.htm. Separate targets: תער"ב I, chapter 129; Sefer HaMaamarim תש"ג, end of p. 131 onward; תער"ב II, p. תתקנ [950]. Do not substitute a page for a chapter. HB16046 for תער"ב is a lead supplied by Claude, not an identification checked by the compiler.

Dossier 0209 · The Focused Studies · Round 7

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [453]

S10 — Lessons for 10 Tishrei: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

Etz Chaim, gate 40, discourse 10: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/רעש_מ_שורד_י

Etz Chaim 47:4: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/רעש_מז_קרפ_ד

Etz Chaim 47:5: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/עץ_חיים/רעש_מז_קרפ_ה

Shaar HaPesukim — Genesis, section 21, "Va-tahar va-teled Sarah" ("Sarah Conceived and Bore," Vayera): https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תישארב/מיקוספה_רעש

תער"ב [5672], digital unit of the discourse "Bereishit bara" ("In the Beginning [G-d] Created"): https://chabadlibrary.org/books/maharshab/terav/2/8/index.htm

F6 photographs read by the compiler:

[453] Document 0209: 02_Claude_F7.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- 697: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1YIZ4QaGsmEdZ0UUtdnRIONsXEilLi1Fx/view
- 698: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gWeRHpmz7iwUL8m4hiQXyNtnef29H5Yc/view
- 950: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bdZLkIh2_mui3jvBISkgzAJaOdZTo1jD/view
- 955: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1m7RvAYJZ_EB-W0JsX_iLENOHUPvHK77z/view
- 338: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DypBIQpJsdMQiINeVD2h_n9_rzYNW5U8/view
- 339: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1v8JvuZevn8fux2id0kcYRXduPn6KbBO1/view
- 340: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1YzOV517E5ADL3W78SV_qDXiIcQE7oN8H/view
- 131: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jnyZfzu1vgzS7NnXY0pyTEDrGA9GagEg/view
- 132: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TP_hD7Z01bdsCwXQOd2ngy7lOoY7Uu-k/view
- 133: https://drive.google.com/file/d/17aA9-DDGRQkB_izrvZmNX5Q2sM8qJiZ1/view

Source folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Lk4bLnZeHLNUrudugQuoK32VCs46nccD

Original source ZIP: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EEEyXn4lBMfJu2qRH7Wk8kgXuliFkaKW/view

If the links are blocked in your conversation, this ZIP is intended to be attached as a file; the photographs need not be reconstructed from a transcription.

Dossier 0244 · The Focused Studies · Round 7

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [258]

S10 — Lessons for 10 Tishrei: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

Existing F6 package: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Lk4bLnZeHLNUrudugQuoK32VCs46nccD

Dossier 0342 · The Focused Studies · Round 7

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [377]

S10 — Lessons for 10 Tishrei: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/21/2026

Photograph of תתקנה ,[5672] תער"ב [955]: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1m7RvAYJZ_EB-W0JsX_iLENOHUPvHK77z/view

Dossier 0542 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [407]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S01 — The Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 20

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת

[258] Document 0244: 04_Grok_Bot_F7.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[377] Document 0342: 03_Grok_F7.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[407] Document 0542: IGK20-Earth-R1_03_Sources.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Mode: digital text, marked “not checked”; the unit and its context were examined.

Scope and limit: working text and preceding/concluding context. Not a photograph of print. The package’s working text originates in the text supplied by the user.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S02 — Lessons in Tanya, 11 Tishrei, Hebrew

https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026

Mode: later explanation; read digitally.

Scope and limit: continuous explanation of growth, mazal, returning light, and mayin nukvin. Text and explanation must be separated typographically; not all explanations may be attributed to the Alter Rebbe.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S03 — Lessons in Tanya, 11 Tishrei, English

https://www.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9/22/2026

Mode: later explanation and translated notes; text and notes 48–60 were read.

Scope and limit: verifies the location and references of the user’s notes. The Rebbe’s notes here are in English; the original Hebrew wording was not read in this round. The 1:10 error in note 56 also appears on the website.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S04 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 6, Gloss

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_א_קלח_אינת

Mode: digital text; the gloss was read in context.

Scope and limit: explicit mention of Sefer Gilgulim, chapter 20, alongside Etz Chaim 47:2. Evidence for the reference and investment; not by itself a description of the local returning light.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S05 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 18

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חי_א_קלח_אינת Mode: digital text.

Scope and limit: investment of Chochmah, level within level, in the soul; parallel in note 53, not a quotation of the growth chain.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S06 — The Alter Rebbe, End of Tanya 51

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אנ_א_קלח_אינת

Mode: digital text; the chapter's end and the textual note were read.

Scope and limit: Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah and the investment of levels within it. The transcription contains a textual note concerning Malchut of Yetzirah; the note's attribution and printing require verification.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S07 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 52

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בנ_א_קלח_אינת

Mode: digital text, marked "not checked."

Scope and limit: the Shechinah's investment in general and particular worlds. Useful for the question of ABYA within a world; it does not alone identify every detail here.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S08 — R. Chaim Vital, Etz Chaim, Gate 1, Branch 4

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_ענף/א_רעש/מייח_זעץ

Mode: digital text; orders of igulim/yosher, the endpoint of the feet, and the notes were read.

Scope and limit: a central source for examining the map. Preserve the distinction between text and notes. The account of Asiyah's remoteness and the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet raises a question of correspondence, not an established contradiction.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S09 — R. Chaim Vital, Etz Chaim, Gate 1, Branch 2

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_ענף/א_רעש/מייח_זעץ

Mode: opened and the beginning read; the continuation of the branch is a target for completion.

Scope and limit: discussion of configurations of orders/igulim and comparison of the sefirot to Ein Sof. Do not mark the entire branch as read.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S10 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 48

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/חמ_א_קלח_אינת

Mode: digital text.

Scope and limit: sovev is not location; the relation of concealment and revelation. Also useful for distinguishing a large number from limitlessness.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S11 — The Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 14

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקודש_ד

Mode: digital text.

Scope and limit: parallel for note 58's reference: continual drawing down renewed every year, and its revelation connected with the action of the lower beings.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S12 — The Alter Rebbe, Iggeret HaKodesh 8

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקודש_ח

Mode: digital text.

Scope and limit: direct parallel to the analogy of sowing, charity, mayin nukvin, and revelation in prayer. Does not alone prove the identity of all parallels or the source of "as written elsewhere" here.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S13 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 36

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקודש_לו

Mode: digital text.

Scope and limit: a dwelling in the lower realms and locating the purpose preferentially in this world. A source for examining humanity's purpose, not permission to erase differences in formulation.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S14 — The Alter Rebbe, Tanya 37, Opening and Continuation

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/אגרת_הקודש_לז

Mode: digital text; opening and paragraphs on performing mitzvot read.

Scope and limit: explicit connection between the act of a mitzvah, drawing down light, and physicality. The whole end of the chapter was not required and is not marked as read.

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Source Register — S15 — Genesis 1:11/20/24

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_תישארב

Mode: digital biblical text.

Scope and limit: utterances “Let [the earth] sprout,” “Let [the waters] swarm,” and “Let [the earth] bring forth.” Correction of the reference in note 56 only.

Dossier 0549 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [413]

IGK20-Earth-R2 — Sources and Verification Limits — Status of the User’s Photograph S16

Addition preserved at the end of R1: this is a transcription and documentation of the compiler’s reading, not the photographic file itself. The photograph was seen in the conversation with the user. Heading of p. 414: Notes and Corrections; tentative note. A transcription of relevant lines is in every R2 prompt. At the time, the addendum file said “R2 has not opened”; this is historical status. This package does open R2.

[413] Document 0549: IGK20-Earth-R2_01_Source_Update.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0370 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [480]

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S01	From What Is the Order of Nourishment Learned?	What explains the order of nourishment?	IG20;L7	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S02	Four Levels and Four Elements	Four orders and four elements	IG20;L6; L4;L5;EC	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

[480] Document 0370: COVERAGE-MAP.csv. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S03	The Reversed Order in Etz Chaim	The reversed order in Etz Chaim	EC;L6; L4;MH	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S04	The Inanimate Left Outside the Examples	The inanimate order omitted from the examples	IG20; NOTE61; L7	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S05	Manifestly Higher, Receiving from Below	Higher in manifestation, receiving from below	IG20;L1; L7; NOTE61	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S06	“Is Nourished and Lives” and “Receives Its Vitality from Both”	‘Nourished and lives’ and ‘receives life from both’	IG20;L1; L7	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S07	Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in the Berakhot Passage	Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in Berakhot	BER; IG20;L1; MATZA	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S08	Wheat, Grain, Bread, and Matzah	Wheat, grain, bread, and matzah	VAET;L1; MATZA; BER	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S09	Two Parents in the Quotation, Father in the Parallels	Two parents in the quotation, father in the parallels	BER; IG20;L1; MATZA	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S10	Chochmah and Daat without Binah	Wisdom and daat without binah	IG20;L1; VAET	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S11	What Happened on the Night without Ox Meat?	What happened on the night without ox meat?	BK;IG20;L1	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S12	Why Ox, and Why Two Proofs?	Why ox, and why two proofs?	IG20;BK;L1;ZOH	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S13	Tohu, Refinement, and Returning Light: What Is Connected?	Tohu, refinement, and returning light: what is connected?	IG20;L1;L2;L3;L7;K5	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S14	What Does “For It Is” Refer Back To?	What does ‘for it is’ refer to?	IG20	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S15	Two Occurrences of Returning Light	Two occurrences of returning light	IG20;K5; L2	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S16	What Does “Etc.” Abbreviate?	What does ‘etc.’ abbreviate?	IG20; NOTE61	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S17	Repetition That Applies the Explanation	A repetition that applies the explanation	IG20;L7	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S18	What Is Revealed with Greater Force?	What is revealed with greater intensity?	IG20;L1; L3	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S19	“Good Taste and Knowledge” as a Transitional Sentence	Good discernment and knowledge as a transition	PS119; IG20	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S20	The Human Face and the Human Figure upon the Throne	The human face and the figure above the throne	EZ1;IG20; K5;ZOH	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S21	Interinclusion Does Not Cancel the Role	Inclusion does not erase a particular role	EZ1;ZOH; L3;L6;K4	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S22	Ox for All Animals, Eagle for Birds	Ox for animals, eagle for birds	ZOH; IG20;L6	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S23	The Lion and Human Do Not Disappear from the Zohar	Lion and human remain in the Zohar	ZOH; IG20	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S24	Spirit That Descends, Spirit That Returns	Spirit descending and spirit returning	ZOH; IG20;L3; L2;K4	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S25	Pleasure, Nourishment, and Satisfaction	Enjoyment, nourishment, and sustenance	IG20; ZOH;VAR	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S26	The Same Line or Another Location?	The same line or a different occurrence?	ZOH; VAR; IG20;L3	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S27	What Does ‘As the Wording Precisely Indicates’ Teach?	What does ‘as the wording precisely indicates’ establish?	IG20; ZOH;L3; NOTE61	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S28	The Angels Too Are from Ban — What Is Added to Them?	Angels too are from BAN—what is added to them?	K4;L3;L6;L7	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S29	A Small Sacrifice and Many Recipients	A small sacrifice and many recipients	ZOH;IG20	4	4	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S30	‘All the Above’ Returns the Conclusion to the Entire Epistle	‘All the above’ reconnects the ending to the whole epistle	IG20; CHRON; PROV	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S31	The Advantage of Matter and Commanded Action	Materiality’s advantage and commanded action	IG20;L3; L6;L7;T4	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S32	The Descent of Souls and Revelation Below	Souls descending and revelation below	IG20;L7; L4;T37	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S33	The Advantage of Action Is Not a Single Ladder	The greatness of action is not a single ranking	IG20;L4;L7;T4;T5;T37	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S34	Study Is Greater, Action Is Greater	Study is greater; action is greater	KID;PEAH;T4;T5;T37;L4;L7	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S35	Four Times, Not One ‘Future’	Four settings, not one undifferentiated future	K3;K5;T4;ERUV;AVOT	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S36	Today, to Perform Them	Today, to perform them	DEUT; ERUV;L6; IG20	4	4	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S37	The Two Halves of ‘One Hour Is Better’	The two halves of ‘one hour is better’	AVOT;T4; L6;K4; IG20	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S38	Resonances That Can Be Heard but Not Proved	Resonances that can be heard without being proved	IG20; PS119;L1	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

ID	Hebrew title [translated]	English title [original]	Sources	Hebrew research paragraphs	English research paragraphs	Archive relation
S39	Thus Far We Have Found: The Limit of Transmission	‘Thus far we found’: the limit of transmission	IG20; NOTE61	5	5	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers
S40	The Complete Argument and Its Limits	The complete argument and its limits	IG20;L1; L3;L4;L6; L7	6	6	Fixed 40-question brief; content alignment required for early Bot S numbers

Dossier 0425 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [391]

[391] Document 0425: Initial-Deep-Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — In-Depth Research into Plain Meaning, Kabbalah, and Chasidut — Map of the Passage and the Point Holding It All Together

First, a small technical precision: the passage before us is the conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20, not the conclusion of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. This is also how it appears in Tanya's division and in the daily lesson. In my view, the key to reading the entire paragraph is that these are not several separate examples — inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking, food, grain, meat, chariot, sacrifices, mitzvot — but one chain of proofs. The Alter Rebbe seeks to establish a paradoxical principle:

In the manifest order, the higher is above the lower; but at the root, specifically the very lowest can bear a loftier power, and can therefore nourish, elevate, and complete what is above it.

This is precisely the continuation of what was explained in the preceding paragraphs: at the bottom of Asiyah, especially in the physical element of earth, that radiance reaching the extremity of the order of hishtalshelut shines with particular strength; the kav ends there and shines from there upward in the mode of returning light. The Alter Rebbe previously illustrated this through the vegetative power in the earth, and the superior fruits produced specifically after sowing and planting — raising mayin nukvin by the human being. Hence the structure:

Bottom of Asiyah → returning light → the lower nourishes the higher → the vegetative gives life to the animal → vegetative and animal add knowledge to the speaking → the spirit of animal and bird nourishes supernal angels → hence the advantage of the practical mitzvah performed in physical matter.

This means that the conclusion concerning practical mitzvot is not a new subject. It is the result toward which the whole of Epistle 20 progresses.

This is especially important for understanding the Epistle as a whole. Lessons in Tanya explains that Tanya's previous parts already explained the advantage of practical mitzvot in making "a dwelling in the lower realms" and refining the animal soul; Epistle 20 adds a deeper layer: physicality itself has a higher root in a manner not revealed in the graded spiritual order. From here each detail can be approached.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — Why the Alter Rebbe Moves from "Vitality" to "Chochmah and Daat"

Until "and the speaking receives its vitality from both," one could think the claim merely biological: the body needs calories.

He therefore adds:

"And also wisdom and knowledge."

This is an immense sharpening. Not only does the higher body subsist on lower matter; even the faculties most distinctive of the speaking level, Chochmah and Daat, can receive an addition from the power of food below it. This is precisely the argument the Alter Rebbe needs for the conclusion about returning light. He therefore brings two very different proofs.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — "An Infant Does Not Know How to Call Father and Mother until It Tastes the Taste of Grain"

The source is Berakhot 40a. Within the Tree of Knowledge discussion, Rabbi Yehudah says it was wheat, and the evidence is that an

infant does not attain recognition of "father and mother" until tasting grain. The source note in Lessons in Tanya explicitly specifies Berakhot 40a. The Alter Rebbe's point is not the botanical dispute about the Tree of Knowledge's identity; he extracts the phenomenon from the saying: grain from the vegetative is connected with the appearance of knowledge in the human being.

Why specifically grain?

Because this rabbinic source most sharply presents the appearance of knowledge as dependent on vegetative food. This is not merely "food giving strength"; grain stands at the transition where the infant becomes able to recognize, distinguish, and call by name.

Later Chasidic teachings explicitly state that food can cause an "addition of light" in intellect specifically after refinement. In the Mitteler Rebbe's Torat Chaim, it says that a new intellectual insight, which the person could not have originated earlier, becomes revealed after eating, using the very proof "I had not eaten ox meat." The Tzemach Tzedek's Or HaTorah emphasizes that food itself is below the person before refinement, but after refinement causes an addition of light in the person. This is precisely Epistle 20's structure: low in revelation, high in its root.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — Why "Father and Mother," and Why Both?

At the first level the answer is simple: this is the Sages' own wording, not a new formulation by the Alter Rebbe. He quotes the proof as it stands. But the wording itself has depth. "Father and mother" are not merely two words the infant learns. This is relational recognition: the infant identifies two distinct people, understands its relation to them, and calls each by the appropriate name. This excellently expresses

Daat as recognition and attachment, rather than merely accumulating information.

Of course, in kabbalistic language "Abba" and "Imma" are also designations of Chochmah and Binah. A kabbalistic reader therefore cannot help hearing an additional resonance. But I would be cautious about claiming that the Alter Rebbe says technically here, "father = Chochmah and mother = Binah," since he himself begins "and also Chochmah and Daat," not "Chochmah and Binah." The kabbalistic resonance is real; it need not be the principal plain meaning.

The more inward plain meaning is: tasting grain marks the appearance of human recognition.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — Why Specifically Grain Rather Than Every Food?

Because grain here is not an arbitrary food example. The Sages themselves chose it as a sign of the appearance of knowledge, and even connected it in Berakhot to the Tree of Knowledge. It is therefore perfect for the Alter Rebbe's argument: here is a lower vegetative thing affecting not only "bodily life" but what defines the human being as speaking.

The word "taste" will also matter two lines later, when the Alter Rebbe says "good taste and knowledge." He builds a verbal and conceptual sequence here: actual taste of food → knowledge → "good taste and knowledge."

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — "And I Had Not Yet Eaten Ox Meat"

The second proof differs. Here there is no infant receiving knowledge for the first time; there is a sage who already has intellect, yet eating meat adds clarity or power in study. Lessons in Tanya marks the Talmudic source as Bava Kamma 71a, and Chasidut repeatedly interprets it as an example of lower food bringing additional intellect to a person. This is an important distinction:

Grain shows vegetative → speaking, particularly the appearance of basic knowledge.

Ox meat shows animal → speaking, particularly added depth and clarity in already existing intellect.

The two examples are therefore not duplication. They fit precisely the words preceding them:

"And the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge."

Vegetative and animal: both can nourish the higher power of the speaking. There is even a beautiful literary sequence: "ox meat" leads almost immediately to the "face of the ox" in the chariot. The lower ox's meat nourishes human intellect; the lower animal's spirit will shortly nourish the higher "face of the ox." The same pattern passes from human to angel.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — and How Lower Food Produces Higher Knowledge — What Is the Chasidic Core of the Two Proofs?

Not that food is "wiser" than the human being.

Rather, in food's root there is a power not measured by its manifest level. Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah explicitly explain that food is low before refinement, but after the person refines it, a power is revealed from it that adds to the person himself. This therefore does not contradict the order of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking:

In terms of revelation: speaking > animal > vegetative.

In terms of the hidden root exposed through refinement and elevation: the lower can give the higher something the higher does not produce from itself alone.

This already directly prepares "for it is the aspect of returning light."

Dossier 0532 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [262]

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — Why move from vitality to wisdom and knowledge?

Until 'the speaking human receives vitality from both,' one could think the claim merely biological: the body needs calories. He therefore adds 'and also wisdom and knowledge.' This sharpens the point enormously. Not only is the higher body sustained by lower matter; even the faculties most distinctive of human life can gain from food below it. This is exactly the argument needed for returning light, and explains the two very different proofs.

[262] Document 0532: initial_deep_research_en.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — The infant does not know how to call father and mother until tasting grain

The source is Berakhot 40a. In discussing the Tree of Knowledge, Rabbi Yehudah says it was wheat, adducing the infant's recognition of father and mother after tasting grain. Lessons in Tanya's source note explicitly cites Berakhot 40a. The Alter Rebbe's point is not the botanical dispute over the tree's identity. He extracts the phenomenon: grain from plant life is connected with human understanding's emergence.

Why grain specifically? Because this rabbinic source most sharply presents understanding's emergence as dependent on plant food. It is more than food giving strength: grain stands at the transition where an infant becomes able to recognize, distinguish, and name.

Later Chassidic writings explain that food can add light to the intellect precisely after refinement. In the Mitteler Rebbe's Torat Chaim, new understanding unavailable beforehand is said to appear after eating, using the ox-meat proof itself. The Tzemach Tzedek's Or HaTorah stresses that food is below the person before refinement but adds light afterward. This is exactly the epistle's structure: low in manifestation, high at its root.

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — Why father and mother, and why both?

At the first level, the answer is simple: this is the rabbinic wording, not a new formulation by the Alter Rebbe. Yet the wording itself has depth. Father and mother are not merely two words the infant learns. This is relational recognition: identifying two distinct people, understanding one's relationship to them, and calling each appropriately.

It is an excellent expression of daat as recognition and attachment rather than accumulated information.

In Kabbalah, Abba and Imma also designate Chokhmah and Binah, so a kabbalistic reader inevitably hears another resonance. I would nevertheless hesitate to claim that the Alter Rebbe technically equates father with Chokhmah and mother with Binah here, since his opening says wisdom and knowledge, not wisdom and understanding. The resonance is real, but need not be the main plain meaning. The inner plain meaning is that tasting grain marks the emergence of human recognition.

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — Why grain rather than any food?

Grain is no accidental example. The Sages selected it as a sign of understanding's emergence and linked it to the Tree of Knowledge in Berakhot. It therefore fits the Alter Rebbe's argument perfectly: a lower plant affects not only bodily life but what defines the human as a speaking being.

The word 'taste' will matter two lines later, when the Alter Rebbe says 'good discernment and knowledge.' He builds a verbal and conceptual sequence: literal food taste, understanding, and then good discernment and knowledge.

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — 'I have not yet eaten ox meat'

The second proof differs. This is not an infant receiving understanding for the first time, but a scholar already possessing intellect whose eating meat adds clarity or strength in analysis.

Lessons in Tanya marks the Talmudic source as Bava Kamma 71a, and Chassidic writings repeatedly use it to illustrate lower food adding

intellect. The distinction is important: grain shows plant to human, particularly basic understanding's emergence; ox meat shows animal to human, particularly increased depth and clarity in an existing intellect.

The examples are therefore not redundant. They fit 'the speaking human receives vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge.' Plant and animal can both nourish the human's higher faculty. There is also an attractive literary sequence: ox meat leads almost immediately to the chariot's ox face. The lower ox's meat nourishes human intellect; the lower animal's spirit then nourishes the higher ox face. The same pattern moves from human to angel.

Grain, father and mother, and ox meat—how lower food produces higher understanding — The Chassidic point of both proofs

The food is not wiser than the person. Rather, its root contains a power not measured by its manifested level. Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah explicitly explain that food is lower before refinement but afterward reveals a power adding to the person. This does not contradict the created hierarchy. In manifestation, human is above animal and plant; through the hidden root disclosed in refinement and elevation, the lower can give the higher something it cannot produce alone. This directly prepares 'because it is an aspect of returning light.'

The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — initial deep research in plain meaning, Kabbalah, and Chassidut — Returning light, the encompassing light, and the kav

In my view, your syntactic reading is substantially correct and very important. The sentence explains returning light upward from the

bottom of Asiyah, where an illumination of an illumination from the encompassing infinite light and the kav at the termination of Adam Kadmon's upright feet is revealed with greater force, as explained above.

Returning light, the encompassing light, and the kav — Is the encompassing light itself returning light?

Not in the technical sense used here. The strongest evidence is not syntax alone, but the preceding lines. The prior paragraph explicitly separates the two: below Adam Kadmon's feet the encompassing infinite light shines; then 'also the kav' shines upward as returning light. The encompassing light shines there, while the kav is described as shining there by returning.

Conceptually I would punctuate the sentence as illumination revealed from the bottom of Asiyah: first from the encompassing infinite light, and second from the kav terminating the upright configuration, in the aspect of returning light. The final words attach most directly to the kav.

The encompassing light is not a ray that fell below and now travels upward. 'Encompassing' denotes light not contracted to a vessel and level in the same manner as inward light within the graded order. The return belongs here to the kav reaching the upright order's endpoint and shining upward. The preceding paragraph almost requires this reading.

Returning light, the encompassing light, and the kav — Why call the entire phenomenon returning light at the start?

There are two levels of usage. At the opening, returning light names the phenomenon being explained: why does the lower give vitality to the higher? Because at the lowest point an order of return and ascen-

t operates. The continuation analyzes the mechanism: illumination from the encompassing light and, additionally, the kav at the upright endpoint actually shining as returning light. The first returning light names the result; the second technically describes the kav. This explains the need for both.

Returning light, the encompassing light, and the kav — Why repeat what was already explained?

Without the repetition, the food examples might seem accidental: this is simply how God made digestion. The Alter Rebbe instead presents a reflection of the entire cosmic structure. He briefly repeats the three necessary points: the bottom of Asiyah, encompassing illumination there, and the kav's endpoint and returning light. 'As above' indicates an application of the mechanism just established, not a new kabbalistic topic.

The repetition also prepares the conclusion about mitzvot. Saying merely that lower food sustains the higher human would not establish why a physical mitzvah object touches such a high root. Specifying the encompassing light and kav shows that the reversal is rooted in the structure of development itself, not biology alone.

Returning light, the encompassing light, and the kav — What does 'an illumination of an illumination, etc.' abbreviate?

There is an almost certain solution from the immediate context. The prior paragraph explicitly said 'an illumination of an illumination of an illumination,' associating it with physical earth and ascent through returning light. A few lines later, the abbreviation does not, in its plain meaning, hint at a mysterious missing fourth level. It shortens a phrase just written in full: the threefold illumination.

Your question why he did not write the third ‘illumination’ again is apt, but the abbreviation is stylistically natural: ‘that threefold illumination already discussed.’ It also leaves the expression open to the orders of concealment and illumination already considered, while its immediate expansion is the previously stated third level.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — ‘Through this, good discernment and knowledge will be clearly understood’

This is not an empty flourish. The expression comes from Psalms 119:66, ‘Teach me good discernment and knowledge.’ It closely fits what just occurred. We read ‘tasting the taste of grain’ and ‘also wisdom and knowledge’; now we read ‘good discernment and knowledge.’ The verbal play is difficult to ignore: food taste becomes taste in the sense of explanation, while the knowledge added by food becomes the knowledge through which sacrifice is understood.

Another beautiful resonance is the verse’s continuation, ‘for I believe in Your commandments.’ Two lines later, the Alter Rebbe reaches the great advantage of practical commandments. I would not turn this into proof of a deliberately constructed allusion, but as a literary and Chassidic structure the correspondence is strong: taste, knowledge, commandments.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — What is the chariot here?

The foundation is Ezekiel’s vision: each chariot creature has four faces—human, lion, ox, and eagle. The lion face is to the right, the ox to the left, and the eagle in the other direction; kabbalistic sources explain the faces as spiritual aspects. One mistaken picture must therefore be corrected: an ox face need not mean an angel appearing only

as an ox, nor is the eagle face a separate giant bird. The vision itself involves mutual inclusion, with several faces in each creature.

Kabbalistic sources deepen this. Or HaChammah on the Zohar says the human face is principal and the other aspects are included in it. Ox, lion, and eagle are modes of manifestation within a combined structure, not four sealed worlds. This answers your question about inclusion: containing other aspects does not contradict the designation 'ox face.' The name identifies the dominant aspect serving as root for a particular branch, not the exclusion of everything else.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — Why not the lion face?

The example concerns altar offerings of domestic animals and birds. The ox face roots the sacrificial animals, and the eagle face the birds. Lion belongs to another aspect of the chariot, without a corresponding branch of wild animals offered in the category discussed here. It is therefore unnecessary for this particular argument.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — Why a human face, if humans are above animals?

We must not simply project the earthly hierarchy onto the higher chariot. The human face there is not a physical person standing beside a physical ox. It is a higher aspect of human form, described in some sources as the principal inclusive aspect containing the other faces. There is no contradiction between physical humans being above animals and the higher chariot containing human, lion, ox, and eagle faces. These are parallel but nonidentical systems.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — What does it mean for angels to be nourished by the sacrificial spirit?

Certainly it does not mean angels need smoke or meat as calories. The Alter Rebbe specifies the animal and bird spirit ascending to them from the offerings. This is the animal's spiritual vitality, elevated through sacrificial service from its lower to its higher root.

The Zohar describes the ox face as the source of spirit extending to sacrificial animals; when that vitality is refined and ascends, it returns to a higher origin associated with the chariot angels.

This resembles human eating: lower food is refined within a person and adds to that person; a lower animal is refined in sacrifice, ascends to its root, and adds to an angel.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — 'Greatly enjoy, are nourished, and are supplied'

I found no sound basis for converting these three verbs into three sefirot or technical levels, and would not impose such a reading. In the more precise Chassidic plain meaning, they accumulate: enjoyment means delight in the illumination; nourishment means it becomes an influx of vitality; being supplied means it provides the required influx.

The Alter Rebbe moves beyond angels being pleased at the sight of a sacrifice toward an essential relation: the lower actually supplies the higher. Why 'greatly'? Because it is not an alien influx. This leads to the Zohar's crucial precision.

Good discernment and knowledge, the chariot, ox and eagle, and nourishing angels — 'They enjoy from their foundation and root'

The simple translation is: 'They enjoy from their foundation and root.' This adds something decisive. Without these words, we might say the higher angel receives an addition from the lower animal. The Zohar makes a bolder statement: when the animal spirit rises, the angel receives from its own foundation and root. The lower animal conceals something reaching the higher angel's deeper root.

This is what the Alter Rebbe has established throughout the epistle: something lower as a branch may reach above the branch standing higher, because its root is not measured by its position in the visible order. Hence 'according to the precise wording of the holy Zohar.' Enjoyment alone is insufficient; the decisive point is that it comes from their own root.

Incidentally, the source research reveals a small inconsistency in the reference: the online Lessons in Tanya note shows 'III, 341a,' while another Chabad source explicitly cites Zohar III, 241a. For locating the passage, 241a is the useful reference.

Dossier 0571 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or testimony from the history of the research [481]

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions

September 23, 2026. Identifiers and questions are preserved from the research map. "Supported" does not mean every possible in-

[481] Document 0571: IGK20-Finale-Close_S_STATUS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

terpretation was excluded; an open detail does not require another round. Sources and reading statuses are detailed in the main report.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S01 — Preferred Reading

Question: What does “And from this” refer back to, and what does “will be well understood” add?

Determination: the advantage of the lowest point in the earth unit is applied to nourishment and knowledge. Sowing and raising mayin nukvin are part of the context, not necessarily the sole referent of “from this.”

Sources: Epistle, near its conclusion.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S02 — Supported; Detail Open

Question: What is the inward connection of each of the four pairs of inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking/elements, even though water itself is inanimate?

Determination: all four pairs are explicit in Pinchas §3; water, fire, and air are explained. Earth is given without a separate reason. “Aspects” are not an identity of matter with a type of created being.

Sources: L6 §3; L4 §1.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S03 — Supported Difference; Proposed Reconciliation

Question: Why earth–water–fire–air in this order; how does it differ from other kabbalistic orders?

Determination: Etz Chaim’s animal–air/speaking–fire versus the Epistle’s animal–fire/speaking–air. Compositional portions versus

characterization of levels is a possible reconciliation; no explicit bridge found.

Sources: Etz Chaim 50:10; L4; L6.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S04 — Partial

Question: Why is the inanimate omitted from the nourishment examples, including water and salt; what precisely does note 61 resolve?

Determination: note 61: “It”=the animal; omission of earth in parentheses, and dependence after creation qualified. L7 includes the inanimate in foods. The chain is not exhaustive; the reason for the omission is undecided.

Sources: note 61 EN; L7.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S05 — Supported

Question: What does “above” mean, and what does the higher’s dependence on the lower teach?

Determination: above in the level of manifest vitality and knowledge; an addition from the lower does not reverse the ranking in every respect.

Sources: Epistle; L1.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S06 — Preferred Syntactic Interpretation

Question: Why “is nourished and lives” versus “receives its vitality,” and why “from both”?

Determination: “is nourished and lives” presents dependence for existence; Chochmah and Daat are added in the human being. “From

both”: vegetative and animal, exemplified by grain and meat. No proved sefirah division in the verbs.

Sources: Epistle; L1 §2.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S07 — Supported

Question: What is the context and precise wording of the grain saying in Berakhot?

Determination: Berakhot 40a: Rabbi Yehudah, wheat as the Tree of Knowledge, calling father and mother after tasting grain.

Sources: Berakhot 40a.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S08 — Supported within the Parallel’s Limits

Question: Why specifically grain; what distinguishes wheat, grain, bread, tasting, and eating?

Determination: Va’etchanan §5 assigns wheat’s root specifically to Daat of Tohu. Wheat, grain, bread, matzah, and tasting must not be interchanged in every detail.

Sources: Va’etchanan §5; L1; Matzah Zo (“This Matzah”) §2.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S09 — Supported Wording; Interpretation Open

Question: Why “father and mother” here versus “father” in the parallels; what is proved concerning Abba and Imma?

Determination: the Epistle preserves father and mother; L1 and Matzah Zo use father. No focused witness interprets the two names as Abba and Imma in the Epistle’s sentence.

Sources: Berakhot; Epistle; L1.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S10 — Limit of Knowledge

Question: Why “Chochmah and Daat” without Binah; is there a mapping to the two examples?

Determination: no evidence for dividing grain=Daat and meat=Chochmah, or explaining Binah’s omission through the two examples.

Sources: the body of parallels examined.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S11 — Supported

Question: What do the meat passage, Rashi, and Tosafot say, and how do they relate to the Epistle’s wording?

Determination: the source is 72a, with context from 71b. “דלא אכלי” (“because I did not eat”) differs from the Epistle’s wording; Rashi: lack of precision; Tosafot: fasting. L1 explicitly concerns an addition to the power of intellect.

Sources: Bava Kamma 72a; L1 §2.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S12 — Partial

Question: Why specifically ox meat, and why are both examples needed together?

Determination: the two examples fulfill “from both,” vegetative and animal. No species-specific reason for ox was found beyond quoting the Talmudic discussion.

Sources: Epistle; L1.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S13 — Supported Parallels; Identity Unproved

Question: How do food's root, refinement, Tohu, and Tikkun connect to returning light — is there an explicit bridge?

Determination: L1: Tohu and refinement; L7: Sag/Mah; L3: sacrifices and Tohu's lights; L2: future returning light. No explicit identification with the kav's return at Adam Kadmon's endpoint.

Sources: L1–L3; L7; Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S14 — Preferred Reading

Question: What does "for it is" refer to; what is returning light at the sentence's beginning?

Determination: "for it is" summarizes the whole phenomenon; food is a possible subject. Returning light at the sentence's beginning explains nourishment upward.

Sources: Epistle and its context.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S15 — Strong Preferred Reading

Question: Analyze "which is revealed… from the light… and from the kav… in the mode of returning light"; what is attributed to sovev and what to kav?

Determination: "is revealed": the radiance. Sovev and kav are sources of radiance; the last returning light attaches to the kav according to "as above" and the earth unit.

Sources: Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S16 — Partial

Question: What is included in “a radiance of a radiance, etc.,” and why abbreviate here?

Determination: “etc.” refers to the earlier description of radiance; undecided whether it abbreviates only one additional “of a radiance” or a broader sequence. No proved fourth level.

Sources: Epistle; Lessons.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S17 — Contextual Interpretation

Question: Why repeat details of the endpoint of yosher and kav after they were explained?

Determination: repetition applies the earlier explanation to nourishment and knowledge; details of kav and lowest point are a reason, not merely an address.

Sources: Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S18 — Supported

Question: What is revealed “with greater force” — power, light, vitality, knowledge — and what is the connection to earth?

Determination: syntactically the radiance is revealed with greater force. In the earth context its strength and ability are visible; later vitality and knowledge are explained as results of the relation.

Sources: Epistle.

Dossier 0372 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [263]

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot

Time: 2026-09-23 ~12:14–12:30pm ET

Limit: concluding unit only; Earth R1–R4 / the ZON-union file was not reopened.

2. Text of the Unit (P1) — Witnesses Opened — 2.2 Independent Reading of the Unit (According to Wikisource / abc770)

And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, and air: although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge, for an infant does not know how to call “father” and “mother” until it tastes the taste of grain, etc., and “I had not yet eaten ox meat,” etc., for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light as above. And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge, how the supernal angels in the chariot, the face of the ox and face of the eagle, greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied from the spirit of the animal and bird rising to them from the sacrifices upon the altar, and as is precise in the holy Zohar’s wording, “And they derive plea-

[263] Document 0372: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

sure from their foundation and root." After these words and this truth, knowledge comes easily to the discerning, to understand through all the above the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world, as written, "today, to perform them," and "One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come." (Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting):

2. Text of the Unit (P1) — Witnesses Opened — 2.3 Points for Examination (P1)

Item	Finding	Classification
Order of elements	Earth, water, fire, air (not א"מ"ע in a different alphabetic order) versus inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking	Explicit in the text
Abba and imma	«אבא ואמא» / «אבא ואימא» ("father and mother," alternate spellings) in the Sages' source	Explicit
And I had not yet eaten	Present in the text	Explicit
Are nourished and are supplied	Present	Explicit
From their foundation and root	«ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון» ("and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root"; spelling variants: /ועקרא ועיקרא)	Explicit
Thus far	In parentheses in digital witnesses; not part of the discourse itself	Later explanation / printers' note — see section 7

3. Lessons Notes / Lessons 61–67 (P2) — Note 62 — Berakhot 40a

Explicit. Rabbi Yehudah: «An infant does not know how to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain.»

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב

3. Lessons Notes / Lessons 61–67 (P2) — Note 63 — Bava Kamma

Correction: not 71a. The wording «דלא אכלי בשרא דתורא» (“because I did not eat ox meat”) passes from the end of 71b to the beginning of 72a.

Rashi 72a: «Because I did not eat ox meat — I did not precisely examine the matter’s reason.» Tosafot: «Because I did not eat ox meat. He was fasting.»

If a Lessons witness prints «71a» — a witness error relative to Vilna p rint/Wikisource.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 4. The Sages (P3) — Wording Table

Source	The Sages’ wording	Iggeret HaKodesh’s wording	Note
Berakhot 40a	«An infant does not know how to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain» (אבא ואמא)	«An infant does not know how to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain, etc.» (אבא ואימא)	Almost word for word; Iggeret HaKodesh: «ואימא»
Bava Kamma 72a	«דלא אכלי בשרא דתורא» (“because I did not eat ox meat”)	«ועדיין לא אכילנא בישרא דתורא כו׳» (“and I had not yet eaten ox meat, etc.”)	Iggeret HaKodesh adds «ועדיין» (“and not yet”) and «אכילנא» (first person, as in the story)

Bava Kamma context (brief): Rav Nachman retracts from night to morning and explains that he did not answer because he had not eaten ox meat — Rashi: he was not precise; Tosafot: he was fasting. Use in Iggeret HaKodesh: an example that intellect/knowledge too depends on food (returning light from below).

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 7. «Thus Far We Have Found in His Holy Handwriting» (P7)

Question	Finding
Who wrote it?	Printers'/editors' note (parenthetical in witnesses); does not appear to be the wording of the Epistle's text
When was it printed?	Appears in standard Tanya editions (digital editions opened); first printing not examined in the round
What must not be inferred?	Do not establish the Epistle's completeness/incompleteness solely from this sentence; do not establish an absolute manuscript boundary without manuscript evidence

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 8. P6 — Search for Loci

Verbal search ("inanimate vegetative animal speaking" + "earth water fire air"; grain/father–mother):

- The explicit correspondence vegetative–animal–speaking ↔ earth–water–fire–air is found in Iggeret HaKodesh 20 itself.
- Earlier claims about Torah Or / Or HaTorah without a verified quotation — not verified.
- No additional exact Alter Rebbe/Tzemach Tzedek locus was found in this round mapping the four pairs or the uniqueness of grain/father–mother outside this unit (and Berakhot 40a).

Dossier 0373 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [264]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot

Witnesses, what was read, limits, locations.

[264] Document 0373: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — Working Rules

- OCR only for locating; quotations checked against a witness.
- Do not call it “side b” without examination; no assumption of a fixed offset.
- Classification: explicit / reasoned interpretation / later explanation / possibility / open.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — C. Talmud and Commentators

Source	URL	Read	Notes
Berakhot 40a	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב	Yes + Rashi/Tosafot on the page	Grain / father and mother
Bava Kamma 71b	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_אע_אמק_אבב	Yes	End of the story; transition to «because I did not eat»
Bava Kamma 72a	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב	Yes + Rashi/Tosafot	«Because I did not eat ox meat»
Eruvin 22a	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בכ_ן'יבורע	Yes	«Today, to perform them»
Avot 4:17	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ז'_ד_תובא_הנשמ	Yes	One hour is better…

Vilna print PDF: not opened; reliance on Wikisource (standard print in digital form).

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — F. P6 Searches

Query	Result
Vegetative, animal, speaking + earth water fire air	Explicitly appears in Iggeret HaKodesh 20; general encyclopedias without an exact verified locus
Grain / father–mother in the Alter Rebbe outside 20	Not located in the round (beyond Berakhot 40a as the rabbinic source)

Query	Result
Torah Or / Or HaTorah (earlier claims)	Not verified — no quotation with a page

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — H. Drive

- Parent Earth: 1ptqHOycgA–ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk
- Bot folder: IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot → id 1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc

Dossier 0374 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [482]

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context

Short precise transcript; interpretation separated from text.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 1. Text of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — Concluding Unit

Witness: Wikisource, Tanya Part IV 20 / abc770

Type: the Epistle's text (digital)

And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, and air,

although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge,

[482] Document 0374: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

for an infant does not know how to call “father” and “mother” until it tastes the taste of grain, etc.,

and “I had not yet eaten ox meat,” etc.,

for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah,

where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds,

and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light as above.

And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge, how the supernal angels in the chariot, the face of the ox and face of the eagle,

greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied from the spirit of the animal and bird rising to them (עליהם) from the sacrifices upon the altar,

and as is precise in the holy Zohar’s wording, “And they derive pleasure from their foundation and root.”

After these words and this truth, knowledge comes easily to the discerning, to understand through all the above

the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls’ descent into this physical world, as written, “today, to perform them,” and “One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.”

(Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting):

Separation: the final parenthetical line = printer’s/editor’s note, not a proved part of the Alter Rebbe’s own text.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 2. Berakhot 40a

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב

Context: discussion of the tree from which Adam, the first man, ate; Rabbi Yehudah says wheat.

Text:

Rabbi Yehudah says it was wheat, for an infant does not know how to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain.

Rashi (brief): «An infant does not know how to call father and mother — and this is called the Tree of Knowledge.»

Separate interpretation: Iggeret HaKodesh uses this wording as evidence that Chochmah and Daat depend on grain food (returning light) — this is a reasoned interpretation of the Epistle's treatment of the saying, not Rashi's explanation.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 3. Bava Kamma — End of 71b / Beginning of 72a

URLs:

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_אע_אמק_אבב

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב

End of 71b (context):

…And the reason I did not tell you in the evening

Beginning of 72a:

is that I did not eat ox meat. But then, what is the difference between the first clause and the last clause…

Rashi: «Because I did not eat ox meat — I did not precisely examine the matter's reason.»

Tosafot: «Because I did not eat ox meat. He was fasting.»

Witness correction: not «71a» but 71b→72a.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 8. Note 61 EN (Later Explanation) — As Supplied in the Prompt

Status: not opened in Hebrew in this round; supplied here solely as a secondary witness from the prompt.

“[It is superior] also with regard to its creation; ‘nevertheless, [it] is nourished…[by the vegetative].’

(This enables us to understand why the element of Earth is not mentioned here, for everything comes from the Earth.

It may likewise be said that for this reason, even after having been created, [everything] depends on it and is nourished by it.)”

Internal separation:

- «nevertheless…nourished» ≈ the Epistle’s text.
- «This enables us…» / «It may likewise be said…» = “it may be said” / a possibility of the later commentator.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 9. K3 / K4

Not read. No transcript. See SOURCE_LEDGER §E.

Dossier 0375 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [483]

[483] Document 0375: TABLES_S01_S40_A01_A18.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Tables S01–S40 and A01–A18

Witness status for each question. «Not examined in depth in this round» where reading is insufficient.

Tables S01–S40 and A01–A18 — S01–S40 (Questions of Evidence / Wording / Source)

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S01	Identifying the concluding unit in a printed witness	Partial	Digital only; print not obtained	Open for print

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S02	Sequence from «And from this will be understood» to «Thus far»	Examined	Continuous in WS/ abc770	Explicit
S03	Order earth water fire air	Examined	Identical in Hebrew witnesses	Explicit
S04	Correspondence of inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking to elements	Examined	«Which are the aspects of earth…»	Explicit
S05	«Although the animal… nevertheless is nourished»	Examined	Present	Explicit
S06	Speaking receives from both	Examined	Present	Explicit
S07	Also wisdom and knowledge	Examined	Present	Explicit
S08	Father and mother / grain	Examined	Berakhot 40a + text	Explicit
S09	And I had not yet eaten…	Examined	Bava Kamma 72a + text	Explicit
S10	Returning light from below upward	Examined	In the text	Explicit

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S11	Bottom of Asiyah with greater force	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S12	A radiance of a radiance from encompassing Ein Sof light	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S13	Kav at the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet of yosher	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S14	Angels, faces of ox and eagle	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S15	Derive pleasure, are nourished, are supplied	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S16	Spirit of animal and bird from sacrifices	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S17	From their foundation and root	Examined	Zohar 241a	Explicit

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S18	Does the Zohar end there?	Examined	No — lion + human	Explicit
S19	Practical mitzvot as purpose of descent	Examined	In the text	Explicit
S20	Today, to perform them	Examined	Deuteronomy 7:11 / Eruvin 22a	Explicit
S21	One hour is better…	Examined	Avot 4:17	Explicit
S22	Note "Thus far we have found"	Examined digitally	Parentheses; printer?	Later explanation
S23	Note 61 HE	Not opened	EN from prompt only	Later explanation / HE unverified
S24	Note 62, Berakhot 40a	Examined	Matches	Explicit
S25	Note 63, Bava Kamma 71a	Examined	Incorrect → 72a	Witness correction
S26	Note 64, Numbers 28:2	Zohar context examined	At the opening of Zohar 240a	Reasoned interpretation
S27	Note 65, Zohar 341	Examined	Incorrect → 241a	Witness correction

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S28	Note 66, Eruvin	Examined	Matches	Explicit
S29	Note 67, Avot 4:17	Examined	Numbering correct	Explicit
S30	K3, Tziyon 5735, 14–15	Not opened	Cloudflare	Not examined in depth in this round
S31	K4, Machatzit 5723	Not opened	Cloudflare	Not examined in depth in this round
S32	Vegetative–animal–speaking/elements locus outside 20	Search	Not located in the round	Not located in the round
S33	Grain/father locus outside 20 + Berakhot	Search	Not located in the round	Not located in the round
S34	Early Tanya printing for conclusion	Not obtained	—	Not examined in depth in this round
S35	Photograph of printed Zohar	Not obtained	WS transcript only	Not examined in depth in this round

ID	Topic (summary)	Witness status	Brief finding	Classification
S36	Printed Lessons Vol.4	Not obtained	HB only Vol.1	Not examined in depth in this round
S37	Variant ועקרא/ועיקרא (“and root,” spelling)	Examined	Zohar: עקרא; Iggeret HaKodesh: עיקרא	Explicit as a minor variant
S38	«Rises upon them» (עולה עליהם) / «to them» (אליהם)	Examined	WS/abc: «עליהם»	Explicit in witness
S39	Early Tanya print	Not obtained	Did not delay package	Not examined in depth in this round
S40	Continuous plain reading	Performed	See REPORT §9	—

Tables S01–S40 and A01–A18 — A01–A18 (Hypotheses — Only Where a Source Can Confirm/Refute)

ID	Hypothesis (summary)	Can a source do so?	Result	Classification
A01	Order of elements directed toward inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking	Yes — text	Confirmed as explicit in text	Explicit
A02	Animal «higher» yet nourished by vegetative = returning light	Yes — text	Confirmed as the Epistle's wording	Explicit
A03	Grain imparts knowledge as proof of returning light	Partial	Rabbinic saying explicit; its use in the Epistle = reasoned interpretation	Reasoned interpretation
A04	Ox meat = same proof	Partial	Saying explicit; application in the Epistle = reasoned interpretation	Reasoned interpretation
A05	Earth is «missing» from the element list here because all is from it	Not from the Alter Rebbe's text	Only note 61 EN («it may be said»)	Later explanation / possibility
A06	Fixed vegetative–animal–speaking↔elements mapping in another Alter Rebbe source	Search	Not verified / not located in the round	Not verified

ID	Hypothesis (summary)	Can a source do so?	Result	Classification
A07	Ox/eagle angels nourished by sacrifice, as the Zohar plainly states	Yes	Confirmed in Zohar + Epistle quotation	Explicit
A08	«From foundation and root» = intentional verbal precision	Yes	The Epistle stresses «as is precise in the wording»	Explicit (Epistle's emphasis)

ID	Hypothesis (summary)	Can a source do so?	Result	Classification
A09	Practical mitzvot = conclusion of entire Epistle	Yes — text	Explicit at the conclusion	Explicit
A10	Grain/father–mother specificity in an additional Chabad source	Search	Not verified	Not verified
A11	Zohar adds lion and human after the quotation	Yes — 241a	Confirmed	Explicit
A12	Epistle deliberately omitted lion/human to fit a system	No decisive source	Requires interpretation	Open
A13	“Thus far we have found” = end of the Alter Rebbe’s manuscript	Partial	Digital printer’s note; no manuscript	Possibility / do not infer from it alone
A14	Tziyon 5735 reinforces «action is greater»	K3 not opened	Not verified in the round	Not verified
A15	Machatzit 5723: angels/refined	K4 not opened	Not verified in the round	Not verified
A16	71a error in Lessons	Partial	Correct source 72a; Lessons witness not opened	Target correction
A17	341a error in Lessons	Partial	Target 241a; Lessons witness not opened	Target correction
A18	Numbers 28:2 belongs to the Epistle’s text	No	Not in this unit’s text; belongs to Zohar’s framework	Reasoned interpretation of note

Note: conceptual disagreements not decided by a witness = «requires interpretation». No new ruling in the Alter Rebbe’s name.

Dossier 0376 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or testimony from the history of the research [484]

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Variants

Concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. No invention of wording from a site's grammar.

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Variants — Base Witness for Comparison

Wikisource, Tanya Part IV 20 + abc770 article_node_2383 (mutual comparison).

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Variants — Table of Observed Variants

Location	Wikisource / abc770	EN (1029342)	Reading note
Unit heading	«Order of levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking»	"order of levels…inorganic, vegetative, animal and articulate"	Translation, not a Hebrew variant
Elements	«Earth water fire air»	"earth, water, fire, and air"	Same order
Father/ mother	«אבא ואימא»	"father and mother"	Wikisource/abc: ואימא; Berakhot: ואמא
Grain	«Until it tastes the taste of grain, etc.»	"until it has tasted grain"	Identical
Meat	«And I had not yet eaten ox meat, etc.»	"I had not yet eaten the meat of oxen"	Identical in principle
Are nourished	«Greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied»	"derive great enjoyment, and are nurtured and content"	Identical

[484] Document 0376: VARIANTS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Location	Wikisource / abc770	EN (1029342)	Reading note
Zohar	«ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון» (“and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root”)	“from their element and essence”	In Zohar on Wikisource: «מיסודא ועקרא דלהון» (עקרא without yud)

Location	Wikisource / abc770	EN (1029342)	Reading note
Thus far	(Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting):	“Until here we found of his holy writing.”	Parentheses in the digital Hebrew

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Variants — Variants Not Invented

- Sites’ punctuation/abbreviations («כ”ע», «א”ק», «עוה”ז» — all worlds, Adam Kadmon, this world): standard abbreviation, not a change in meaning.
- Order earth–water–fire–air verified in two Hebrew witnesses; no witness with another order in this round.

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Variants — The «Thus Far» Note

Appears as a footnote/parentheses in digital witnesses. No manuscript examined.

Classification: later explanation / printer’s note until proved otherwise.

Dossier 0405 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [446]

[446] Document 0405: IGK20-Finale-R1-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Compiler's Review and Additional Sources

September 23, 2026. Concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: from "And from this will be understood" to the note "Thus far we have found." This is a review of the three Finale-R1 reports supplied in the conversation, with additional independent examination. It is not a booklet, does not change the original reports, and does not automatically open R2. The Earth and union dossiers were not reopened.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Compiler's Review and Additional Sources — 1. Review Conclusion

R1 advanced the investigation of the Zohar and the relationship between Torah and action, but did not complete all the specific questions. The present examination added two Alter Rebbe sources on grain and corrected the attribution of the correspondence to Etz Chaim. Distinguish a source not read, a question investigated and left open, and an interpretation supported by evidence but not explicit.

The boundary between the Epistle's text and later explanation is preserved. Even a later source explicitly interpreting the Epistle is important interpretive evidence; it is not the Alter Rebbe's wording.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Compiler's Review and Additional Sources — 2. Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal, Speaking and the Elements — Substantive Correction to S02–S03

The text of Etz Chaim, gate 50, chapter 10, was opened in the Wikisource digital version, marked there "not checked." Its correspondence is not identical to the Epistle's:

Level	Iggeret HaKodesh 20, supplied wording	Etz Chaim 50:10
Inanimate	Earth	Earth
Vegetative	Water	Water
Animal	Fire	Air
Speaking	Air	Fire

This Etz Chaim passage therefore does not verify all four pairs of the Epistle. Grok's mixed reference "Mishnat Chasidim / Etz Chaim gate 50" requires separation. Mishnat Chasidim's text was not read in this examination.

Nevertheless, the chapter provides a positive basis for an answer: it distinguishes elements from creatures composed of them and attributes the levels to portions within each element. Physical water is not classified as a plant here. This helps with "water too is inanimate"; it does not explain why the Epistle places animal opposite fire and speaking opposite air. The proposal to distinguish yosher and igulim is not proved by the source read.

Source: Etz Chaim 50:10.

3. Grain and Knowledge — Two Primary Sources Added — א [1]. Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan

In "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'And You Shall Know Today' "), section 5, it says: "Wheat's root is in the aspect of Daat of Tohu." The food analogy explains how something below the person in its manifest state adds knowledge through its root. The continuation compares this to Torah invested in physical matters.

This is real evidence for wheat's distinctiveness in the context of knowledge and the advantage of food's root. It advances beyond repeating the infant saying in the Gemara. It does not by itself identify

Daat of Tohu with the kav's returning light in the Epistle, and does not divide grain=Daat and meat=Chochmah.

Source read digitally: Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, the aforementioned discourse, section 5. The section number was identified in sequence; no photograph of a printed page was examined.

3. Grain and Knowledge — Two Primary Sources Added — ב [2]. Likkutei Torah, Tzav

In "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' "), section 2, the infant saying explains the mochin of Abba in matzah. Recognition of the father is not presented as a developed intellectual understanding of fatherhood; it explains knowledge above apprehended knowledge, drawn down in immaturity.

This is a positive source for using "father" in a particular kabbalistic context. It also requires qualifying the earlier explanation that the infant already understands its relation to its parents. There is still no explicit explanation here for preserving "father and mother" in the Epistle, nor evidence that both words there necessarily intend the partzufim Abba and Imma.

Source read in full text: Likkutei Torah, Matzah Zo ("This Matzah").

3. Grain and Knowledge — Two Primary Sources Added — ג [3]. Meat

The reports and Bot's file document the difference between the Gemara's and the Epistle's wording. The change alone does not establish that the Alter Rebbe deliberately changed the Talmudic passage's plain meaning. Rashi and Tosafot supply a context of study and fasting; this still does not resolve the advantage of specifically ox meat.

Nor should it be said that the connection between meat and intellect arose only in Lessons: the Epistle itself joins the meat proof to Chochmah and Daat. The later explanation interprets the proof's function.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Compiler's Review and Additional Sources — 8. Status of Questions S01–S40

"Supported" does not mean every verbal precision was decided. "Open" does not claim there is no source.

ID	Status after review
S01	"And from this": application of the preceding explanation; precise reference limits remain interpretive.
S02	Etz Chaim 50:10 added: explains aspects and composition, but does not verify the entire Epistle order.
S03	Animal–fire and speaking–air versus Etz Chaim's reverse order: open; yosher/igulim unproved.
S04	Omission of inanimate: note 61 helps; Hebrew source and water/salt not exhausted.

ID	Status after review
S05	Superiority in the created order versus dependence on nourishment: a supported plain-meaning distinction.
S06	"Is nourished and lives" / "receives its vitality": verbal difference undecided.
S07	Berakhot 40a: grain source documented in reports; do not turn it into an experimental claim.
S08	Explicit source added for grain and Daat of Tohu in Likkutei Torah.
S09	Source added for father in matzah; reason for father and mother in the Epistle still open.
S10	Chochmah and Daat without Binah: no proved mapping to the two examples.
S11	Bava Kamma 72a and wording difference documented; significance of difference unproved.
S12	Why specifically ox meat: not exhausted.

ID	Status after review
S13	Connection between wheat's root and knowledge added; precise bridge to returning light still missing.
S14	"For it is" as the higher's nourishment from the lower: preferred interpretation.
S15	"Is revealed" refers to radiance; returning light at the end attaches to the kav.
S16	"Etc." as the third radiance: supported by later explanation; reason for abbreviation open.
S17	Repeating the mechanism as a new application: plausible, not exhaustive explanation of every wording.
S18	"With greater force" in nourishing knowledge and angels: do not equate without discussion with revelation of the vegetative power.
S19	Good taste and knowledge: possible literary connection; intention of allusion unproved.
S20	Sources added for the chariot and distinguishing the human in the chariot from the human upon the throne.
S21	Interinclusion of faces is in the Zohar; details not exhausted.

ID	Status after review
S22	Ox–animal and eagle–bird: supported; not identification of every physical species with a single configuration.
S23	Lion and human participate in Zohar; the Epistle's choice of two explained by the example's scope.
S24	The spirit's descent and return in sacrifice are explicit in Zohar.
S25	Derive pleasure/are nourished/are supplied: no proved mapping to three levels.
S26	Quotation at 241a; variation between two occurrences is not by itself variation among witnesses.
S27	Foundation in this world nourishes higher beings, without canceling the spirit's higher source.
S28	K4 distinguishes refined/not yet refined; explicit later explanation.
S29	Zohar's candle analogy answers the quantitative difficulty; no need to invent a physical mechanism.
S30	Concluding expressions and limits of "all the above" not exhausted.

ID	Status after review
S31	Transition to mitzvot requires commanded action, not physicality alone; interpretation of the sequence partly supported.
S32	Purpose of descent and a dwelling in the lower realms: explanatory combination; no identification of “elsewhere.”
S33	Advantage of practical mitzvot is not an absolute ranking of every aspect of Torah and mitzvot.
S34	Tanya 4 read and added as a direct anchor; rest of the Torah-study discussion not exhausted.
S35	K3: action is greater in the days of Mashiach; do not extend to every meaning of the future.
S36	Eruvin 22a documented in Bot; does not make distinctions of times and concepts unnecessary.
S37	“One hour is better”: Tanya 4 is a direct source; do not transfer the mishnah “All Israel” into it.

ID	Status after review
S38	Ox meat→ox face: possible resonance, not proved editorial intent.
S39	Thus far: transmission note; early print and manuscript not examined. A reference for the Piena tradition was located.
S40	A qualified continuous explanation can be written; do not claim every question is resolved.

Dossier 0406 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [265]

Working Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1

This is a first round on the final unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 in Tanya, from “And from this will be well understood the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal, and speaking” to the note “Thus

[265] Document 0406: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

far we have found in his holy handwriting." It is the last research unit before work on a comprehensive booklet. We are not now requesting a booklet, popular survey, or another research proposal: perform independent research now and submit a report with positive answers as far as sources permit, and where there is no reconciliation, a precise open question. No confirmation with us is needed before beginning.

All necessary input appears in this prompt: text, context, all questions, previous research summary, preparatory corrections, sources, and your task. There is no dependence on an additional file, previous conversation, or another model's report. Links are targets for reading and verification, not substitutes for the questions or context here. Obtaining a Drive package is not required to begin.

Goal: explain the plain meaning of every detail and connection in the Epistle through the Alter Rebbe's wording and sources from the Sages, Kabbalah, and Chasidut. The user also requests new questions, contradictions, and parallels you find. No need to prove in advance that everything is reconciled or every expression a separate mystery. Earlier research helps but does not bind your conclusions. Ending an investigation with a substantiated difficulty is preferable to an unsourced reconciliation.

Working Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1 — א [1]. Complete Working Text of the Unit

The following is the working wording supplied in the conversation, without vowel points and with some abbreviations expanded. It is not a diplomatic transcription of print; variants and punctuation must be examined as needed. Do not correct it silently.

"And from this will be well understood the order of the levels: inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, air; although the animal is above the vegetative, and the

speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished by and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and also wisdom and knowledge, for an infant does not know how to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain, etc., and I had not yet eaten ox meat, etc., for it is the aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force from the Ein Sof light encompassing all worlds, and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the endpoint of the feet of yosher of Adam Kadmon, in the mode of returning light, as mentioned above.

And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge, how the supernal angels in the chariot, the face of the ox and face of the eagle, greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied from the spirit of the animal and bird rising to them (אליהם) from the sacrifices upon the altar, and as is precise in the holy Zohar's wording: 'And they derive pleasure from their foundation and root.'

After these words and this truth, knowledge comes easily to the discerning, to understand through all the aforementioned the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world, as written: 'today, to perform them,' and 'One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.'

Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting."

א [1]. Complete Working Text of the Unit — Notes Supplied with the Passage — For Examination, Not Automatic Adoption

1. The Rebbe's note in English, as supplied: "[It is superior] also with regard to its creation; 'nevertheless, [it] is nourished…[by the vegetative].' (This enables us to understand why the element of Earth

is not mentioned here, for everything comes from the Earth. It may likewise be said that for this reason, even after having been created, [everything] depends on it and is nourished by it.)" Locate the Hebrew source and distinguish a determination from "it may be said" / a proposal. Do not attribute this note to the Alter Rebbe.
2. Berachot 40a.
3. Bava Kama 71a — the reference supplied requires correction; see the preparatory examination below.
4. Numbers 28:2 — examine what the reference is attached to ("My offering, My bread," and the like), rather than inventing a word in the Epistle's text.
5. III, 341a — suspected 341/241 error; a direct target opened during preparation: Zohar III רמ"א ע"א [241a].
6. Deuteronomy 7:11; Eruvin 22a.
7. Avot 4:17 — check the numbering of the mishnah if it varies between editions.

Working Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1 — ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40

Cluster א [1] — Opening, the Inanimate–Vegetative–Animal–Speakin g Orders, and Elements

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S06. "Is Nourished and Lives" versus "Receives Its Vitality": Is There a Distinction?

Are the vegetative nourished by the inanimate, the human by the vegetative without the animal, and the animal by the animal missing? Do not divert the discussion to modern nutrition where it is unnecessary for the plain meaning.

Cluster ב [2] — Grain, Daat, and Meat

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S13. What Is the Relationship between the Food's Refinement, Its Root in Tohu, Its Power to Add Daat, and Returning Light?

Seek a source that connects them, not merely four sources using similar terms. Does the addition apply to everyone who eats, or to Divine service with intention/refinement?

Cluster ג [3] — Syntax of the Encompassing Light and the Kav

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S14. What Is the Subject of "For It Is," and What Is the Subject of "Which Is Revealed There"?

Propose alternative punctuation for each reasonable reading, noting its advantage and difficulty.

S15. Does the first "returning light" describe the phenomenon of nourishment, or that very same technical radiance? To what does the last occurrence apply? Is the encompassing light included in the return, or is it only a source of radiance at the bottom? Do not determine that the user's assumption is correct without examining the wording and the parallel.

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S18. Is "With Greater Force" a Revelation of Power, Light, Root, or Apprehension?

Do not automatically apply the determination in the earth dossier to the nourishment of human daat or to the angels. What bridge is needed?

Cluster ד [4] — The Chariot and Sacrifices

Working Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1 — ו [6]. Rules of Evidence and Deliverables Applicable to Everyone

1. Mark every substantive determination: explicit in the source / reasoned interpretation / later explanation / possibility only / open. “Examined” is not a conclusion’s status.
2. For each source: author, work, precise location, link, main text/photograph/search excerpt/another report, and short identifying words. Do not quote from a summary as though you had read the text. Where Rashi’s text is illegible, write [unclear].
3. For each central dossier: preferred answer, source, inferential step, a genuine alternative if one exists, the strongest contrary evidence, and the limit of determination. There is no obligation to invent contrary evidence where none exists; a blocked website is not evidence against its content.
4. Do not conclude that everything is relative without stating what is being measured, in which world/state, and in which result. Do not identify Tohu, returning light, encompassing light, Essence, and the root of food with one another without a source connecting them.
5. Do not attribute an explanation by the Rebbe/the Tzemach Tzedek/Weinberg to the Alter Rebbe; do not infer historical dependence from conceptual correspondence. There is no need to delete a later explanation: it is an important source when its identity is clear.
6. We are not seeking medical/nutritional advice. The statements about grain and meat are not independent scientific proof, nor an instruction to feed an infant. Do not construct a kabbalistic argument from empirical data that have not been checked.
7. Report a technical obstacle once; continue with what can be done. Do not request files unnecessary for useful execution. Do not write that you took a photograph or performed a reading that you did not perform.

8. Reports in Hebrew. Actual tables for comparisons; no need for rhetoric or a long, repetitive essay. There is no artificial length limit that causes a question to be omitted. All S01–S40 must appear in a status table, even if your answer is “not examined in depth in this round.”
9. Do not write a booklet, delete previous material, publish, or send anything to anyone. Submit the work now. Do not settle for a promise of future research. Another round is not the default; at the end, identify only a specific target that might change a substantive conclusion, if one was found.
10. If you use subagents, your own review is still required; state what you saw yourself and what you received from them. Do not attribute their reading to yourself.

End of input. Act according to the role at the top of the prompt and submit the research you performed, not merely a plan.

Dossier 0407 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [485]

Your Role — Grok: Plain Meaning, Structure, and a Positive Explanation of the Entire Conclusion

You are the lead independent researcher of the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders and elements, food and daat, syntax and returning light (S01–S18), and the way these lead to sacrifices and mitzvot. You must also examine S19–S40; do not close them through a summary of the previous research.

[485] Document 0407: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Preferred order of execution: א [1]. The Epistle's text and the two adjacent paragraphs. First create a sentence table: subject, action, recipient, source of light, direction, and result. Find a source for the complete correspondence of the elements, not four independent associations. Examine whether the air/fire order indicates two criteria. ב [2]. Berachot 40a and Bava Kamma 71b–72a with commentators; then parallels in the Alter Rebbe and Chasidut concerning food/daat. Prioritize an explanation of grain's distinctiveness and father/mother. Compare the Talmudic source, Chasidic usage, and the Epistle's wording. ג [3]. Examine at least two syntactic readings of "for it is… which is revealed… and from the kav… in the mode of returning light." Do not settle for the heading "general versus particular": show where the sentence requires a reading and where it merely permits it. ד [4]. Read the Zohar itself and K3 as well; formulate the possible missing link between nourishment, the spirit of a sacrifice, and the performance of a mitzvah. Let the sources correct the assumption about study in the future.

Your deliverable: 1. Up to seven important findings; distinguish each from a claim already in the input. 2. In-depth dossiers: the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders/elements; grain/meat and daat; syntax of returning light; the transition to the chariot and mitzvot. Within each dossier, give an answer, evidence, inference, alternative, and limit. 3. A table of the four correspondences with a source for each pair, and a table of the two food proofs showing Talmudic wording against the Epistle's wording. 4. Review of A01–A18 and a status table for all S01–S40, without omitting the Torah/action portions or the wording of the ending. 5. A continuous explanation of the entire unit that the reader can understand without opening another report. Do not turn a literary hypothesis into certainty. 6. A source/reading register, new questions, and up to three specific follow-up targets only if there is a genuine reason.

Title: IGK20-Finale-R1-Grok. There is no need to wait for another model or request approval.

Dossier 0408 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [486]

Your Role — Grok Bot: Verification of Witnesses, Wording, and References for the Entire Conclusion

You are the source verifier. Do not settle for collecting links or decide conceptually in place of the texts. You are required to read the necessary sequence and identify when a source contradicts an earlier description. All S01–S40 questions are included for you so that you know what each witness needs to prove; in the status table, state whether there is a relevant witness, whether it was read, and what it does not prove. You need not write an independent conceptual explanation for each question.

Order of work and required deliverable: P1. The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 in an identified printed witness and a digital text: photograph/transcribe the whole unit without cutting off context. Check the order earth–water–fire–air, father and mother, “and still,” “etc.,” “are nourished/are supplied,” “and their foundation/and their root,” and the “thus far” note. Do not produce a textual variant from punctuation added by a website. Locating a first/early printing if accessible is useful for S39; do not delay the entire package for it. P2. The Rebbe’s note 61: a Hebrew source if possible, location and page; distinguish a determination from a proposal. Locate the online notes 62–67 and document the reference errors 71a and 341a if they actual-

[486] Document 0408: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ly occur in the witness. The list of notes and corrections is examined only to the extent actually opened; you are not required to consult an earlier photograph that was not attached. P3. Berachot 40a and Bava Kamma, end of 71b–beginning of 72a: the sentence's full wording with brief context and the relevant Rashi/Tosafot. A table comparing the Sages' wording with the Epistle's wording. Verify the printed folio against the PDF page. P4. Zohar III, end of רמ [240] and continuation on רמא [241]: a clear photograph if accessible and a transcription of the passage from which the quotation comes, with the ox/eagle paragraphs and also the lion/human afterward. Mark the Zohar's text, parenthesized variants, and translation/explanation. Documenting lion and human is essential; do not cut off after "foundation and root." P5. Explanatory sources: K3, "Tziyon be-mishpat tipadeh" ("Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice"), תשל"ה [5735], יד–טו [14–15] and its notes; K4, "Pekuda liten machatzit ha-shekel" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), תשכ"ג [5723], the paragraph on angels, refiner/refined, and drawing down (hamshachah). A complete digital text is sufficient if a photograph is inaccessible; say so. P6. Locate an exact source for the four correspondences of the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders/elements and for the distinctiveness of grain/father and mother. Search the Alter Rebbe's and Tzemach Tzedek's writings by wording; if no focused location is found, record "not located in this round," rather than a list of books as though they had been examined. Torah Chaim and Or HaTorah were not given a verified reference in the previous research. P7. Biblical and Mishnaic references at the end, and the status of "Thus far we have found": evidence of who wrote it, when it was printed, and what cannot be inferred. Do not determine that the Epistle is complete on the strength of this sentence alone.

For every photograph: work's title, author, edition to the extent verified, scan identifier, PDF page number, printed folio, side/column,

URL, and what can be read. Do not assume a fixed pagination offset. Do not call column ב [2] “side ב [b]” without checking. OCR is a finding aid; quoted text must be checked against the witness. Mark [unclear] instead of an imagined completion.

Submit: 1. REPORT_HE.md with findings and source corrections, not merely a “ready” message and a link. 2. SOURCE_LEDGER.md and VARIANTS.md: witnesses, variants, your own reading, limits, and location. 3. SOURCE_READER.md: the required source excerpts, brief but contextual, with precise transcription and interpretation kept separate. There is no need to copy entire books. 4. An S01–S40 table on the witness’s status for each question; an A01–A18 table only insofar as it can be verified/refuted from sources. In a conceptual dispute, mark “requires interpretation.” 5. If the tools permit, a photographs folder and ZIP with a clear README. If files are impossible, write all tables and transcriptions in the response. Do not claim to have saved a file that was not created. Links and the summary must stand within the response itself even if a package exists.

Title: IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot. Execute now without waiting for researchers’ packages. Do not reinvestigate Earth or the union dossier.

Dossier 0424 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [439]

IGK20-Finale-Close — The Compiler’s Report and Explanation of the Concluding Unit

September 23, 2026 · Based on R1–R5 · From “And from this will be well understood” to “Thus far we have found”

[439] Document 0424: Final-Closure.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The unit is ready to be formulated. There are now explicit sources for the order of the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking categories in the Epistle, for the two food proofs together, for the angels' pleasure, and for the advantage of practical Divine service. The closure concerns the investigation needed for the explanation: details on which no determination has been reached remain marked. This is not a general booklet, nor a reopening of the earth or union dossier.

The report unifies the researchers' results and corrects final formulations. It does not attribute to the compiler an independent reading of every witness the researchers supplied. The reading register at the end distinguishes between texts opened in this review, photographs seen, and findings retained from previous rounds.

IGK20-Finale-Close — The Compiler's Report and Explanation of the Concluding Unit — א [1]. Closing Determinations

1. The Epistle's order is supported and explained in the Alter Rebbe's books. L6 is Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et benei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel"), §ג [3]. It includes all four pairs; explicit reasons are given for water, fire, and air. Earth–inanimate is given without a separate reason. Ki Tetze §א [1] and Shelach, in the section on libations, §א [1], reinforce the upper pairs. A Chasidic source for animal–fire is no longer missing.
2. Etz Chaim does not verify this order. In gate נ [50], chapter י [10], the animal is linked to the air component and the speaking to the fire component. Distinguishing between the elemental components in the composite and the characterization of the levels of created beings is a proposed reconciliation grounded in differences of wording. No bridging source was found that determines that this is the reconciliation the Alter Rebbe intended.
3. L1 is the shared parallel for grain and meat: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot"),

ב§ [2]. Do not replace it with “Matzah zo” (“This Matzah”) or the website designation “צו ז” (“Tzav 7”). L7, Kuntres Acharon 4, adds the Sag/Mah formulation and includes the inanimate among foods.

4. The reference in L3 ב§ [2] was identified by its content: the paragraph concerning Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and Mah from the forehead corresponds to Kuntres Acharon 4. Do not attribute it to Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The identity of the person who wrote the reference and the scope of the designation “אג”ה” remain undecided.
5. The Epistle itself gives returning light as the reason. It does not merely give the phenomenon’s location. In the preferred reading, “for it is” sums up the nourishment of the higher from the lower; “which is revealed” refers to the radiance; the final “in the mode of returning light” refers to the kav, based on context and “as above.” Reading “it” as referring to the food is possible and does not require changing the applicability of the final returning light.
6. A fixed angelic role is not evidence of a lack of refinement. L6 א§ [1] includes Michael in love and Gabriel in awe in its description of a world that has already been refined. This can be combined with the root in Tohu in L3 and refined Ban in K4; the combination is a synthetic explanation, not an explicit statement from one source.
7. The advantage of mitzvot is not ascent alone. In L4, distinguish root, human Divine service, and result; in L7, Torah too draws down light. The purpose of Divine service is revelation below, and elevation participates in it. There is no fixed dictionary in which Torah = descent and mitzvot = ascent.

IGK20-Finale-Close — The Compiler's Report and Explanation of the Concluding Unit — ד [4]. What Remains Open and Does Not Require a New Round

- An explicit reconciliation with Etz Chaim נ׳ [50:10]; an independent reason for earth–inanimate; a precise reason for omitting the inanimate from the examples.
- A focused exposition on the two parents, the choice specifically of an ox, and the combination of Chochmah and Daat without Binah. Do not construct a sefirotic mapping from these without a source.
- The scope of "etc.," the targets of "elsewhere," and the applicability of "as below." Kuntres Acharon 4 is a parallel, not a proved identification of the latter two.
- Attribution of the references in Likkutei Torah, an original Hebrew wording for note 61, and proof of transmission from early print or manuscript.
- Pagination details that were not seen: particularly the Emor column and the exact page of Kuntres Acharon. Better to cite discourse and section than supply an estimated number.

There are no new questions that must change the explanation. The user's forty questions are preserved in S_STATUS, including places where the answer is a limit of knowledge rather than a solution.

Dossier 0531 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [487]

Basis of the edition

Corpus: initial Deep Research report; all 15 research instructions for R1–R5; collector assessments R1–R4; five Bot reports and ledgers

[487] Document 0531: editorial_basis.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

retrieved directly; final closure and S01–S40; user-supplied Claude/Grok reports R2–R5 in the conversation. The latter are analyzed as supplied reports. Standalone verbatim exports of those conversation messages were not retrieved. R1 as visible in the user message was truncated; do not reconstruct it from later criticism. No document may claim the available archive is a complete raw export of the entire conversation.

Research edition must explain the documented substantive proposals and retractions in full, not use the archival limitation to abbreviate the inquiry. English must match every editorial unit. Research has no beginner glossary. Reader has no model scores or round diary.

All forty S questions are the fixed research brief's wording, preserved verbatim in Hebrew and translated in English. They are not represented as a verbatim transcript of an earlier spoken user question. User's production request authorizes the four booklets and four advisory review packages; does not authorize sending the packages to other models.

Latest substantive lock: Finale-Close, 23 September 2026. Source reading reported in prior rounds remains attributed to its reader; editorial work is not a new claim to have independently inspected every scan.

Dossier 0618 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Combined dossier: distinguish findings from the follow-up brief [488]

[488] Document 0618: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Complete Prompts — Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20, Finale-R1

Each file is an independent prompt. Copy its entire contents to the model whose name appears in the filename. There is no need to attach a report, Drive link, or another prompt.

- Claude: the chariot, Zohar, sacrifices, and Torah–action; review of all the other questions.
- Grok: the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders, elements, grain/meat and daat, and syntax of returning light; explanation of the entire unit.
- Grok Bot: verification of witnesses, wording, printed editions, and references, with the full question map.

Each contains: the complete unvocalized concluding text; context from the Earth dossier; all 40 questions; 18 claims from the independent research supplied; four preparatory anchors; notes 61–67; starting sources; rules of evidence and a deliverable tailored to the model.

The independent research was converted into a claim map complete in its content, and is not copied here word for word. Its original citation identifiers are not verifiable references. In the preparatory examination, Bava Kamma 71b–72a, Zohar III 241a, and the discourse “Tziyon be-mishpat tipadeh” (“Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice”), יד–טו ,[5735] תשל”ה [14–15], were read digitally. The source “Machatzit ha-shekel” (“Half a Shekel”), תשכ”ג [5723], was located only in search. This distinction is maintained in every prompt.

This is the first round on the final unit. There is no automatic invitation to another round and no booklet-writing at this stage.

Dossier 0378 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [441]

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Drive

Folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1xgDmj3FxWTS0SLtNMWDNcTF4MDqHhuOJ

ZIP: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sLUKQ7ZHvyl55mg8Le19Zx_1Ar3cyqYT/view

Parent Earth: 1ptqHOycgA–ErsF89ohY7CVHeQgfBsEk

R1 (not touched): 1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc

Drive — File IDs

File	ID
folder	1xgDmj3FxWTS0SLtNMWDNcTF4MDqHhuOJ
ZIP	1sLUKQ7ZHvyl55mg8Le19Zx_1Ar3cyqYT
REPORT_HE.md	1tED4luUL-isY3UHQODtYh4dVKeL1h6d2
SOURCE_LEDGER.md	1mcCFADpR7zsXhD8m6s0fpuaUEz0EXvYd

File	ID
SOURCE_READER.md	1A_abyRFWR3VhFKnRq6ZanSEejcj1H6zp
VARIANTS.md	1G0g5NRlRFNvvwsq9bTTi1863G7yWv9sr
S_STATUS.md	1hu1n9ZDPMMNgptcjGxfyKbXa7938M4Ql
README.md	1nCaExbfOOmizitCvEUgSI6DMBadpMSSU
EC_N10_pairing_anchors.txt	1bOsyTc0uVSiGxfrYS5X5HiDAT_p7DgKH

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Local

/workspace/IGK20-Finale-R2/

[441] Document 0378: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0379 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [266]

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Hebrew Report

Time: September 23, 2026, ~12:47pm–1:05pm ET

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Hebrew Report — 1. P1–P6 Summary

Package	Status	Key
P1 DCM/elements	Read	Etz Chaim, gate נ [50], chapter י [10] + Mishnat Chasidim, Tractate HaHarkavah + Iggeret HaKodesh witnesses
P2 Grain/daat	Read	Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan ו' [6] + Tzav יג [13] (Matzah Zo, "This Matzah"), from lt_full.txt
P3 Zohar	Read	רמ ב–רמא א [240b–241a] + Stanford sel=385
P4 Angels/K4	Partial	Emor לח ג [38c] read; K4 text: Cloudflare; digital alternative marked

Package	Status	Key
P5 Torah/action	Not completed in this round (secondary)	Cloudflare on K3/K5; reuse of R1 for the Sages' sources
P6 Note 61/ printing	Not completed (secondary)	HE note 61 not opened; an early printing containing Iggeret HaKodesh was not verified here

[266] Document 0379: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

3. P2 — Grain / Daat — 3.1 Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan — "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'And You Shall Know Today' ")

- Discourse/section: Va'etchanan ו" [6] (explicit heading in witness lt_full.txt).
- Printed page (marked in the LT OCR): after the page heading ו [6] (Va'etchanan), then a sequence of pages with markers 12/14/16 in the OCR; column: a two-column text; a/ב [b] was not inferred from the PDF index.
- Anchor: «An infant does not know how to call father until it tastes the taste of grain… the root of wheat is from the aspect of Daat of Tohu, which is above the human being» + the corresponding analogy to Torah as nourishment for the soul / "and nurture faith."
- Additional digital source opened: text.chabadpedia, Va'etchanan (complete).

3. P2 — Grain / Daat — 3.2 Likkutei Torah, Tzav — "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' "), ב§ [2]

- The discourse's heading on p. יג [13] (Tzav) in the OCR: «יג תורה צו לקוטי» [13, Torah, Tzav, Likkutei].
- The text opens «To understand what is written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah'…»; in the following section: father / daat / immaturity (matzah as immaturity; Daat of Tohu in Etz Chaim, gate ח [8]; «for I had not eaten ox meat»; the taste of grain).
- Column: a/ב [b] was not marked without verified structure beyond the page heading.

3. P2 — Grain / Daat — 3.3 Ox Meat / Additional Intellect

Read within the above matzah discourse (Tzav יג [13]): an explicit quotation of Rav Nachman + grain.

Additional search in Torah Chaim/Or HaTorah: no new locus with a verified page beyond this was submitted in this round.

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Hebrew Report — 7. New Questions

- N-R2-Grok-01: In a photographed printing of Etz Chaim (not only Wikisource), is the pairing animal = air / speaking = fire identical?
- N-R2-Grok-02: Verification of the exact column (א/ב/ג/ד [a/b/c/d]) for Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan ו' [6] and Tzav יג [13], against the standard Brooklyn edition.
- N-R2-Grok-03: Reading the text of K4 §ז [7] on the refinement of Ban (Cloudflare workaround / PDF).
- N-R2-Grok-04: A printed Hebrew source for note 61 («it may be said»).
- N-R2-Grok-05: A Tanya printing containing Iggeret HaKodesh with a verified title page and year + the wording «Thus far we have found».

Dossier 0380 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [489]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot

General rule: PDF page / printed number / folio-amud are three separate fields. Do not infer a/ב [b] from the PDF index alone.

[489] Document 0380: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — P1 — DCM / Elements

- ID: P1-EC
- Book/discourse/section: Etz Chaim, gate נ [50], chapter י [10]
- URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/י_קרפ/נ_רעש/מייח_זץע
- Verified edition: Wikisource (digital)
- PDF page: n/a
- printed page: n/a
- column: n/a
- folio/amud: n/a
- read scope: complete text of chapter י [10] + introduction on composition
- witness type: digital_body
- ID: P1-MC
- Book/discourse/section: Mishnat Chasidim, Tractate HaHarkavah [Composition]
- URL: HB7122 / hebrewbooks.org/7122
- Verified edition: Kraków, תרמ"ט [5649] (HB title page)
- PDF page: PDF file HB7122
- printed page: printed צא [91] + (tractate heading)
- column: n/a
- folio/amud: n/a
- read scope: chapter א [1]–mentions of chapter ד [4]; elemental pairings
- witness type: print_scan_OCR
- ID: P1-IGK-WS
- Book/discourse/section: Tanya, part כ ,[4] ד [20]
- URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת
- Verified edition: Wikisource
- PDF page: n/a

- printed page: n/a
- column: n/a
- folio/amud: n/a
- read scope: concluding unit on the vegetative, animal, and speaking orders (צח"מ)
- witness type: digital_body
- ID: P1-IGK-ABC
- Book/discourse/section: Iggeret HaKodesh 20
- URL: https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/
- Verified edition: website
- PDF page: n/a
- printed page: n/a
- column: n/a
- folio/amud: n/a
- read scope: concluding unit
- witness type: digital_copy_possible
- ID: P1-IGK-CP
- Book/discourse/section: Iggeret HaKodesh, section כ [20]
- URL: https://text.chabadpedia.com/…כ_ומיס
- Verified edition: ChabadText
- PDF page: n/a
- printed page: n/a
- column: n/a
- folio/amud: n/a
- read scope: concluding unit
- witness type: digital_copy_possible

Note: ABC/CP are not verified separate printings; they may be copies of the same wording.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — P2 — Grain / Daat

- ID: P2-LT-VA

- Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Va’etchanan ו’ [6], «Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom» [“To Understand with Further Explanation Based on ‘And You Shall Know Today’ ”]
- URL / path: text.chabadpedia + /workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/lt_full.txt
- PDF page: n/a (OCR book dump)
- printed page: OCR heading for p. ו [6] (Va’etchanan)
- column: a/ב [b] not verified
- folio: n/a
- read scope: Daat of Tohu + grain + the corresponding analogy to Torah
- witness type: digital_OCR_from_print
- ID: P2-LT-TZ
- Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, «Matzah Zo» [“This Matzah”]
- URL / path: aid/5898813 Cloudflare; text from lt_full
- PDF page: n/a
- printed page: heading for p. יג [13] (Tzav)
- column: not verified
- folio: n/a
- read scope: father/daat/immaturity + ox meat
- witness type: digital_OCR_from_print

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — P5–P6

ID	Status
K3 3140547 / K5 2988026	Cloudflare
HE note 61	Not opened (R1: EN only)
Sefer HaMaamarim, Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a]	Not opened
Early printing of Iggeret HaKodesh	Title page and year not verified

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Evidence files

See EVIDENCE/; filenames correspond to the ledger.

Dossier 0381 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [442]

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — A. Etz Chaim, Gate ׳ה [50], Chapter ׳י [10]

Distinction between elements ↔ created beings: simple elements (matter + form); created beings = a second composition from all four elements (inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking).

Pairings:

The inanimate… over which the element of earth predominated

The vegetative… from the components of water

The animal… from the component of air

The speaking… from the component of fire

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — B. Iggeret HaKodesh 20 (Conclusion)

The order of the levels inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire, air… the animal is nourished… by the vegetative… an infant does not… the taste of grain… I had not eaten ox meat… returning light… the face of the ox and face of the eagle… and they derive pleasure from their foundation and root… practical mitzvot… (Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting)

[442] Document 0381: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — C. Likkutei Torah, Va’etchanan ו׳ [6]

Title: «Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom…» [“To Understand with Further Explanation Based on ‘And You Shall Know Today’…”]

Daat of Tohu anchor:

…the taste of grain… the root of wheat is from the aspect of Daat of Tohu above the human being… so… Torah… nourishment for the soul and “nurture faith”

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — D. Likkutei Torah, Tzav י״ג [13] — Matzah Zo [“This Matzah”]

To understand what is written in the Haggadah, “This Matzah”…

In the continuation: immaturity / father / «for I had not eaten ox meat» / the taste of grain / Daat of Tohu (Etz Chaim, gate ח [8])

Dossier 0382 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [490]

S_STATUS — Only S-ids Confirmed/Changed by Witness Verification

S-id	Status	Witness	Change relative to R1 / previous assumption
S02–S03 DCM	Confirmed + clarified	Etz Chaim נ:י׳ [50:10]	Pairing: animal = air, speaking = fire; Iggeret HaKodesh: animal = fire, speaking = air. No harmonization

[490] Document 0382: S_STATUS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

S-id	Status	Witness	Change relative to R1 / previous assumption
S02 Mishnah	Secondary source partially verified	Mishnat Chasidim, HaHarkavah	Tractate + chapters exist; do not attribute Iggeret HaKodesh's formulation to it
S08–S13 Grain/daat	Locus confirmed	Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan ו׳ [6]; Tzav יג [13]	Daat of Tohu + grain + ox meat in the text read
S23–S27 Zohar	Confirmed	רמ ב–רמא א [240b–241a] + Stanford	Correction to 241a; lion + human retained; no determination on dilehon ["their"]
S33–S37	Nothing new	—	Reuse of R1 for the Sages' sources; K3/K5 blocked
note 61	Unchanged	—	HE not opened; EN = later explanation
Thus far	Unchanged	Digital	Printers' note; early printing not verified
K4 Ban	Open	Emor לח ג [38c] read; K4 text not read	No labeling as returning light without the source's wording

Dossier 0383 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or testimony from the history of the research [491]

VARIANTS — The Same Location Only — Table 2: Separate Occurrences (Not Variants)

See REPORT_HE §4, occurrence 1–6 table.

VARIANTS — The Same Location Only — Table 3: Pairing the Inanimate–Vegetative–Animal–Speaking Orders ↔ Elements (Different Witnesses, Not a "Printed Variant")

[491] Document 0383: VARIANTS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Witness	Animal	Speaking
Etz Chaim נ:י [50:10]	Air	Fire
Iggeret HaKodesh 20 (order: earth, water, fire, air)	Fire	Air

This is a discrepancy between works, not an apparatus of the same text.

Dossier 0410 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [492]

Role: interpretation of the four correspondences, grain/daat and meat, and the connection to returning light.

Dossier א [1] — S01–S06, the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speakin g orders and elements: א [1]. You must read the text of Etz Chaim נ י [50:10]. Its order, according to the compiler's examination: inanimate–earth, vegetative–water, animal–air, speaking–fire. In the Epistle, the last two are reversed. Therefore retract the blanket verification in R1, or provide an exact witness. ב [2]. Locate Mishnat Chasidim, Tractate HaHarkavah, particularly chapter ד [4]; this is a target from a secondary reference, not a verified source. Do not write "Mishnat Chasidim, gate נ [50]." Examine the order and the reason. ג [3]. Seek a Chasidic source that specifically gives and explains the Epistle's order. The question is not whether a characteristic can be attached to each element, but whether the explanation also stands against the other mapping. Prioritize the Alter Rebbe, the Mitteler Rebbe, and the Tzemach Tzedek. ד [4]. Propose a positive explanation of the concept "aspects": elemental matter, level of soul, function,

[492] Document 0410: IGK20-Finale-R2_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

and characteristic are not the same thing. How is inanimate water connected with the vegetative? How does composition from all the elements not negate an element that characterizes a level? ה [5]. Examine whether the explanation through yosher/iggulim or “a speaking spirit” is actually grounded in a passage that decides the order; if not, mark the previous explanation as withdrawn. ו [6]. Omission of the inanimate: read note 61 and examine water and salt versus earth. Separate a reason based on the source of creation from one based on nourishment after creation. Do not replace the user’s question with “everything comes from earth” without explaining the omission. ז [7]. “Is nourished and lives” and “receives its vitality from both”: propose a syntactic and contextual interpretation without inventing sefirotic levels.

Dossier ב [2] — S07–S13, grain and meat: א [1]. Read Likkutei Torah, Va’etchanan, “Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom” (“To Understand with Further Explanation Based on ‘And You Shall Know Today’ ”), ה§ [5]. Examine Daat of Tohu, food’s descent, and additional daat; what is distinctive about wheat compared with a general argument concerning food’s root? ב [2]. Read Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo” (“To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, ‘This Matzah’ ”), ב§ [2]. Compare knowledge, recognition, immaturity, faith, the mochin of Abba, and the taste of grain. Do not attribute a developed understanding of fatherhood to the infant contrary to the discourse’s wording. ג [3]. The father-and-mother question is not resolved merely by “that is what the Talmud says”: that is the first layer of plain meaning. Seek a Chasidic use of both designations together with grain; compare a passage quoting father alone. Do the sources emphasize different matters, and is there evidence of the reason for the Epistle’s choice? ד [4]. Wheat, grain, bread, matzah, tasting, and eating: state what each source says and what is transferred only by analogy. Do not conclude

without a source that all grain species are identical in every detail. ה [5]. Read Berachot 40a in full context and Bava Kamma 71b–72a, Rashi, and Tosafot. Identify the speaker and what was corrected in the morning. Is this a lack of eating, a lack specifically of meat, or an expression of weakness in analysis? What does the Epistle itself add? ו [6]. Locate at least one exact parallel on ox meat and additional intellect in the Alter Rebbe/Mitteler Rebbe/Tzemach Tzedek. Torah Chaim and Or HaTorah, Vayigash, are targets, not evidence. If the discourse you found concerns only the Temple and the inanimate, it is not a source for the meat question. ז [7]. Grain versus meat, infant versus sage, the beginning of daat versus additional wisdom: examine what is explicit and what is proposed. Do not decide that grain = daat and meat = chochmah merely to explain binah's absence.

Dossier ג [3] — S13–S18 and a critical examination of S33–S37: א [1]. Is there a source explicitly connecting food–refinement–root in Tohu–the kav's returning light? If not, propose the parallel and its differences precisely. "Low in manifestation, high in root" does not replace an explanation. ב [2]. Compare K5 §§ד–ז [4–7] with Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, and the Epistle: the food's body, its vitality, encompassing and indwelling light. What does the human being receive, and what is the connection to additional daat? ג [3]. As an independent examination of the conclusion, read Tanya 4 against K3 §§יד–טו [14–15]: why does the advantage of practical mitzvot in the Epistle not require an absolute ranking of Torah? Do not conflate the question of reward with the precedence of action. ד [4]. Write a transitional paragraph from earth to nourishment and from nourishment to sacrifice and mitzvah, explaining every arrow rather than merely drawing it.

Required deliverable: 1. Up to six new findings or corrections to R1. 2. Three complete dossiers with evidence, an alternative, and the remaining difficulty. 3. A table of the four correspondences: Epistle / Etz Chaim / Mishnat Chasidim if read / exact Chasidic source / type

of explanation. 4. A grain–meat table: source wording, function, recipient, type of daat, and what cannot be inferred. 5. A continuous 600–1,000-word explanation of the first half of the conclusion, plus a contextual paragraph connecting it to the conclusion on mitzvot. 6. A change table for the S identifiers examined and a source register based on actual reading. 7. Do not end by saying the correspondences are already written in the Epistle: the user is asking why and how.

========== All Context, Text, and Questions ==========

ב"ה [By the grace of G-d]. IGK20-Finale-R2 — Second Research Round on the Concluding Unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20

Task preparation date: September 23, 2026.

This is a research task to execute now, not a proposed plan. The prompt is self-contained: it includes the working text, all the unit's questions, R1 findings and the compiler's criticism, sources, and deliverable requirements. You do not need another model's prompt. Do not write a booklet at this stage.

Canonical question map — preserve these identifiers; new questions will be marked N-R2-[model name]-01, etc.:

Dossier 0411 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [493]

Role: locating and verifying focused witnesses and supplying readable material to the researchers. There is no need to invent conceptual determinations.

[493] Document 0411: IGK20-Finale-R2_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Each P below defines a question that the witness has the power to change. Do as much as possible on all targets; prioritize P1–P4. If a photograph is inaccessible, supply a labeled digital text and continue. Do not spend most of the round repeatedly encountering the same obstacle.

P1 — Inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders/elements, S02–S03:

- Obtain the text and, if accessible, a photograph of Etz Chaim, gate נ [50], chapter י [10], in the four paragraphs on inanimate/vegetati ve/animal/speaking; include the introduction on composition and the distinction between elements and created beings.
- Obtain Mishnat Chasidim, Tractate HaHarkavah, chapter ד [4], and examine adjacent chapters only as needed. The location, chapter ד [4], was supplied from a secondary reference, so verify it.
- Present the exact wording for each pair; do not reconcile the difference from the Epistle or emend either witness.
- Seek an additional witness of Iggeret HaKodesh 20's text for the order earth, water, fire, air, preferably print. Distinguish an additional witness from a site copying the same transcription.

P2 — Grain/daat, S08–S13:

- Likkutei Torah, Va'etchanan, "Lehavin be-tosefet biur al pi Ve-yadata ha-yom" ("To Understand with Further Explanation Based on 'And You Shall Know Today' "), section ה [5]: identify the printed folio and column, and verify the passage on Daat of Tohu, including the preceding sentence and the corresponding analogy to Torah afterward.
- Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "Lehavin mah she-katuv ba-Haggadah matzah zo" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' "), section ב [2]: identify folio and column, father/daat/immaturity.

- Seek a focused source for ox meat and additional intellect in Torah Chaim or Or HaTorah; supply a location only after reading the text. Do not submit a list of books without an identified passage.
- PDF page index, printed number, and traditional folio/side are three separate fields. Do not infer א/ב [a/b] from a mere PDF page without verified structure.

P3 — Zohar, S23–S27:

- Obtain a continuous photograph of רמ ב–רמא א [240b–241a], with every occurrence of “foundation/root” and the continuation on lion and human.
- A short transcription for each focus, and sufficient context to identify the subject. Construct a table

of occurrences in their order. - Examine the Stanford/Pritzker apparatus, sel=385. Every claim of a variant requires the same location, anchor wording, witnesses, and line; two different occurrences are not a variant. - Open Mikdash Melekh or Or HaChamah on the passage if accessible. A website translation is labeled separately and is not a photograph of the commentator. - Do not determine that “dilehon” [“their”] alone proves a higher root or lower foundation; your role is to provide the exact context.

P4 — The Closest Source for Explaining the Angels:

- Likkutei Torah, Emor לח ג [38c], to which K4 note 37 refers: identify discourse and section, read the context, obtain a photograph if accessible.
- Read the text of K4 §ז [7], this time without settling for R1’s blocked status. If blocked for you, use an alternative website/printing.
- Collect separately what is said of Ban already refined and what has not yet been refined. Do not label this returning light without the source’s words.

P5 — Torah/Action and Reward, S33–S37:

- Verify K3 §§יד–טו [14–15], K5 §§ג, ז [3, 7], and Tanya 4: only the key sentences, identifying the mishnah in each source.
- Explicitly state that the mishnah “All Israel” and the mishnah “One hour is better” are different sources.
- Verify Eruvin 22a, Kiddushin 40b, and Avot 4:17 with both halves; there is no need to regenerate valid witnesses from R1 if they are already available to you. Only add what is missing and mark reuse.

P6 — Note 61 and the Manuscript Ending:

- Locate a Hebrew source for note 61 in “Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya” [“Lessons in Tanya”] or in lists/notes and references, with a photograph and author attribution if accessible. Examine where “it may be said” applies.
- Sefer HaMitzvot by the Tzemach Tzedek, קעא [170a], the reference in K3 note 27: identify the passage concerning the Piena tradition, its wording, and its status.
- An early witness of “Thus far we have found”: a printing containing Iggeret HaKodesh, not the first Tanya printing that predates the printing of Iggeret HaKodesh. Do not assume in advance that Shklov תקע”ד [5574] is the witness you obtained; verify title page and printing year.
- These are secondary targets after P1–P4. Absence of a photograph does not prove absence of the text.

Deliverable package: REPORT_HE.md — findings and changes only, with a precise reading list. SOURCE_LEDGER.md — book/discourse /section, link, edition if verified, PDF page, printed folio and column, reading scope, witness type. SOURCE_READER.md — short, readable anchor passages and their context; neither uncorrected OCR nor a huge file without navigation. VARIANTS.md — variants at the same location only; differences between occurrences in a separate table. S_STATUS.md — only S identifiers that the witness verifies or changes; no importing philosophical conclusions. EVIDENCE/ —

photographs actually opened and examined, with a filename linking to the register. Also retain a full page when cropping may conceal a heading or context. If Drive is available and authorized in your conversation, save in a new Finale-R2-Bot folder and return a link and ZIP. If unavailable, provide local files and the report's full text. Do not claim an upload or sharing that was not performed. Do not delete or replace R1, Earth, or booklet files.

Role limitation: textual testimony, yes; a determination of the Alter Rebbe's intent only if the commentator says so explicitly, with attribution to that commentator. Do not write "no source was found" when only a photograph was not obtained.

Dossier 0412 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [400]

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3

September 23, 2026. Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Source reports are preserved. No booklet.

Corrections to the Argument, Not Only to References — The Concluding Note

"Thus far we have found" attests to the limit of the material found by those transmitting it. This wording alone does not attest to a physical tear in the manuscript, to the author stopping in mid-course, or to an intentional ending. The R2 sentence "attests that the manuscript was cut off here" must be deleted or restricted to the limit of transmission alone.

[400] Document 0412: IGK20-Finale-R2-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0386 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [494]

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot — Strict Rules Observed

- A new folder only; neither R1 (1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc) nor R2 (1xgDmj3FxWTS0SLtNMWDNcTF4MDqHhuOJ) was deleted/replaced.
- Website labels ≠ printed numbers without a photograph.
- The five Likkutei Torah discourses are separate; L3 = Ve-henif ["And He Shall Wave"], not U-sefartem ["And You Shall Count"].
- No kabbalistic determination in place of interpretive research.

Date: 2026-09-23 (ET).

Dossier 0387 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [267]

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot Report — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET

Role: verification of witnesses, disentangling mixed Likkutei Torah loci, focused photographs.

R1/R2 folders (local or Drive) were not touched.

New folder only: /workspace/IGK20-Finale-R3/ + Drive IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot.

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot Report — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET — P3 — Note 61 in Hebrew

Honest status: no Hebrew photograph of the note was opened.

---

[494] Document 0386: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[267] Document 0387: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Targeted search for “Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya” [“Lessons in Tanya”] / Likkutei Biurim [“Collected Explanations”] / notes and references; no alternative book title was invented.

A plausible candidate: Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya (Weinberg; the Rebbe’s notes within the edition). When opened, the wording of the Rebbe’s note must be separated from Weinberg’s commentary.

No translation from English in place of a Hebrew source.

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot Report — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET — P5 — Transmission

Secondary; no printing of «Thus far we have found» with title page + year was opened in this round.

K3/K4/K5 do not inherit «read» status.

Dossier 0389 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [443]

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3)

Orthography from the source; [?] for an uncertain reading. OCR = finding aid only.

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — B — Matzah Zo [“This Matzah”], §ב [2] (Printed יא ג [11c]; PDF 51–52)

Opening: «To understand what is written in the Haggadah, “This matzah that we eat”…»

[443] Document 0389: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ב§ [2]: matters of father / immaturity / faith (as in the discourse's text); do not merge with A.

Evidence: LT_Tzav_MatzaZo_printYA_pdf-051.png … -053.png.

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — C / L2 — Va-akhaltem Akhol ["And You Shall Eat Plentifully"] (Printed ח→ז [7→8]; PDF 44–45)

Opening/text: «And you shall eat plentifully…» — elevation of foods/souls; discussion of the future (returning light / the light encompassing all worlds).

«ב [2]. And from all this will be understood…» later on the page.

Only a candidate for a connection with the conclusion of Ihu Vechayohi ["He and His Vitality"]; no identity was declared.

Evidence: LT_Tzav_Vaachaltem_printZ_pdf-044.png, -045.png.

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — E — Tosefet Biur Ve-yadata ["Further Explanation of 'And You Shall Know' "], ה§ [5] (Printed ו [6]; PDF 235–238)

Opening (PDF 235, heading ו [6]):

«To understand with further explanation based on "And you shall know today and take it to your heart"…»

ה§ [5] (PDF 238):

«ה [5]. And this is the matter of "Speak to the heart of Jerusalem"…»

«…grain, namely because the root of wheat is from the aspect of Daat of Tohu, which is above the human being…»

Evidence: LT_Vaetchanan_TosefetBiur_printV_pdf-235.png … + LT_Vaetchanan_cont_pdf-238.png.

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — Note 61

No verified Hebrew passage in this round.

Dossier 0414 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Questions and assumptions for examination — these must not be attributed to a model as its answer [495]

Role: a positive answer concerning the inanimate–vegetative–animal –speaking orders, the distinctiveness of grain and meat, and the exact connection between food and returning light.

Required order of work:

1. First open L1, “Sheshet yamim tokhal matzot” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”), ב§§–ג [2–3]. Do not repeat a general search in Torah Chaim before reading the source already located. Separate it from Matzah Zo ב§ [2]. Compare the two proofs here with the wording of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: the order in which they are given, father alone versus father and mother, wisdom and intellect versus wisdom and knowledge. What does the discourse explain explicitly, and what detail is still unexplained?
2. Construct an explanation of food’s ability to add daat: what its source is, the food’s state before refinement, what the person effects, and what he receives after refinement. Explain how a claim about levels resolves the difficulty without claiming that manifest food is wiser than the human being. Read Va’etchanan ה§ [5] and Matzah Zo only for the questions distinguishing them, not to reconstruct R2.
3. Why specifically wheat/grain, and why ox meat? Seek a specific explanation beyond the fact that these are the Sages’ expressions.

[495] Document 0414: IGK20-Finale-R3_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

If only a reason for grain and a general reason for meat are found, say so openly and give the partial answer. Father and mother: seek a parallel in which both names appear and are expounded, and distinguish it from the Epistle. Do not decide that whatever is not expounded here must be unintended.

4. Open L2, Va-akhaltem Akhol [“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”]. Compare eating now, elevation, sacrifice, and the future discussion in which returning light appears. Ask what the subject is, what ascends, what the root is, who the recipient is, and at what time. Is this a parallel explaining a pattern, a partial explanation of the mechanism, or an explicit identity with the returning light at the endpoint of the kav? Do not decide merely from a shared term; likewise, do not reject the parallel because it is not identical in every detail.
5. The inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking orders: an important question remains unresolved. Seek a precise external source explaining animal–fire and speaking–air in the Epistle’s order. Examine commentaries on the passage and parallels with all four pairs. Document which passages were actually read. Four characteristics you invented are insufficient. Against Etz Chaim שער נ [50:10], distinguish composition, soul level, and function; a different mapping does not prove a contradiction. Do not reinstate an explanation through yosher/iggulim without evidence.
6. Omission of the inanimate: give the best plain reading of note 61, with the limit of “it may be said.” The distinction between earth as a general source and water and salt as edible inanimate matter is a difficulty, not an answer. Do the preceding context on earth and the structure of “from both” provide a sufficient explanation? Mark such an interpretation as your own. Do not describe spontaneous growth or infant nutrition as contemporary scientific claims.

Deliverable:

- Up to six findings that change R2, foremost the correction of the shared source.
- Three dossiers: elements; grain and meat; food and returning light. For each, a positive explanation, an exact witness, what is explicit and what is inferred, and the remaining difficulty.
- The parallels table must include discourse title and section, not a number derived from a website menu.
- A continuous explanation of the first half of the conclusion, 700–1,100 words, plus a transitional paragraph to sacrifice and mitzvot. Do not present a conjectured reason as the author's intention.
- Update only the S identifiers you addressed; the whole question map appears below for context and is not

an instruction to reopen forty dossiers. - Supply a source register and links. Photographs are not a prerequisite for inference from a digital text, but a digital text must not be called a photograph.

========== R2 Review and the New Sources ==========

Dossier 0416 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [268]

IGK20-Finale-R3 — Compiler's Review and Decisions for R4

September 23, 2026. The concluding unit only. No booklet; the union dossier is on hold; "elsewhere" is unidentified.

R3 obtained two important anchors: the shared source for grain and meat is Sheshet Yamim Tokhal Matzot ["Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot"]; the parallel for sacrifice and the angels' pleasure is Bi-ur Ve-henif HaKohen Otam ["Explanation of 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "]. An explicit source for the two pairs animal–fire and

[268] Document 0416: IGK20-Finale-R3-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

speaking–air has now also been found. R4 therefore focuses on interpreting known sources and completing particular witnesses.

IGK20-Finale-R3 — Compiler's Review and Decisions for R4 — What Is Accepted and What Requires Correction

Claim in R3	Compiler's decision	Significance for the explanation
L1 brings grain and meat together	Accepted according to the source read in the round; a photograph of the actual quotations still needs to be supplied	Additional intellect can be explained from Likkutei Torah without attributing it only to a later commentator
There is no Chasidic source for animal–fire / speaking–air	Outdated after the discovery of Ki Tetze	Refer first to the source, then discuss the difference from Etz Chaim
Composition versus function resolves the reversal	A proposal, not a proved conclusion	The qualification must be preserved in the continuous explanation as well
Note 61 says that the lower is superior in its creation	Incorrect according to the note's location and English wording	The sentence's subject is the animal above the vegetative, although it is nourished by it
The inanimate was omitted because it was already discussed under earth	A reasonable proposed reading	Do not present it as a proved reason; distinguish illustration from an exhaustive list

Claim in R3	Compiler's decision	Significance for the explanation
L1 explains why, and the Epistle only where	An overly restrictive division	The Epistle gives a causal explanation in "for it is"; do not turn it into merely a map of location
The reference in Emor must be the Alter Rebbe's self-reference	Not proved	There is a printed source making the connection; the reference's author and editorial layer remain open

Claim in R3	Compiler's decision	Significance for the explanation
L3 and K4 necessarily assign the angel different locations	Not yet proved	A root in Tohu and a state after refinement may be reconcilable; a precise table is required
The two syntactic determinations depend on each other	The correction in Claude-R3 is accepted	The subject of "for it is" and the applicability of the final returning light are examined separately
The Epistle contains no comparison with Torah at all	This formulation was already rejected in R3	There is a comparison in the text; it does not yield an absolute ranking in every respect
"Thus far we have found" proves truncation	The correction in R3 is accepted	The formula attests only to the limit of transmission

Note 61 was examined in its English text and at its anchor's location. Lessons, Epistle 20, part 9. The proposal in parentheses is not the Alter Rebbe's wording. The Hebrew source was not seen. There is no need to wait for it to correct the reversal of the English sentence's subject.

Dossier 0431 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [496]

Kehot Likkutei Torah ©1948 Revised 1998 7th printing 2017; local scan hb58812.pdf 904 pages

Dossier 0452 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or testimony from the history of the research [497]

HB7122 Mishnat Chasidim Krakow תרמט [5649] 585pp with peirush Taam Atzo

[496] Document 0431: LT_EDITION.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[497] Document 0452: MC_EDITION.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0393 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [498]

IGK20-Finale-R4-Bot — Witness pack (2026-09-23 ~14:35–15:00 ET)

Role: Witness verification + locus untangling for Iggeret HaKodesh 20 finale unit.

Not kabbalistic rulings. Collector report = critique starting point only.

Local: /workspace/IGK20-Finale-R4/

Edition used: Kehot Likkutei Torah ©1948 / Rev. 1998 / 7th 2017 — /workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/hb58812.pdf (904 pp). No re-download of giant books.

R1–R3: untouched (local + Drive).

Dossier 0394 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [456]

P1 — L4 / L5 (New Sources) — L4 — Ki Tetze LaMilchamah Al Oyevekha ["When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies"]

- Discourse title: Ki Tetze LaMilchamah Al Oyevekha ["When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies"]
- §א [1]: PDF 292, Arabic-numeral heading 68 (seen), TOC לד [34], column with §א [1] and then §ב [2].
- Pair seen: fire = the animal soul; air = speaking (and the translation of "a living soul" → "a speaking spirit").

[498] Document 0393: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[456] Document 0394: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- Pointer seen: “(And see what is written about this in the discourse beginning, in the section on libations, in the portion Shelach).”
- §ד [4]: PDF 293; the two directions of embedding / “their beginning is embedded in their end”; Torah–action.

Do not convert the website label «Tetze א׳ [1]» into printed folio א [1].

P1 — L4 / L5 (New Sources) — L5 — BeParashat Nesakhim Ketiv Ki Tavo’u [“In the Section on Libations It Is Written, ‘When You Enter’ ”]

From the TOC: BeParashat Nesakhim [“In the Section on Libations”] ≈ מ [40]; Inyan HaNesakhim [“The Matter of Libations”] ≈ מא [41] (another discourse; do not conflate).

- PDF 111–112 (Arabic numerals ~80–82): text with “the land of your dwelling places” / summary on seraphim / the element of fire. Animal = fire is seen in parentheses (vegetative = water; animal = fire), the reverse of Etz Chaim, gate נ [50], chapter י [10] (animal = air, speaking = fire), according to report/digital text. Not to be harmonized.
- Tetze → Shelach pointer on PDF292; Shelach → Tetze pointer in print: open.

P1 — L4 / L5 (New Sources) — Pairing Table (Report Only; Not a Determination)

Source	Animal	Speaking
L4, print §א [1]	Fire	Air
L5, print (parentheses)	Fire	(Not in those parentheses)
Etz Chaim, gate נ [50], chapter י [10] (digital/report)	Air	Fire
Iggeret HaKodesh 20 (known text)	L4 direction	—

Dossier 0395 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [499]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R4 — Edition

Kehot Likkutei Torah, hb58812.pdf — ©1948 / Rev 1998 / 7th 2017, 904 pp. Path: /workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/hb58812.pdf.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R4 — Do not confuse

- Site «תצא א׳» / «שלח ה׳» / «צו ז׳» [Tetze 1 / Shelach 5 / Tzav 7] = article INDEX, not printed folio.
- PDF page ≠ printed folio ≠ column.
- R2 «צו יג» [Tzav 13] = Sheishet Yamim print folio, not Matzah Zo.

Dossier 0396 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [269]

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R4)

Mark: body / photo / transcript / search / late / inference

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R4) — Likkutei Torah print (hb58812) — photo

1. PDF 292 — Teitzei first maamar §א [1]: pairing אש/חי · רוח/מדבר [fire/animal · air/speaking]; pointer (ועמ״ש מזה בד״ה בפ׳ נסכים בפ׳ שלח) [“And see what is written about this in the discourse beginning, in the section on libations, in the portion Shelach”]; arabic header 68. TOC folio לד [34]. photo + body (digital parallel).

[499] Document 0395: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[269] Document 0396: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

2. PDF 293 — ד§ [4] region: piercing / נעוץ תחילתן בסופן [“their beginning is embedded in their end”] / Torah–maaseh. photo.
3. PDF 111–112 — Shelach nissachim block (מושבותיכם [“your dwelling places”] / seraphim / יסוד האש [“the element of fire”]); parenthetical חי=אש צומח=מים [animal=fire, vegetative=water]. Next maamar «ענין הנסכים» [“The Matter of Libations”] boundary. photo. Reverse pointer Teitzei not isolated. gap.
4. PDF 55–57 (re-check + raw 054–058) — Sheishet Yamim: 55 opener/header יג [13]; 56–57 full proof sentences. photo. Not Matzah Zo.
5. PDF 103–107 — Emor Vehenif: 106 arab 76, ד§ [4], Iggeret pointer zone; 107 folio לט [39]. photo. Folio לח [38] and column ג [c] = inference.

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R4) — Etz Chaim

- Shaar 50 ch.10 pairing (חי=רוח, מדבר=אש [animal=air, speaking=fire]): late/digital contrast table only — no new EC photo. Do not harmonize with L4/L5.

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R4) — Inherited R3 photos (copied, not overwritten in R3)

Emor 103–106, Sheishet 055–057, related crops — used as baselines; R4 re-extracted where needed from hb58812.

Dossier 0397 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or testimony from the history of the research [500]

[500] Document 0397: VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS — R4 critical fixes — 2. Emor PDF106 ↔ citation «לח ג» [38c]

Field	Value	Status
PDF page	106	SEEN
Arabic header	76	SEEN
Section	ד§ [4]	SEEN
Iggeret pointer	in body (right column zone)	SEEN (photo + prior R3/collector)
Adjacent	PDF107 folio לט [39]	SEEN
Printed folio letter	לח [38]	INFERRED (לח≈76 [38] via ×2 pattern + sequence; Teitzei לד≈68 [34] corroborates)
Column «ג» [c]	right column of leaf	INFERRED (citation convention / position; glyph not separately photographed)

Presence in print ≠ Alter Rebbe authorship of the pointer. Attribution: OPEN.

VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS — R4 critical fixes — 3. L4 / L5 print IDs

- Source: L4
- Maamar title: כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [“When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies”]
- §: א [1]
- Visible print mark: arab 68 SEEN
- Folio: TOC/inf לד [34]
- PDF: 292
- Column notes: א§ [1] then ב§ [2]; pairing + Shelach pointer
- Source: L4
- Maamar title: same
- §: ד [4]

- Visible print mark: continues leaf
- Folio: span inf לד/לה [34/35]
- PDF: 293
- Column notes: נעיצה / תורה–מעשה [embedding / Torah–action]
- Source: L5
- Maamar title: בפ' נסכים כתיב כי תבאו ["In the Section on Libations It Is Written, 'When You Enter' "] (nissachim block)
- §: region א [1]
- Visible print mark: arab ~80–82
- Folio: TOC מ [40]
- PDF: 111–112
- Column notes: חי=אש [animal=fire] parenthetical SEEN; do not use site «שלח ה'» [Shelach 5] as folio
- Source: ≠L5
- Maamar title: ענין הנסכים ["The Matter of Libations"]
- §: —
- Visible print mark: —
- Folio: TOC מא [41]
- PDF: from 112
- Column notes: different maamar

Site «תצא א'» [Tetze 1] ≠ print page א [1].

VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS — R4 critical fixes — 4. L1 Sheishet Yamim — start vs citation loci

What	Locus	PDF
Maamar start / header יג [13] / start ב§ [2]	print יג [13]	55
Two proof sentences (basar/dagan etc.)	same maamar continuation	56–57
Not Matzah Zo	Matzah Zo = יא ג [11c] PDF51–53 (R3 inherit)	—

What	Locus	PDF
Not צו ז׳ [Tzav 7] as this maamar	—	—

VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS — R4 critical fixes — 5. Pairing contrast (report only; no harmonization)

Source	חי [Animal]	מדבר [Speaking]
L4 §א [1] print	אש [Fire]	רוח [Air]
L5 parenthetical	אש [Fire]	—
Etz Chaim 50:10 (digital/late)	רוח [Air]	אש [Fire]

Dossier 0420 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [501]

IGK20-Finale-R4 — Compiler's Review and Completion toward a Summary

September 23, 2026. The supplied Grok and Claude reports were examined. The Bot-R4 report was not attached. No booklet and no reopening of the Earth or union dossier.

IGK20-Finale-R4 — Compiler's Review and Completion toward a Summary — What Can Already Be Explained

The passage presents the manifest order of created beings and the higher's reception from the lower. The examples add that this reception is not only bodily existence: daat too, and afterward the nourishment of angels, are connected with the lower. The Epistle explains this through the radiance at the bottom and returning light; Likkutei

[501] Document 0420: IGK20-Finale-R4-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Torah supplies parallels concerning root and refinement. These explanations can be combined while preserving the difference between the power's root, the mode of radiance, and human action.

The transition to mitzvot requires the component of command already stated in the Epistle's text. The advantage of matter in itself does not turn every use of it into a mitzvah. Nor does the precedence of action in the purpose of descent negate Torah's advantage. The explanation must show what is drawn down, with what the action is performed, and where its purpose is revealed, without reducing mitzvot to ascent alone.

Details of wording remain for which no additional proved reason is available here: the double "father and mother," specifically an ox, dividing wisdom and knowledge between the two proofs, and a single reason for omitting the inanimate. Their plain meaning and function can be explained without presenting conjectured expositions as determinations.

IGK20-Finale-R4 — Compiler's Review and Completion toward a Summary — R5 — A Defined Target for Completion

- Grok: the four pairs according to L6, the limit of reconciliation with Etz Chaim, and completion of the first half with the help of the source located.
- Claude: limiting the ascent/descent formula, examining the premise of the difficulty concerning angels, and a complete concluding explanation.
- Bot: focused witnesses for L6 and L7; R4 supplements only if they were not completed. There is no assumption that a report we did not receive was submitted.

The three prompts contain the entire text, forty questions, and the research they need. R5 is intended to finish an explanation with limits;

details that do not change it will remain in the register and will not automatically generate another round. The general booklet is not yet being opened.

Dossier 0521 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [502]

R4 local evidence reused (NOT re-done) — L1 Sheishet Yamim two proofs

- SEEN in R4: LT_Tzav_SheshesYamim_proofs_pdf-056.png + LT_Tzav_SheshesYamim_cont_pdf-057.png
- Copied into R5 EVIDENCE. Locus: PDF56–57 (print יג [13] maamar continuation).

R4 local evidence reused (NOT re-done) — L4 Ki Teitzei §§א [1] and ד [4]

- SEEN in R4: LT_Teitzei_KiTeitzei_§א_printLD_arab68_pdf-292.png + LT_Teitzei_KiTeitzei_§ד_pdf-293.png
- Copied into R5. arab 68 SEEN; TOC לד [34].

R4 local evidence reused (NOT re-done) — Emor PDF106 arab 76 → לח ג [38c]

- SEEN in R4: LT_Emor_Vehenif_§ד_arab76_pdf-106.png + REPORT
- Folio לח [38] INFERRED; column ג [c] INFERRED (do not claim stronger).

[502] Document 0521: R4_POINTERS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Dossier 0401 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [503]

IGK20-Finale-R5-Bot — closing witness pack

Finale unit for Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Positive biur + explicit boundaries. No new question list. No booklet. R1–R4 untouched.

IGK20-Finale-R5-Bot — closing witness pack — Critical

Collector did not receive Bot-R4 as attachment. R4 witnesses cited as local/Drive Bot-R4.

Local R4: /workspace/IGK20-Finale-R4/

Drive R4: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1bhqfJyVYcK18HtxqGP7IDyOXhb5-gaJE

Dossier 0402 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [504]

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation)

Date: 2026-09-23 ~15:13–15:30 ET

Unit: conclusion of the Iggeret HaKodesh 20 unit (finale)

Likkutei Torah edition: Kehot hb58812 (©1948 / revision 1998 / 7th ed. 2017)

[503] Document 0401: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[504] Document 0402: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Critical note: the compiler did not receive Bot-R4 as an appendix. R4 witnesses are cited as local/Drive Bot-R4 only. R1–R4 were not overwritten.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — Explicit Explanatory Limits (Minor)

#	Limit
א [1]	From Ki Tetze ד§ [4] alone one cannot derive «Torah = only descent / mitzvot = only ascent»; in Kuntres Acharon 4, both directions (elevation and drawing down) serve a higher need; practical mitzvot emphasize drawing down.

#	Limit
ב [2]	Do not automatically posit a contradiction between an angel with a fixed attribute and a refined world (L6 א§ [1]).
ג [3]	The presence of the pointer «אג"ה» in print is not authorship by the Alter Rebbe / does not prove editing.
ד [4]	Tanya chapters 5/41 were not cited as read; they were not opened in this round.
ה [5]	Note 61 in Hebrew was not obtained; secondary and not an obstacle.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — P3 — Status of R4 Leftovers

Item	Already in R4	Seen now in R5	Not obtained
L1 proofs 056+057	Yes	Copied/cited	—
L4 Tetze ד§ + [1] א§ [4]	Yes	Copied/cited	—
Emor ג לח→106 [38c]	Yes (לח/ג [38/c] inferred)	Cited without strengthening	Separate glyph «ג» [c]
Five complete LT discourses	—	Not supplied again (intentionally)	—

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — What Was Not Done (Intentionally)

No booklet · No new question list for another round · No overwriting R1–R4 · No manuscript research to attribute the pointer · No opening of union/Piena/«Thus far» · No giant PDF in the ZIP.

Dossier 0404 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or testimony from the history of the research [270]

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R5)

Mark: body / photo / transcript / search / late / inference

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R5) — Explicit non-reads

- Tanya chapters 5 / 41 — not opened.
- Note 61 HE — not obtained (secondary).
- KA4 Kehot paper folio — not obtained.
- Manuscript attribution research — not done.

Dossier 0617 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 180

Criticism, collection, or interim determination [505]

IGK20-Finale-Close

Closing report on the concluding unit only, September 23, 2026. No general booklet.

[270] Document 0404: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[505] Document 0617: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- REPORT_HE: the compiler's report, continuous explanation, corrections, limits, and reading register.
- S_STATUS.md: the forty original questions, the determination and state of knowledge for each.
- S_STATUS.csv: the same information for import into a table.
- evidence/L6_Pinchas_PDF180.png: a photograph seen during the review; section ג' [3] and the four pairs. It comes from the Bot-R5 package linked below. This is a photographed page from a modern edition, not a manuscript.

Original witness package: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aRuEIKR-1zn9MFwJF3x9b2N9UqJ0n0ej

Original photograph file: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cS3hvpkClbTC07ak8S15q-PGN7KOaRaY/view

The L1 photograph downloaded during the review arrived as a truncated file, was not read visually, and is not included. The digital L1 text was read. Witnesses from previous rounds are not copied into this package; the report contains links and reading statuses.

20 · Sacrifice, Mitzvot, and the Revelation of Light Below

Sacrifice extends the structure of nourishment to the chariot. The animal and bird, lower than the angels, participate in the pleasure and nourishment described above. Understanding this requires reading the Zohar's expressions in their locations, identifying the subjects and the sequence of the faces of ox, lion, and human, and avoiding the combination of different occurrences as though they were textual variants of the same sentence.

The concluding research also distinguished between an angel's fixed characteristic and the question of whether the world in which it exists

is refined. A source in Pinchas showed that a fixed attribute and a refined world can coexist. The first alone does not imply the opposite of the second.

The transition to practical mitzvot returns the Epistle to its purpose. The lower's advantage does not end in leaving it upward. Action arouses and draws down, and the result concerns revelation in vessels and below. The entire system therefore must not be based on "Torah descends, mitzvot ascend." Kuntres Acharon 4 and Likkutei Torah parallels require a richer reading of the directions.

This chapter also examines the limits of references: correspondence in content with Kuntres Acharon can identify an important parallel without deciding who wrote a printed reference; a correct page citation does not prove every interpretation attributed to it. The book's conclusion thus preserves the positive achievement, understanding action as a place of revelation, together with responsibility for every link through which that understanding is reached.

The Epistle's Wording — Source Units

[W16-01 · source words 1–10]

And through this will be well understood, with good taste and knowledge, how the supernal angels in the chariot,

[W16-02 · source words 11–18]

the face of the ox and face of the eagle, greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied

[W16-03 · source words 19–26]

from the spirit of the animal and bird rising over them (עליהם) from the sacrifices upon the altar,

[W16-04 · source words 27–33]

and as is precise in the holy Zohar's wording: "And they derive pleasure from their foundation and root."

[W16-05 · source words 34–44]

And after these words and this truth, knowledge comes easily to the discerning, to understand through all the aforementioned

[W16-06 · source words 45–55]

the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world,

[W16-07 · source words 56–65]

as written: "today, to perform them," and "One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better

[W16-08 · source words 66–68]

than all the life of the World to Come."

[W16-09 · source words 69–71]

(Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting):

The word ranges preserve the local count in the earlier division of the source; W identifiers are fixed. Word count of the working text: 1,640 words.

The Question and Its Investigation

What does the spirit of the sacrifice add to the angels from which it was drawn, and how does the progression lead to the advantage of practical mitzvot?

The relationship seen in nourishment now appears in the chariot: the face of the ox and face of the eagle derive pleasure from the spirit of the animal and bird rising from the sacrifice. In the Zohar, the spirit is drawn from above, whereas the creatures below are a foundation in this world to which the higher beings approach. These are not

two opposite claims concerning the same relationship. The higher is the source of the spirit, and the lower is its place and garment in this world. The Epistle emphasizes the pleasure derived from "their foundation and root" within the progression in which the lower adds to the higher.

In Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), ד§ [4], it is printed that refinement reveals the lights of Tohu, hence the angels' pleasure. A reference to the end of Ihu Ve-chayohi ["He and His Vitality"] is also printed; the reference's very existence does not determine who wrote it. The explanation adds a way to understand the sacrifice's contribution without identifying all its terms with returning light. An angel with a fixed attribute can be refined: Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, describes Michael in love and Gabriel in awe in a world already refined. A fixed role is not proof of a lack of refinement.

"And after these words and this truth" returns to the purpose of the entire Epistle. At its beginning, it was explained that separate beings are created so that they will fulfill the Emanator's commandments; in its middle, that the root of mitzvot is high although they appear in action; and at its end, the power of the bottom becomes clear. Therefore the practical mitzvah in this world is the purpose of the souls' descent.

Command is an indispensable link: not every action in matter becomes a mitzvah by virtue of its physicality alone.

"Today, to perform them" establishes the time of Divine service, and "One hour of repentance and good deeds is better" explains its advantage over the life of the World to Come. This is not an absolute ranking of action above Torah in every respect: Torah too draws down light and has the advantage of inwardness and apprehension. Root, action, and result are not one axis. Finally comes the transmission note,

“Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting.” It marks the limit of the material found, and by itself proves neither an abrupt truncation nor an intentional ending.

S20 · The Human Face and the Human Figure upon the Throne

What is the chariot in this sentence: chayot, angels, Beriah/Yetzirah, a general category, or a particular aspect? Read Ezekiel 1 in context; do not identify levels without a source. What is the relationship to the human figure upon the throne?

Ezekiel’s vision includes faces in human likeness and also a likeness with the appearance of a human being above the throne. Similar wording can merge two different levels. The Epistle itself speaks of angels in the chariot, so the distinction must be preserved.

In Ezekiel 1, each chayah has four faces, among them a human face; the figure upon the throne appears later, above the firmament. These are not the same detail in the vision. The Epistle calls the face of the ox and face of the eagle supernal angels in the chariot. K5 also distinguishes, regarding the roots of souls, between the human face and the human figure upon the throne. Do not add an identification of a world or level to every detail without a focused source.

The first step is to read the biblical description before using the names as kabbalistic shorthand. The verses on four faces and on the human face concern the chayot. The verse on the likeness of the throne and on a likeness with the appearance of a human being adds another layer. Simply saying “the human in the chariot” without distinguishing them can mistakenly transfer a root of souls from one place to another.

K5 contributed an explicit distinction between the human face in the chariot and the supernal human upon the throne in the context of the roots of nefashot and neshamot. It is a later source interpreting a

related system, and does not change the order of the verses. Its value here is that it shows that the biblical distinction is also preserved in the Chasidic explanation and is not a meaningless visual detail.

The material examined did not supply a complete map of all worlds in every occurrence in answer to the user's question about the chariot's world. The Epistle says "supernal angels in the chariot." Other sources may distinguish between chariots and levels, but the designation alone cannot determine whether every detail belongs to Beriah or Yetzirah in the same sense. Positive precision sometimes means preserving the author's definition without adding a broader map.

An example of a counter-test is the question of how a human can be a face among animals, while in the inanimate–vegetative–animal–speaking order the human is above them. The difficulty diminishes when we distinguish between levels of physical created beings and the chariot's faces as spiritual symbols and roots. This is not a physical human standing beside a physical ox. Nevertheless, the distinction must not become permission to invent any relationship between the maps; the parallels establish which connections may be explained.

This result is needed for the continuation on sacrifice. When saying that the animal's spirit returns to the faces in the chariot, do not transfer it without a reason to the human figure upon the throne. Even when L3 describes ascent as far as Malchut of Atzilut, the stages of explanation it supplies must be preserved. Distinguishing the locations does not dissolve the vision's unity; it enables us to follow the claims of each source. [506]

[506] Ezekiel 1, verses 6, 10, 26; the four faces and the human figure upon the throne; do not identify the human face with the human figure upon the throne without distinguishing them. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_לאקזחי ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; "Ve-niglah kevod Havayah" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), §§ג–ח, [5722] תשכ"ב [3–8], particularly the food's body and the encompassing light; notes 49, 54; an unreviewed transcript; access status

S21 · Interinclusion Does Not Abolish a Role

Four faces for each chayah and interinclusion: how are they nevertheless called ox/eagle/lion/human? What is primary in each name, and how many interinclusions are actually required by the source? Do not manufacture infinite multiplicity as an explanation for everything.

If all the faces are included in one another, it must be explained why particular faces remain the source of animals and others of birds. In addition, interinclusion must be distinguished from refinement: these mistakenly became interchangeable terms during the research.

The Zohar describes interinclusion and, in the same sequence, assigns defined roles to ox and eagle. The two are not contradictory. L6 shows that even in a world already refined there is Michael in love and Gabriel in awe. A fixed attribute does not prove a lack of refinement, and refinement does not prove that all attributes have become one role. Distinguish root, state, structure, and nullification.

The first datum is local and simple: the Zohar does not regard its description of the faces gazing at and becoming included in one another as a reason to stop calling them ox and eagle. Immediately after the description, it continues to the extension of spirit to animals and birds. The names therefore indicate roles within a system containing connections, not a claim that each aspect is wholly isolated.

R4 raised a difficulty between “each in a particular attribute” in L3 and “Ban already refined” in K4. Behind the difficulty lay the assumption that refinement should abolish the particular attribute. L6 §א [1] explicitly challenged that assumption: it describes a clarified world

varied between rounds. https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm ; Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע״ב–רמא ע״א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle’s quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website’s translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84

that has already been refined, and within it the camp of Michael in love and the camp of Gabriel in awe, each in its place. Constancy is compatible with refinement and in itself does not testify against it.

The embryo analogy in L6 must also be read. There, a state in which the head and foot are included together describes the time before formation is complete. This is not the same rectified interinclusion of attributes in a human partzuf discussed in L3. The same word can indicate an early lack of differentiation or an integration of differentiated aspects. Using it as a uniform term without context produces contradictions that the texts themselves do not posit.

L3 adds another kind of connection: peace between the minister of water and the minister of fire through a revelation above the attributes. An angel's particular attribute therefore does not imply that it has no relation whatsoever of interinclusion or shared nullification. What is limited is a particular structure and role, not every possibility of connection. The closing formulation also corrected the exaggeration produced in the opposite direction.

The combined reconciliation distinguishes a root in Tohu, a refined state, and a particular role. It rests on several sources rather than a single sentence listing all three. It may therefore be called a supported reconciliation, provided that the combination is marked. There is no need to attribute to each source the words stated by the other, and no need to generate infinite levels of interinclusion to avoid every limit.[507]

[507] Ezekiel 1, verses 6, 10, 26; the four faces and the human figure upon the throne; do not identify the human face with the human figure upon the throne without distinguishing them. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_לאקוחי ; Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע"ב–רמא ע"א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), §§א–ו [1–6], particularly ג לח; §ד [4] [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840 ; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et benei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel"), §§א–ד [1–4];

S22 · Ox for All Animals, Eagle for Birds

Why is the ox a root for animals and the eagle for birds, including different species? What is the relationship to kosher/non-kosher species and to the fact that an eagle is not offered as a sacrifice? Supply a source, not a zoological generalization.

The face's name is not a list of the species actually offered. If eagle designates a root of birds, it does not follow that an eagle is sacrificed. We must examine the species the Zohar itself lists and the scope of the correspondence.

In the Zohar, the spirit of animals extends from the face of the ox, and the sequence also mentions bulls, sheep, he-goats, and goats. The spirit of birds extends from the face of the eagle, while pigeons and turtledoves are mentioned for sacrifice. Thus ox and eagle name spiritual roots, rather than restricting the matter to two physical species. This does not provide an exhaustive theory of all kosher and non-kosher species.

The difficulty sharpens when "root" is translated into simple identity. If the face of the ox were an enlarged physical ox, it would be hard to understand why a sheep belonged to it. But the source itself lists several species under the same extension. The answer is not a generalization invented by the editor to rescue the correspondence; it is a datum of the Zoharic sequence.

With the eagle too, there is no need to invent a sacrifice that is not mentioned. The Zohar distinguishes between the faces from which the spirit extends and the birds brought to the altar. The difference

---

the four pairs in ג§ [3]; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923 ; "Pekuda liten machatzit ha-shekel" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), תשכ"ג, §§ו–ח ,[5723] [6–8], note 37; Mah, Ban, and Sag; an unreviewed transcript; according to note 1, based on a discourse of the Alter Rebbe with notes by the Tzemach Tzedek. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192

between source and branch allows the higher name to be eagle and the practical example to be a turtledove or pigeon. This does not change the Epistle's wording, which links the face of the eagle with the bird's spirit rising from the sacrifices.

What has not been fully answered is why specifically the form of the ox or eagle names that root throughout the kabbalistic system. Additional discourses concerning the natures of species and the attributes may be found, but the present investigation did not construct a comprehensive map of them. The report must explicitly state what it proves: the relationship between the faces and the group of animals appears in the source; the full reason for each name's symbolism is not proved from it.

Impurity and purity require similar care. The fact that the source concerns sacrificial birds does not by itself determine all the roots of birds that are not offered. Do not transfer the limits of sacrifice to the limits of hishtalshelut, or vice versa. For the Epistle's sentence, it is enough to identify the spirit rising from sacrificial species and its connection to the faces; a complete system of all species is a broader demand.

A further implication concerns the meat proof. Since the face of the ox also includes a source for sheep and goats, the transition to ox meat does not prove that the reason for the additional intellect is particular specifically to the ox species. The connection between the passages is strengthened at the level of the structure of nourishment, but does not resolve every question about the choice of species in the Talmudic discussion. [508]

[508]Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע״ב–רמא ע״א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et benei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel"), §§א–ד [1–4]; the four pairs in §ג [3]; PDF 179–181, particularly

S23 · The Lion and Human Do Not Disappear from the Zohar

Why does the Alter Rebbe mention only ox and eagle when the adjacent Zohar also discusses lion and human? Give an answer suited to the Epistle's argument and the strongest evidence against it. The absence of wild animals from sacrifice is not the end of the discussion.

An early answer said that a lion is not offered and therefore does not belong in the discussion. But the Zohar itself assigns roles to lion and human. The Epistle's choice must be explained without erasing the source's continuation.

The Epistle concerns the spirit of the animal and bird, so the faces of ox and eagle suit the example. In the Zohar, the lion participates through fire and the human through the spirit and soul of the person bringing the offering. The local explanation for choosing the two faces is strong, but it is not an explicit statement by the Alter Rebbe concerning the reason for the omission. Do not say that the other two do not participate in sacrifice.

The initial error arose from an explanation that was partly correct but closed too soon. There is no offering of a lion as there is of the animal and bird mentioned. This can explain why there is no parallel example of the spirit of a physical lion. It cannot establish that the lion's face has no role in sacrifice. The Zohar's continuation is a direct counter-test of that extension.

Paragraphs 539–541 discuss human and lion. The human is connected with the spirit and soul of the person bringing the offering; the lion descends in fire and is included in the process of sacrifice. The complete sacrifice is therefore broader than the two animal categories. The Epistle can select from it the part needed to demonstrate the

180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923

higher's nourishment from the lower without purporting to convey the Zohar's entire teaching on sacrifice.

The preferred explanation is thus a delimitation of the example. Earlier, grain and meat were discussed as sources for the human being; now, the spirit of animal and bird as a source for angels. These two kinds have an explicit correspondence to ox and eagle in the Zohar. Lion and human are not examples of the same kind, although they belong to the ritual and the higher structure. The Epistle's choice is thus preserved, and the strongest contrary evidence ceases to be a contradiction.

Why, nevertheless, is this not a complete determination of the reason for the omission? Because the Epistle does not add, "and therefore I did not mention lion and human." There may be further considerations of brevity or emphasis unknown to us. Strong contextual evidence justifies a preferred explanation; it does not become the author's testimony about his editorial work. The difference is particularly important after the investigation has already corrected an earlier categorical claim.

The reader should receive the answer without the burden of the error diary: the two faces correspond to the spirit of the animal and bird, while the other two are discussed in the Zohar in other roles. The research has a duty also to preserve why the explanation "there are no wild animals in sacrifice" was insufficient. This shows that the correction added context rather than merely replacing one cautious expression with another. [509]

[509] Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע"ב–רמא ע"א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

S24 · A Spirit That Descends, a Spirit That Returns

“The spirit of the animal and bird rising to them”: what rises, who raises it, and what is the relationship between the physical branch and the source of the spirit? Does the spirit return to the root from which it came or reach above it, and in what sense?

If the animal’s spirit already came from the angels, it is difficult to understand what they receive in its return. This is the central question concerning the mechanism of sacrifice: return to a source does not by itself explain an addition within the source.

In the Zohar, the spirit extends from the faces to the lower being and returns through sacrifice; the lower is also a foundation and garment in this world. The Epistle explains the higher’s nourishment through the returning light at the bottom. L3 adds that refinement reveals lights of Tohu. A proximate source and a higher root can be combined, provided that the entire wording of the parallels is not attributed to the Zohar itself.

The Zohar describes more than one direction of relationship. The face of the ox is a source for the animal’s spirit; the hosts approach their foundation and garment below and derive pleasure from it. There is no need to choose which direction is true and erase the other. In different contexts, “foundation” refers to the spirit’s origin and to its basis in this world. This was one of the principal distinctions that the review added to the initial research.

The analogy of the Shechinah and the righteous person’s spirit in paragraph 535 connects origin and return. The pleasure is connected with the spirit’s having come from the one who derives pleasure. It explains a relationship of belonging, but does not by itself formulate the entire mechanism of additional light developed by the Chasidic explanation. The Zohar therefore must not be summarized as though it says only “a kind derives pleasure from its own kind,” nor should

the endpoint of Adam Kadmon's feet be introduced into it without marking the addition.

The Epistle places the rising spirit after the explanation of returning light. In doing so, it gives a reason for the addition from the lower, rather than merely describing an unchanged circular motion. The interpretive inference is that passage through the bottom, where the radiance is revealed with greater force, explains why the return is not merely a return of the same amount of vitality. This must be formulated as an understanding of the Epistle's sequence, not as an explicit quotation from the Zohar.

L3 details the refinement of the animal's spirit and its elevation to the face of the ox and as far as Malchut of Atzilut, followed by revelation of the lights of Tohu and the angels' pleasure. This is a significant Chasidic witness for reading the addition. The reference to the Epistle is printed there; its personal attribution to the Alter Rebbe or an editor was not decided. The parallel's value as content does not depend on the historical determination of who wrote the pointer.

One can distinguish between a proximate source and a higher root: the spirit is drawn from the chariot, while the root of the lights revealed through refinement is higher than the recipient's present level. K4 adds the difference between Ban already refined and that which has not yet been refined. The combined explanation does not claim that every source stated all the stages. It presents how the addition can be understood through distinctions with separate anchors.

Care is also needed with "unrefined." The animal before Divine service is treated as requiring refinement; what nourishes the angels must not be described as though it remains unrefined after the offering. The addition is connected with Divine service and elevation, not with transferring raw impurity to the higher. This is a small but in-

dispensable correction of applicability for a continuous formulation that does not clash with the parallels. [510]

S25 · Pleasure, Nourishment, and Supply

“Greatly derive pleasure, are nourished, and are supplied”: explain each verb, including its source if found. Is “mistapkim” from the root meaning supply rather than doubt? What does “greatly” add? Do not invent three sefirot.

Three adjacent verbs can elaborate one relationship or indicate three levels. Their linguistic meanings must first be explained, and we must examine which already occur in the Zohar.

“Derive pleasure” indicates enjoyment; “are nourished,” reception of vitality; “are supplied,” receiving the supply of their needs, not casting doubt. The pair pleasure and nourishment was found in the Zohar; “are supplied” was not located in the sequence examined. “Greatly” intensifies the pleasure. No source was found assigning the three expressions to three separate sefirot or levels.

The initial research proposed a useful linguistic division: pleasure, vitality, and supply. It is retained as a plain interpretation, provided it

[510] Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע”ב–רמא ע”א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle’s quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website’s translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from “And furthermore, this” to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam” (“Explanation Based on ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”), §§א–ו [1–6], particularly §ד [4]; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840 ; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “Va-akhaltem akhol” (“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”), discussion of eating and elevation and of the future; witnesses at PDF 44–45; digital text and photographs; no proved identity with the kav’s returning light. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808 ; “Pekuda liten machatzit ha-shekel” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), תשכ”ג [5723] [6–8], note 37; §§ו–ח, Mah, Ban, and Sag; an unreviewed transcript; according to note 1, based on a discourse of the Alter Rebbe with notes by the Tzemach Tzedek. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192

is not turned into a kabbalistic table. Different words do not require three separate sources of light. They may elaborate the description of reception to take it beyond merely external pleasure and indicate genuine dependence.

Investigation of the source gave added weight to two of the verbs. The Zohar has "אתהנון ואתזנו" ["they derived pleasure and were nourished"]; the apparatus also reported the reverse order in some witnesses. Thus pleasure and nourishment are not necessarily two linguistic inventions of the Epistle. Nevertheless, the pair's very existence in the Zohar does not prove that there is no conceptual difference between them. It merely places them in the context within which the difference must be read.

"Mistapkim" ["are supplied"] was not found in the sequence examined. This is a limited search result, not proof that the Alter Rebbe coined the word in this context or that it has no other source in the literature. Therefore, in the book, no exclusive linguistic innovation is attributed to the author. There is a plain explanation in terms of supply, alongside the limit of comparison with the Zohar.

The word "greatly" prompted the possibility of connecting the pleasure with the intensity of the root's revelation. This fits the explanatory sequence, but no separate explicit reason was found for the adjective itself. It is better to say that the pleasure is described as great and that the Epistle's explanation explains the importance of the addition than to assign "greatly" to a fixed level without an applicable source.

The translation must avoid a misleading double meaning. In English, doubt and supply are not as close as in the Hebrew structure, so a word meaning "doubt" must not be chosen. Nor should "nourishment" become a caloric mechanism. A translation of "received sus-

tenance” preserves the reality of reception without replacing spiritual food with physical food. [511]

S26 · The Same Line, or Another Location?

Read Zohar III רמא–רמ [240–241] to the extent needed before and after the quotation: who derives pleasure, from what, what is the foundation and what the root, and to whom does “dilehon” [“their”] refer? Separate the Zohar’s text, translation, and the commentaries Or HaC hamah/Mikdash Melekh/HaSulam.

Two different word orders on the same page are not necessarily textual variants. They may be two different occurrences. First identify the location, and only then compare witnesses to that same location.

The wording closest to the Epistle occurs in the passage on birds, paragraph 537 on the website, in Zohar III רמא ע”א [241a], near line 2. In paragraph 540, near line 14, there is another order and also an actual variant among witnesses in that same line. The preceding context is on רמ ע”ב [240b]. The pronouns are determined separately in each paragraph. The texts of Mikdash Melekh and Or HaChamah were not read in the documented investigation.

The first stage corrected the location itself. The context of the spirit’s extension appears on the previous folio, but the quotation close to the Epistle’s wording is on רמא ע”א [241a]. Throughout the reports, folio designations, website paragraph numbers, and apparatus lines were interchanged; in one place, 240 line 14 was written and corrected to

[511] Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from “And furthermore, this” to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diphlomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע”ב–רמא ע”א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle’s quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website’s translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Stanford/Pritzker variant apparatus, רמא ע”א [241a], particularly lines 2 and 14; secondary scholarly apparatus, not a photograph of the manuscript itself. https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385

רמא א [241a]. Such an error must not remain in the source list merely because the conceptual argument remains correct.

The second stage distinguished two occurrences. In the bird paragraph it says “ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דלהון” [“And they derive pleasure from their foundation and root”]. Later, in the discussion of the four figures, the order is root and foundation in the printed wording examined digitally. A difference between two sentences does not show that copyists disagreed over the same sentence. A claim of a textual variant requires comparing the same unit in different witnesses.

The third stage found an actual variant in the later line in the Stanford apparatus: root–foundation in some printings versus foundation–root in some witnesses. Thus the criticism of R1 did not cancel the entire claim of a variant; it required precision about where it exists and what it attests to. The Epistle’s wording is particularly close to the earlier occurrence, so there is no need to explain it solely through an unusual witness of the later one.

The pronouns also changed in the record. In the ox and bird passages, the subject is hosts or holy spirits; later, the four figures; and in the passage on priests, Levites, and Israelites, additional relationships of belonging appear. Do not say that every “dilehon” [“their”] in the sequence refers to the same noun. A possessive pronoun is not a cosmological map in itself: context determines whose foundation it is and where that foundation is found.

The visual evidence is limited. A digital text and apparatus were read, and a photograph of a Zohar printing serving as the basis for all determinations was not completed. Bot documented locations, but a website screenshot is not a photograph of an early edition. Nor is mention of Or Yakar in the apparatus a reading of the Or Yakar commentary. These distinctions are preserved so that anyone wishing to

continue investigating the text will know precisely what has already been done.

The comparison supplies an interpretive result even without determining which printing was before the Alter Rebbe. There is a clear location for wording close to the quotation; there is a relationship of a lower foundation to higher beings in context; and there is an actual variant elsewhere that does not determine the relationship's direction. The question of the historical printing remains a separate demand, not a prerequisite for reading the present sentence. [512]

S27 · What Does "As Is Precise" Teach?

What precisely does the Alter Rebbe infer through "as is precise in the wording"? Does "foundation and root" prove the superiority of the lower's root, a kind nourishing its own kind, or a source of vitality of another sort? Does the translated reading preserve the direction of the relationship?

The Epistle does not settle for quoting, but emphasizes the precision of the wording. The question is what is found in the words themselves and what is added from the preceding explanation or the Chasidic parallels.

The precision emphasizes that the higher beings derive pleasure from their own foundation and root. In the Zohar, the spirit has a

[512] Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע"ב–רמא ע"א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Stanford/Pritzker variant apparatus, רמא ע"א [241a], particularly lines 2 and 14; secondary scholarly apparatus, not a photograph of the manuscript itself. https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385 ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), §§א–ו [1–6], particularly לח ג [4]; §ד [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840

source above and also a basis and garment below in this world. L3 explains the addition through revelation of the root's lights in Tohu. The combined reading is useful, but the possessive pronoun alone does not prove that "foundation" denotes a concealed higher root in every occurrence.

In the initial research, foundation and root were almost always translated as the deep root of the higher beings. The review required "יסודא דהאי עלמא" ["the foundation of this world"] to be read plainly in context: a basis in this world connected with the spirit's garment and sacrifice. The correction was indispensable because a uniform translation erased the fact that the Zohar points downward. But the correction too cannot erase the passages in which the spirit issues from above.

We must therefore distinguish the direction of hishtalshelut from the relationship of nourishment. The higher source gives spirit to the lower branch; the branch becomes a basis in this world that the higher beings approach and from which they derive pleasure. The word "foundation" participates in both relationships. There is no lexical contradiction, as long as each occurrence explains the subject and what is founded upon it.

L3 changed the status of the Chasidic reading. It says that the angels derive pleasure upon revelation of the lights of Tohu, and gives the Zohar's wording with a reference to the Epistle's conclusion. The root interpretation thus need not be treated as an addition by Lessons alone. There is a parallel in Likkutei Torah connecting the quotation with revelation of the root. The reference's presence is proved in the witness read, but its author is undecided.

What does "as is precise" add within the Epistle? The preferred reading is that the food is not something foreign that the higher happens to receive; it has a relationship to its foundation and root. The pre-

ceding explanation shows how a lower being can carry an addition to a higher. The Zohar quotation joins it as expressing such a relationship of belonging. This is a strong contextual interpretation, but it must not become a claim that the Zohar's entire explanation is already identical to the Epistle's map of lights.

The alternative of affinity of kind alone remains too narrow if it erases the Epistle's treatment of returning light. The alternative of a higher root alone is too narrow if it erases the basis in this world in the Zohar. The full explanation preserves both connections and marks where the parallel adds the language of Tohu. There is thus no need to choose between the two halves of the evidence. [513]

S28 · The Angels Too Are of Ban: What Is Added to Them?

If the angels are the animal's root, how does the animal complete them? Do the angels too belong to Ban/Tohu, so that "Tohu versus Tikkun" alone is insufficient? Examine target K4 in particular.

If both recipient and food belong to Ban, the general contrast of Tohu–Tikkun is not sufficient by itself. We must examine not only where they came from, but their state and what is renewed through the service of sacrifice.

[513]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע"ב–רמא ע"א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif hakohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), §§א–ו [1–6], particularly לח ג; [4] ד§ [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840 ; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English: "It" refers to the animal; omission of earth and the qualification after creation; a later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note's Hebrew source was not verified. https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431

K4 distinguishes between angels who are Ban already refined and animals not yet refined, whose root is higher. L3 describes revelation of the lights of Tohu, while L6 shows that a refined state is compatible with a fixed role. Root, state, and role can be combined into one explanation, but no single source was found that explicitly formulates the whole combination.

K4 is important because it explicitly asks the difficult question. This is not a general reference to a discourse on sacrifices, but a distinction within Ban itself. What has not yet been refined is lower in its state, and the discourse reads that lowliness as an indication of a higher root. Refinement raises it above the refiner's level. There is thus no need to assume that the angel belongs to a system entirely unconnected with the animal's root.

In R3, the difference between L3 and K4 was described as a different location for the angel. R4 narrowed the claim: one source may describe a root and the other a state after refinement, so there is no necessary disagreement. The correction matters because two non-overlapping vocabularies are not necessarily two contradictory positions. We must first determine which question each sentence answers.

L6 provided a test of another assumption. Michael in love and Gabriel in awe are described in a clarified world already refined. A particular role therefore must not be identified with a lack of refinement. The proposed reconciliation need not say that the angel changed its essence between the sources; it can say that belonging to a root, a state of refinement, and mode of operation are different descriptions of the same recipient.

Nevertheless, the combination remains a combination. L3 does not say in the same sentence, "the particular attribute is a trace of Tohu although it has already been refined"; L6 does not present a map of

Sag and Mah here; K4 is a later explanation in an unreviewed transcript referring to earlier sources. The marking of inference therefore must not be erased once the reconciliation becomes persuasive. The synthesis's strength does not turn it into a quotation.

The angels' pleasure does not imply that they lack all completeness before the sacrifice. The discourses describe addition and revelation. Something refined can also receive an addition from what is revealed through the service of the lower. The word "completes" in the question therefore needs careful reading: there is no need to remedy a moral deficiency or impurity in the angel to explain spiritual nourishment.

The assessment of the sources remains graded. K4 gives a direct distinction addressing the Ban difficulty; L3 gives substance to the revelation; L6 negates an assumed contradiction based on the attributes' constancy; L7 explains the Sag–Mah relationship in food and drawing down. Each contribution is defined separately, and this is the basis for the reasoned combination in the book. [514]

S29 · A Small Sacrifice and Many Recipients

How does a small sacrifice supply a multitude of angels? The Zohar itself raises a related question; what does its explanation add to the

[514] "Pekuda liten machatzit ha-shekel" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), ,[5723] תשכ"ג §§א–ו [1–6], particularly לח ג [4]; §ד [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840 ; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et benei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel"), §§א–ד [1–4]; the four pairs in §ג [3]; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923 ; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4, "To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"; "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and the continuation; reported digital text and Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm

Epistle's plain meaning? Separate physical food and spiritual influence without emptying "are nourished" of content.

If nourishment is interpreted too physically, the problem of dividing the quantity arises. If it becomes merely figurative, the added vitality is lost. The Zohar's analogy offers a way to preserve the reality of influence without calculating portions.

The Zohar uses the analogy of a slender candle's light and abundant influence arising from little. This explains that a small source can allow illumination for many. The analogy is not a quantitative formula for spiritual food, nor does it negate nourishment. It removes the need to measure the recipients according to the mass of the physical sacrifice.

The question teaches that the Zohar does not settle for an unexamined description of pleasure. It itself makes room for wondering about the relationship between the size of the thing below and the multitude of recipients.

The difficulty therefore must not be dismissed by saying that all the words are spiritual and have no content. The analogy is intended to give the reader a way to understand a relationship that is not ordinary material distribution.

A candle can illuminate for many without each recipient receiving a portion of its wick. This is the useful point of the analogy. There is no need to transfer an exact physical mechanism from it to the higher lights. Nor does the analogy's use of a small object prove a numerical relationship between the sacrifice's size and the number of angels. It illustrates how the small, tangible cause does not alone measure the result's scope.

This reading fits "are nourished" in the Epistle. There is an addition that the higher beings receive; it is not merely knowledge that someone below performed a good deed. But the addition is connected with

the sacrifice's spirit and with revelation, not with meat eaten in heaven in the human manner. The language of nourishment can thus be preserved without turning it into a description of an angelic digestive system.

The limit is that the analogy does not replace the explanation of returning light. It chiefly answers the difficulty about quantity. The question of the source of the addition, why what came from above adds when it returns, requires the discussion in the preceding questions. Distinguishing the two difficulties lets each source contribute what it actually explains, without overloading the candle analogy. [509]

S30 · "All the Aforementioned" Returns the Conclusion to the Whole Epistle

"And after these words and this truth, knowledge comes easily to the discerning, to understand through all the aforementioned": identify the biblical turns of phrase, pronouns, and function of each expression; does "all" include the whole Epistle or only the final sequence?

The transition to the conclusion is written in elevated language, but it has a logical function. We must determine what has already been established for the advantage of mitzvot to be "easy to understand," rather than settling for identifying the verses.

"After these words and this truth" echoes II Chronicles 32:1; "knowledge comes easily to the discerning," Proverbs 14:6. The preferred reading includes the body of the Epistle in "all the aforementioned": the command to separate beings, the root of mitzvot, and the drawings down. Nourishment and sacrifice are the final links, not the en-

[509] Zohar III, Pinchas, רמ ע"ב–רמא ע"א [240b–241a], paragraphs 531–547 according to the website; the Epistle's quotation is near 537; the Aramaic text is distinct from the website's translation and commentary. No photograph of print was verified. https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84 ; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

tire basis. The scope of the reference is a contextual conclusion, not the author's explicit definition.

Identifying the biblical turns of phrase is only a first step. The verse from Chronicles supplies the language of transition after matters have been established; the verse from Proverbs supplies language expressing ease of understanding for the discerning. The Epistle uses them to announce the move from an explanatory system to a conclusion. There is no evidence that every detail of the verses' historical context is imported here as an allusion.

The broad reading of "all the aforementioned" rests on earlier explicit anchors. Separate beings were created to fulfill the command; mitzvot are called Torah's essence and root; drawings down of lights are connected with the purpose of humanity's creation. Without these anchors, a transition from natural nourishment to the advantage of a mitzvah may appear to be a leap. Locating them in the Epistle's text restored to the explanation links that did not need to originate with a later commentator.

The narrower alternative is not unreasonable: "all the aforementioned" can sometimes sum up only the nearby sequence, which already includes sacrifice as the performance of a mitzvah. Even then, however, understanding the conclusion is influenced by the preceding discussion of the root of Torah and mitzvot. It is therefore unnecessary to claim that the pronoun grammatically requires every line from the beginning of the Epistle; it is enough to show that the concluding argument naturally rests on the body of the discussion.

"As below" in the paragraph on externality and inwardness remains a forward reference that was not developed in the existing material at the same level of detail. The conclusion may fulfill part of the promise, but this does not prove that the whole distinction was explained there. L7 gives a detailed parallel for inwardness in Torah

and externality in mitzvot. This assists the explanation; it is neither a proved identification of "below" nor evidence of truncation.

"Easy to understand" does not authorize skipping the inferential link. Precisely in a book, that link must be set out: the advantage of the bottom, action according to the command, and the purpose of revelation in the physical world. What is easy for the discerning after reading the whole Epistle is not necessarily clear to a reader beginning only with the last sentence. The explanation's role is to restore the premises, not replace them with a declaration that the conclusion is simple.[515]

S31 · The Advantage of Matter and Commanded Action

What is the logical link from the nourishment of humans and angels to the advantage of practical mitzvot? Why is the mere use of matter insufficient, and what do command, will, nullification, refinement, and intention add? Do not conclude that every material action is a mitzvah.

The fact that lowly food gives life to a human being does not imply that every meal is a mitzvah. We must show where command enters and what sacrifice adds to the transition from nature to human Divine service.

Command is already explicit in the Epistle's text: the separate yesh was created to fulfill mitzvot. The bottom's advantage explains why action in matter can reveal a higher power; sacrifice illustrates commanded Divine service in matter. The conclusion concerns practical mitzvot, not physicality in general. Intention and refinement are

[515]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; II Chronicles 32:1, "After these words and this truth"; linguistic source; an exposition of the historical context is not required. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בל_ב_סימיה_ירבד ; Proverbs 14:6, "And knowledge comes easily to the discerning"; the conclusion's biblical turn of phrase. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ו_די_ילשמ

explained in the parallels, but must not be inserted as conditions of every instance of natural nourishment.

The transition does not start from nothing in the concluding paragraph. The body of the Epistle has already connected the creation of yesh with Malchut and command. When the reports settled for food and sacrifice, a need arose to add "physicality in accordance with G-d's will" from outside. Reading the whole Epistle showed that this component was present from the outset. The proper editorial addition is to return it to the forefront of the explanation, not present it as the explanation's invention.

Natural eating serves as an example of the lower's ability to add. Sacrifice serves as an example that also contains an act of Divine service and elevation. It is therefore an important link between the nourished human being and practical mitzvot. Do not infer that the altar is merely a higher system of nutrition, since the Zohar itself connects sacrifice with repentance and a broken spirit.

However, do not extrapolate from this that every infant tasting grain already performs that same intentional Divine service.

L3 explains human eating with a blessing and intention, and the preceding prayer, in the context of refinement and revelation. L1 marks a separate transition to Divine service after discussing food and the proofs. Both parallels teach that the language of refinement can appear at several levels. The requirement is to read each paragraph's conditions in their place, not turn every use of "refinement" into an identical system of conditions.

Will and nullification can explain the relationship between action and mitzvah within Tanya's framework, but here we must begin with what is explicit: a mitzvah is a command. Do not say that intention alone turns every material action into the same mitzvah praised by the Epistle. Nor should a new halachic ruling on details of action and inten-

tion be constructed from the discussion; the book interprets the Epistle's argument and the parallels examined.

The positive formulation is that commanded action realizes the higher will in the separate world, in the place where the Epistle described a particular revelation of power. This is the link connecting the underlying structure of creation with the purpose of Divine service. Matter matters because the action is performed in it; command matters because it determines the action's relationship to the King. If either component is erased, the Epistle's conclusion changes. [516]

S32 · The Souls' Descent and Revelation Below

The purpose of the souls' descent versus the purpose of humanity's creation, a dwelling in the lower realms, revelation of His powers, and knowing Him: are these levels of explanation or different purposes? Choose precise parallels rather than the slogan "it is all the same thing."

Several formulations of purpose appear in the Epistle and the parallels. Combining them requires distinguishing who descends, what the human being does, and what result is revealed in the world, rather than replacing them all with one slogan.

[516] Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "Biur al pi Ve-henif ha-kohen otam" ("Explanation Based on 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), §§א–ו [1–6], particularly §ד [4]; לח ג [38c] according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and photographs. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undecided. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840 ; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "Tzav et benei Yisrael" ("Command the Children of Israel"), §§א–ד [1–4]; the four pairs in §ג [3]; PDF 179–181, particularly 180; digital text and photograph; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not the portion Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923 ; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4, "To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"; "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and the continuation; reported digital text and Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4, "One hour is better"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; reading of the text was reported in early rounds; not reopened in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/4.htm

The Epistle connects drawings down of lights with the purpose of humanity's creation, and practical mitzvot with the purpose of the souls' descent. L7 explains elevation and drawing down whose purpose is revelation of light below; L4 also describes an addition in the animal soul. These are complementary aspects, not synonyms. Kuntres Acharon 4 is a close parallel to the sowing analogy, but not a proved identification of "elsewhere."

Distinguish the subject of the purpose from the description of the result. "The souls' descent" emphasizes the soul's movement into the world; "humanity's creation" presents the human being within creation's framework; "drawings down" describes an action and result in the lights; "a dwelling in the lower realms" describes the goal of revelation. The connections among them can be explained, but they should not be called four definitions the author gave in the same sentence.

L7 is particularly useful because it does not leave elevation as the ultimate purpose. It emphasizes that revelation of the higher light below is the purpose of hishtalshelut, while the lower's ascent is temporary. Raising mayin nukvin participates in drawing down. Therefore, do not say that a mitzvah takes the human being out of the world and that this alone realizes its purpose; the progression returns to revelation in the lower.

The sowing analogy connects a small act with a power not present in the seed alone. In L7, the etrog and parchment arouse at their root, while in the Epistle, fruits that come through sowing are superior. The closeness clarifies how an action in the lower can participate in a higher drawing down. Yet it does not prove that the words "as written elsewhere" point specifically to this chapter; further evidence of the reference is required.

R5's correction also concerned Torah. If study too draws down light, the goal of revelation below cannot be used to exclude Torah from the purpose. The distinction between Torah and mitzvot is explained through inwardness and externality and through different roots, not a contrast between something that has a purpose and something that has none. The Epistle emphasizes the practical character of mitzvot from within the subject it has been discussing.

Expressions such as "knowing Him" or "revelation of His powers" may occur in other contexts, but here they do not replace the requirement for an applicable parallel. The research need not combine every formulation of creation's purpose found in the literature. It is enough to explain the anchors read and leave the broad comparison of all purposes outside what has been proved in the concluding unit.[517]

S33 · The Advantage of Action Is Not a Single Ladder

"Practical mitzvot" versus Torah: does the Epistle explicitly rank them against each other, or is their advantage established along a particular axis? What about Torah study as a mitzvah, speech as action, prayer, and intention?

The conclusion praises practical mitzvot, but one must not immediately infer that Torah is inferior in every respect. Both the body of the

[517] Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4, "To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"; "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and the continuation; reported digital text and Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm ; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "Ki tetze la-milchamah" ("When You Go Out to War"), א§ [1]: animal and fire; ד§ [4]: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and photographic witnesses. Distinguish root, Divine service, and result. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974 ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37, the purpose of descent, action, and Torah study; reading of the text reported in R3; not reread in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/37.htm

Epistle and the criterion by which each source says “greater” must be examined.

The Epistle’s text explicitly compares the root of mitzvot with Torah and externality with inwardness. The conclusion emphasizes action in this world against the life of the World to Come. L4 distinguishes aspects in which study is greater and action is greater; L7 includes study too in drawing down. It is therefore incorrect to say there is no comparison at all, and incorrect to turn it into an absolute ranking.

At one stage, the review settled for the sentence “there is no comparison with Torah here.” The sentence is correct only if its scope is the narrow concluding unit, in the sense of an explicit comparison in those lines. It is not correct about the whole Epistle: the root of mitzvot in Gulgalta and the root of Torah in Mocha Stima’ah, as well as externality and inwardness, are discussed in the text. R3 and R4 corrected the applicability so that the qualification would not erase an explicit claim.

Another proposal assigned Torah to revelation and mitzvot to purpose. It gives a useful direction, but does not by itself provide the full comparison. L4 explains two aspects of embedding and concludes that both must be present in the human being. L7 distinguishes the inwardness of the mochin from the externality of the vessels, and in the same discussion includes Torah and mitzvot in drawing down. A description of one dimension must not be transferred to all the other dimensions.

R4 proposed a sharp formula: Torah is descent, mitzvot ascent. R5 corrected it from the continuation of L4 itself. At the root of the structure, Torah is compared to descending water and mitzvot to “their end in their beginning”; in human Divine service, Torah brings ratzo [“running forth”] and mitzvot shov [“return”]; in the result, the power

of fire is drawn below as far as the animal soul. Ascent to the root thus participates in drawing down and is not the whole action.

The concept of a practical mitzvah does not negate Torah's itself being a mitzvah. Speech and thought too are discussed in Tanya within systems of garments and drawing down. But here the Epistle emphasizes doing in the physical world from within an argument concerning the bottom. It need not resolve every halachic question concerning speech's status as action, nor should prayer be equated without a source to every detail of a bodily mitzvah.

A good comparison asks in each sentence what is measured: root, manner of investment, quality of union, required action, or purpose. It does not settle for "everything is relative," because it gives each relationship content. This preserves the advantage of action that the Epistle seeks to establish, and at the same time the advantage of Torah explained by the other sources. [518]

S34 · Study Is Greater, Action Is Greater

"Torah study is equivalent to them all" and "Study is greater because it leads to action": read the context and explain what counts as greater

[518]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, the entire Epistle, particularly from "And furthermore, this" to the end of the transmission note; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "Ki tetze la-milchamah" ("When You Go Out to War"), א§ [1]: animal and fire; ד§ [4]: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and photographic witnesses. Distinguish root, Divine service, and result. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974 ; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4, "To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"; "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements") and the continuation; reported digital text and Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4, "One hour is better"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; reading of the text was reported in early rounds; not reopened in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/4.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 5, the union of knowing Torah; food and garment; at different stages: a search excerpt and a reported reading; distinguish the route of access from the content. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/5.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37, the purpose of descent, action, and Torah study; reading of the text reported in R3; not reread in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/37.htm

in each source. Compare Tanya 4–5, 35–37, and Kuntres Acharon 4 if relevant; a division of Torah = apprehension / action = purpose is insufficient without an applicable source.

Different advantages may appear contradictory when each becomes an overall ranking. The sources allow us to examine not only what is more important, but in which question each advantage is decisive.

Kiddushin 40b connects study's greatness with its leading to action. Tanya 4 includes Torah and mitzvot against radiance; chapter 5 explains a particular union in apprehending Torah; chapter 37 distinguishes a mitzvah that others can perform from one that they cannot. L4 supplies two aspects of "greater," and L7 establishes that study too draws down light. The axes combine rather than cancel each other.

The mishnah "Torah study is equivalent to them all" and the discussion of "Study is greater" are not the same sentence and should not be combined without context. Kiddushin presents a determination explaining study's greatness through its leading to action. It contains a relationship between study and result, but not, in the same sentence, a division between our times and the messianic era. The addition of the future axis comes from other Chasidic sources and must be marked accordingly.

Tanya chapter 4 matters because it uses the same mishnah, "One hour is better," that appears at the Epistle's end, and applies the advantage to Torah and mitzvot. The mishnah itself is therefore not evidence for excluding Torah from this world's advantage. Chapter 5 adds the quality of union in apprehension: the intellect is invested in the wisdom, and the wisdom within it. This is an axis that cannot be replaced by a claim about the place of action alone.

Chapter 37 supplies a practical test for preserving both sides. A mitzvah that cannot be performed by others overrides study; when it can be performed by others, one does not interrupt Torah study. The

discussion connects the purpose of descent with great illumination in study without requiring either to negate the other. The book uses it as an explanatory parallel, not as a source for a new ruling unrelated to the question.

L4 explicitly states that both sentences concerning the greatness of Torah and action are true in different respects. But its continuation requires distinguishing root, Divine service, and result. Reading a complete passage is preferable to extracting a line that appears to answer all the sources perfectly. R5 restored drawing down below to the description of what mitzvot effect and corrected the one-directional formula that R4 had already tried to establish.

L7 clarifies that in part of the discussion the principal contrast is between drawing down and mere elevation of intellectually generated love and awe. Study and halachot too draw down light. One therefore must not read “specifically practical mitzvot” while skipping the nearby sentences concerning Torah. Responsible source comparison does not collect only the line that fits the desired side.

The status of reading Tanya changed between researchers and rounds: sometimes a text was opened, and sometimes only a search excerpt was received. This edition preserves the dossier’s conclusion as it was locked, and does not present it as though every participant reread every chapter in every round. The argument derives its force from the sources and their applicability, not from counting how many times a book’s title was recorded. [519]

[519] Kiddushin 40b, study is greater because it leads to action; the discussion’s context; it does not itself contain a division between now and the messianic era. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/שודיק_ב_מ_וי ; Mishnah Peah 1:1, “And Torah study is equivalent to them all”; source of the comparative wording, not a comprehensive mapping of all axes. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_האפ_הנשמ_א ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4, “One hour is better”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; reading of the text was reported in early rounds; not reopened in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/4.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 5, the union of knowing Torah; food and garment; at different stages: a search excerpt and a reported reading; distinguish the route of access from the content. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/5.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei

S35 · Four Times, Not One “Future”

Examine the future assumption in particular: study is greater now/action is greater in the future, or another order? Distinguish the messianic era, resurrection of the dead, and Gan Eden, and apprehension of Torah in the future. Read K3 and its sources; do not present the user’s question as a fact.

“The World to Come” and “the future” do not always denote the same time or the same kind of reward. The question asked for an assumption to be examined, so it must not be copied into the conclusion without reading the source.

K3 explicitly says that in the messianic era, “action is greater” will be revealed; do not turn this into Torah being greater in the future. K5 distinguishes Gan Eden and resurrection in the context of reward and revelation in the body. Tanya 4 explains the World to Come in the context of the pleasure of apprehension, while Eruvin distinguishes doing today from reward tomorrow. Do not infer actual study at resurrection from the exposition “with wisdom You made.”

The preparatory examination had already found in K3 the direction of action being greater in the future. This corrected a possible assumption that Torah specifically would then stand above action. The question itself was not a fact, and the researcher was required to let the source correct it. In presenting the history, do not attribute a categorical position to the user merely because the user asked to examine a possibility.

Amarim 37, the purpose of descent, action, and Torah study; reading of the text reported in R3; not reread in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/37.htm ; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “Ki tetze la-milchamah” (“When You Go Out to War”), א§ [1]: animal and fire; ד§ [4]: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and photographic witnesses. Distinguish root, Divine service, and result. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974 ; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4, “To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”; “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And furthermore, this: in truth, the refinements”) and the continuation; reported digital text and Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a photograph of print. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm

The table must distinguish doing, study, receiving reward, and revelation of an advantage. A statement that action's advantage will be revealed in the future does not necessarily mean that the same framework of doing as today exists at that time. A statement that Torah's reward is in Gan Eden is not a complete description of all study there. Without separating the columns, adjacent cells become claims that were never made.

K5 explains the World to Come in the mishnah "All Israel" in the context of resurrection of the dead. Do not automatically transfer this interpretation to the World to Come in the mishnah "One hour is better." The expression "derive pleasure from the radiance of the Shechinah" also receives different interpretive contexts. The book does not seek to decide all disputes over the definition of the World to Come, but to preserve the local meaning each source gives it.

A particular error was corrected in the R3 table: "with wisdom" and "You made" in K5 were interpreted as though they described study and action actually taking place at resurrection. The context concerns the causes of reward and the revelation arising from Divine service. The correct translation of the source's claim therefore is not an unstated new future action. This is a test of temporal applicability, not merely of a word's meaning.

"Tomorrow" in Eruvin likewise must not be labeled specifically Gan Eden without a source. The exposition places the time of doing against the time of reward. It can serve the Epistle's conclusion without filling every future cell by itself. The empty cell in the table is sometimes the most precise finding: that source supplies us with no statement on the particular question.

The conclusion about the relationship to Torah remains measured. K3 is a later Chasidic explanation of direct importance, but its wording must not be attributed to the Alter Rebbe at the Epistle's conclu-

sion. It adds an axis of future revelation to an advantage explained now. It must not replace the axis of Divine service and reward in the Epistle's two quotations. [520]

S36 · Today, to Perform Them

"Today, to perform them": what do the verse and the exposition in Eruvin prove? Doing versus reward, a time of opportunity, or precedence of action over study? Do not infer beyond the source's applicability.

The exposition sounds like praise of action, but its explicit contrast is today versus tomorrow. We must see what it adds to the Epistle's conclusion without turning it into a discussion of study versus action that it does not contain.

The verse in Deuteronomy 7:11 and the exposition in Eruvin 22a set the time for action against the reception of reward: today to perform them, tomorrow to receive their reward. L6 explains the difference between the world of action and choice and an ordered world that has already undergone refinement. The exposition alone does not decide that action is greater than Torah in every respect.

---

[520] "Tziyon be-mishpat tipadeh" ("Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice"), §§1–יד, [5735] תשל"ה טז [14–16]: study and action now and in the future; the Rebbe's explanation; do not attribute the future wording to the Talmud itself. https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/3140547/jewish/page.htm ; "Ve-niglah kevod Havayah" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), §§1–ח, [5722] [3–8], particularly the food's body and the encompassing light; notes 49, 54; an unreviewed transcript; access status varied between rounds. https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4, "One hour is better"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; reading of the text was reported in early rounds; not reopened in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/4.htm ; Eruvin 22a, "today, to perform them"; tomorrow to receive their reward; text/search excerpts according to the round; a claim concerning the time of doing and reward. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בכ_ויבוריע ; Mishnah Avot 4:17 and Tosafot Yom Tov, both halves of the mishnah: action and contentment; both halves are needed to understand the comparison. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תובא_הנשמ_זי_ד_

The quotation has a role concerned with time and opportunity. The advantage discussed is not merely an abstract advantage of matter, but the advantage of the soul's service in this world. "Today" defines the arena in which action takes place. The exposition thus supports the purpose of descent without addressing every detail of the scale between Torah and mitzvot.

L6 §1 supplies a close parallel: this world is the world of action and choice; in the world that has already undergone refinement, every level is in its place. The comparison does not say that the World to Come contains no content or revelation whatsoever, but that the opportunity for service and change discussed here belongs specifically here. This explains why action in the lower world can be superior along the axis the Epistle seeks to show.

The wording "and not tomorrow to perform them" is not permission to construct a complete table of all future periods without additional sources. Rashi and the parallels help in reading the time of reward, but the subject at the end of the Epistle remains the difference between action and the result received afterward. In this context there is no need to introduce into the exposition a promise about every detail of life after death.

The error to prevent is the substitution of one contrast for another. Today versus tomorrow is not Torah versus action, just as apprehension versus essence is not necessarily study versus a bodily mitzvah. Another source may connect these axes, but that connection must be shown. The Epistle brings the exposition after the advantage of practical mitzvot, and it therefore serves the local conclusion; this does not change the explicit contrast within the exposition itself.[521]

[521]Deuteronomy 7:11 — "which I command you today to perform"; the verse of the commandment; distinct from the exposition in Eruvin and the mishnah in Avot. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/מירבד_אי_ז; Eruvin 22a — today to perform them; tomorrow to receive their reward; full text/search excerpts according to the round; a claim concerning the time for action and reward. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ויבוריע_בכ_א; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the

S37 · The Two Halves of “Better Is One Hour”

“Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds…”: why repentance here, what are good deeds, and what is “all the life of the World to Come”? Read also the half of the mishnah about spiritual pleasure. Check Tanya 4 and parallels: does will/nature versus radiance/appre hension explain this, and what does it not explain?

The mishnah first praises an hour in this world and then an hour in the World to Come. These are not two contradictory determinations if we understand that each measures something different. We must also be careful not to provide a special reason for the word repentance without a source.

The first half praises the service of repentance and good deeds; the second, spiritual pleasure in the World to Come. Tanya 4 explains attachment through Torah and mitzvot versus radiance and apprehension. L6 explains the two concluding quotations through memale and sovev. The word repentance is in the mishnah quoted by the Epistle; it has not been proved that it was chosen here to allude specifically to the refinement performed by penitents in K4.

Reading the second half of the mishnah prevents the superficial claim that the World to Come has no advantage. The mishnah itself praises its spiritual pleasure above life in this world. The distinction is between the opportunity for service and the reward and enjoyment. Thus the superiority of an hour of service does not mean that every experience in this world is greater than every revelation in the World to Come.

Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; digital text and facsimile; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not Parashat Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

Tanya 4 adds the quality of attachment, not merely time. Torah and mitzvot allow grasping and investment in what is not apprehensible through thought alone, whereas enjoyment of a radiance is illumination and apprehension. This corrects reports that based the two quotations on time alone. The time for action and the quality of the connection both contribute to the explanation, and each must be stated in its own place.

L6 is especially close because it brings “today to perform them” and “better is one hour” in the same discourse, alongside the system of memale and sovev and the discussion of the sacrifice. The two quotations should not be called “two verses”: one is a verse and its exposition, the other a mishnah. Nor should it be said that this is the only place in all the literature where both appear together; this is a parallel found in the investigation that explains the sequence well.

The proposal to connect repentance to K4 §8 was preserved as a possible echo. There the transformation of evil in the service of penitents has a place in refinement. But the Epistle does not separately expound the word repentance here. Merely quoting a mishnah that contains it does not prove that the author chose the mishnah specifically for the sake of that exposition. Conversely, there is no evidence that the word is accidental or meaningless; the result is the absence of proof for a special reason.

What are good deeds? In the mishnah’s context, these are service in this world; in Tanya 4 the explanation includes Torah and mitzvot. In the Epistle the emphasis is on practical mitzvot. Translation and explanation must preserve the general word in the quotation and its local application in the argument, without restricting the mishnah itself to bodily mitzvot alone or expanding the Epistle to every beneficial human action.

The meaning of the World to Come is determined by context. The discussion in K5 of the mishnah "All Israel" does not automatically decide it here. The examination can draw on commentators to the mishnah who distinguish action and reward, but it need not eliminate every difference between interpretations in order to understand the end of the Epistle. This is a limited determination concerning the subject that the verse and mishnah come to serve.[522]

S38 · Echoes That May Be Heard but Cannot Be Proved

Are ox meat→the face of an ox, taste→Daat→mitzvot, and the transition food→sacrifice an intentional structure? Separate an explicit thematic connection from a literary allusion that can only be proposed.

The sequence of expressions creates an attractive connection between the examples. The question is when this attractiveness becomes evidence, and when it should remain a suggestion that helps the reading.

The transition from food to sacrifice and from there to mitzvot is explicit in the Epistle's order and connective words. The echoes ox meat–the face of an ox and the taste of grain–good discernment and knowledge are possible and illuminating. It has not been proved that

[522]Mishnah Avot 4:17 and Tosafot Yom Tov — the two halves of the mishnah: action and spiritual pleasure; both halves are necessary to understand the comparison. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/זי_ד_תובא_הנשמ; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — "better is one hour"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; reading the full text was reported in earlier rounds; not reopened in R5. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/1/4.htm; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; digital text and facsimile; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not Parashat Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923; "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; an unreviewed transcript; according to note 1, based on a discourse of the Alter Rebbe with notes by the Tzemach Tzedek. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/

they are a deliberate program of allusion, or that they provide an independent reason for choosing an ox and the names Chochmah and Daat.

We must begin with what is not conjectural: the Epistle itself marks “and from this,” “for it is,” “and through this will be well understood,” and “and after these things.” These are not connections invented by the reader. They build a sequence of argument from the preceding explanation to nourishment, sacrifice and conclusion. Even without any additional verbal allusion, the unit has a clear structure.

The echo adds a reading experience: the ox that already appeared as food returns in the faces of the chariot; the taste that already appeared in eating grain returns in the discernment and knowledge of understanding. This may be presented as a literary suggestion. The error begins when it is used to justify a claim not proved in another way, such as that ox meat specifically was chosen because of the face of an ox, or that grain refers to just one sefirah.

L1 helps test the limit of the claim. It brings the two pieces of evidence from food in reverse order and in another context, and they still function as joint evidence. This does not disprove a special design in the Epistle, but it shows that the evidence does not specifically require the echo in order to fulfill a conceptual role. The principal explanation must rest on the content, and the allusion may accompany it.

The biblical continuation “for I have believed in Your commandments” in Psalms adds the possibility of an echo, not proof that the Epistle deliberately abbreviates the entire verse. If every continuation of a quoted verse were necessarily considered part of the argument, one could construct many connections with no indication in the text. Identification of the source and the proposed allusion are therefore recorded separately in the register of hypotheses.

The editorial decision is to preserve the suggestion in the research and present it briefly to the reader, with the wording “one may hear here.” There is no need to choose between erasing all literary sensitivity and declaring a proved intention. This exemplifies a rich possibility that the research preserves precisely by limiting its status.[523]

S39 · Thus Far We Found: The Limit of Transmission

“Thus far we found in his holy handwriting”: who wrote the note, in which printed witnesses, and what may be inferred from it about the c ompleteness/interruption/date of the Epistle? Do not turn a copyist’s note into evidence of an intended ending.

The concluding note sounds like historical testimony, but it says first of all what was found by those transmitting the text. To infer from it why the author stopped requires information not contained in these words.

The formula marks the limit of the material transmitted from his handwriting. It does not prove that the Epistle was interrupted, nor does it prove that it was deliberately concluded at this point. The tradition concerning Piena and writing close to his passing was reported in later sources, but its earliest source and an early printed edition were not fully verified here. This decision is unnecessary to explain the existing conclusion.

R2 included wording that the note testifies that the manuscript was interrupted here. R3 corrected it: it testifies only to the point up to

[523]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Psalms 119:66 — “Teach me good discernment and knowledge, for I have believed in Your commandments”; source of the biblical expression; the intention of the full allusion is not proved. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/טיק_מילהת_וס; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ששת ימים תאכל מצות” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved facsimile witnesses; not “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”). https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814

which material was found. The difference is not a stylistic softening. “Was interrupted” asserts an event in the text or the writing; “we found” describes a state of transmission. There may be a lacuna, there may be an ending, and the transmitters may simply be indicating the extent of the witness before them.

The opposite conclusion is likewise impermissible. That the conclusion concerning mitzvot sounds complete does not prove that the author intended to end there. It is possible to explain a thematic ending in the existing material without turning it into an intentional historical conclusion. Literary reading and testimony concerning the manuscript’s history are two different claims.

The tradition concerning Piena was mentioned in Lessons in the name of the Tzemach Tzedek, and it was proposed to examine the source and the Shklov 5574 edition. These targets were not completed to a sufficient standard of original evidence in the present investigation. A Hebrew date must therefore not be converted to a secular year and used to construct an argument about authorship without verification. In particular, an approximate timeframe must not be used to decide who added a reference in Likkutei Torah.

The question of “אג”ה” (an abbreviation for Iggeret HaKodesh) in L3 led to a circumstantial inference about an editorial layer. R5 gave up the more categorical tendency: the abbreviation also refers to content that appears before us in Kuntres Acharon. This teaches us about usage of the designation, not the identity of the writer. A manuscript or an editor’s correction may resolve this in the future; at present we cannot replace such a witness with a plausible story.

In the reader’s book, a sentence clarifying that the line is a transmission note is sufficient. The research also preserves the rejected formulations, the targets for examination, and the reason they do not hold up the explanation. Leaving the history open does not erase the

Torah conclusion that the text itself brings; it prevents that conclusion from becoming evidence for what is not written.[473]

S40 · The Complete Argument and Its Limits

The overall map of the argument: what was proved, what served as an analogy, and what was learned by inference? At the end, write a continuous explanation of the entire unit, but do not replace the individual questions with the slogan "the lower is higher at its root." Add newly discovered questions with the identifier N-[model name]-01, etc.

After all the precise observations, we must return and read the unit continuously. The result is not a collection of reservations: there is a positive explanation, with places within it where the evidence stops.

Earth prepares the advantage of the lowest level; the food chain applies it to vitality and Daat; returning light explains the higher receiving from the lower; sacrifice demonstrates this relationship in the chariot; the command and the root of mitzvot within the Epistle lead to the purpose of action in this world. The parallels expand on the root and refinement of food and the advantage of drawing down, without identifying all the mechanisms with one another. The closure is that of a responsible explanation, not a declaration that every detail has been solved.

We can now read the transitions without skipping the details. "And from this" does not introduce an unrelated subject, but applies what was learned concerning earth. The levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders provide a visible scale on which the

[473]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; particularly from "ועוד זאת" ("And furthermore, this") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation; a later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note's Hebrew source has not been verified. https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431

paradox becomes sharper. “From both of them” prepares two examples, and “also Chochmah and Daat” shows that the dependence is not restricted to a low bodily need. Each part contributes to the argument and not merely to a list of symbols.

“For it is” returns from the examples to the explanation. It does not suffice with grain and meat having an effect, but connects that effect with the structure of illumination at the lowest level. The sovev illuminates and the kav returns; the distinction is maintained even when the first sentence calls the whole phenomenon an aspect of returning light. The explanation thus rests on the Epistle’s own wording rather than a later identification of every high root with every returning light.

“And through this will be well understood” transfers the structure to the sacrifice. The spirit descends from the chariot and returns from below; its return allows enjoyment and an addition. The Zohar supplies the relationships of origin, garment and affiliation. L3 supplies the language of revealing the lights of Tohu, and K4 the distinction in the status of refinement. These additions illuminate the reading provided they are not presented as the words of the Zohar or the Epistle.

“And after these things” deduces the advantage of mitzvot from the entire foundation. The command is already explicit in the text, so the conclusion is not that all physicality is holy in the same sense. Action according to the command takes place where a distinctive power is revealed, and fulfills a purpose of revelation within the separate world. L4 and L7 prevent this from being restricted to ascent alone, restoring both drawing down and the place of Torah.

The final two quotations add time and quality: now is the time for action, and service allows a connection that is not identical to enjoyment of a radiance. They do not negate the advantage of reward, nor do they rank every aspect of Torah against every mitzvah. The

transmission note concludes the material in our possession without determining the author's intention concerning the end of the writing.

The remaining questions are not equal in weight. A specific reason for the ox and the doubling of the parents is lacking; an explicit authorial reconciliation with Etz Chaim is lacking; details of references and textual history are lacking. In contrast, anchors were found for the structure of nourishment, the map of the elements and the conclusion concerning mitzvot. The research can end because the explanation does not depend on turning every gap into a solution, and the book can show the progress without hiding its limits.[524]

Resolution of the Issue: Action Reveals the Purpose of Bringing into Being

The sacrifice sharpens the movement from the lower to the higher. The beast and bird, lower than the chariot, participate in the nourishment described above. The example must therefore not be read merely as returning something to the place from which it descend-

[524]Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition. https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; digital text and preserved facsimile witnesses; not "מצה זו" ("This Matzah"). https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; text and facsimiles. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undetermined. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; digital text and facsimile witnesses. Root, service and result must be distinguished. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898974; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; digital text and facsimile; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not Parashat Tzav. https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation; reported digital text and a Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a facsimile of a printed edition. https://chabadlibrary.org/books/adhaz/tanya/5/4.htm

ed; the advantage revealed in the root and the act of elevation also require explanation.

The discussion of the Zohar's wording is retained because identifying the subject changes the evidence. Wording stated about a bird in a specific context is not transferred indiscriminately to every component of the sacrifice; two similar occurrences are not necessarily two versions of the same sentence. The parallel is useful once its limits have been identified.

From here the Epistle returns to the advantage of practical mitzvot. This does not negate the advantage of Torah or the soul's apprehension in the World to Come. The subject is the purpose of its descent to a world in which it is possible to fulfill the will through action. Knowledge of the advantage does not make action unnecessary; it is intended to add understanding and vitality to it.

The book therefore concludes with the same relationship with which it began: infinity and limitation are not two competing sources. Divine power brings a limited reality into being, and human service takes place within that reality. The research remains open to correction in the details, but the line of study reaches its goal: to see how examination of unity, vessels and bringing into being illuminates the meaning of a mitzvah in this world.

Research Questions on the Issue

The wording of the questions is preserved to allow examination of the completeness of the discussion. The mere appearance of a question in the register is not a determination concerning it; the investigation and the limit of the conclusion must be read. The identifiers here are the edited map of questions and are not an automatic merger with the earlier numbering of other reports.

Q171 — Construct a dependency map between Q18–Q88 and Q89–Q170: which earlier questions are prerequisites for understanding the new passage?

Q172 — Which terms recur throughout the Epistle: yesh, emanated yesh, created yesh, Malchut, Keter, Chochmah, vessel, kav, kisses, gestation, birth, alma de-itgalya?

Q173 — For each term write: a definition, a source, change of meaning according to world/level, and connection to the other questions.

Q174 — Construct a future outline for a general booklet on the whole of Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20, after the sectional booklets. The outline must be a continuous explanation in the Epistle's order, not an unconnected collection of answers.

Q175 — Separate three future layers: 1. Individual booklets on daily passages. 2. An integrated explanation of the entire Epistle. 3. A sources and provenance-criticism appendix. Do not mix the three layers in the present answers.

S20 — What is the chariot in the sentence: living creatures, angels, Beriah/Yetzirah, a general category or a particular aspect? Read Ezekiel 1 in context; do not identify levels without a source. What is its relationship to the man upon the throne?

S21 — Four faces for each living creature and mutual inclusion: how are they nevertheless called ox/eagle/lion/man? What is primary in each name, and how many mutual inclusions are actually required by the source? Do not produce an infinite multiplicity as an explanation for everything.

S22 — Why is the ox the root of beasts and the eagle of birds, including different species? How does this relate to clean/unclean species and to the fact that an eagle is not offered? Bring a source, not a zoological generalization.

S23 — Why does the Alter Rebbe mention only the ox and eagle when the adjacent Zohar also discusses the lion and man? Give an answer suited to the Epistle's argument and the strongest evidence against it. The absence of wild animals from the sacrifice is not the end of the discussion.

S24 — "The spirit of the beast and bird that ascends to them": what ascends, who elevates it, and what is the relationship between the physical branch and the source of the spirit? Does the spirit return to the root from which it came or reach above it, and in what sense?

S25 — "Derive great enjoyment, are nourished and receive their supply": explain each verb, including its source if found. Is "מסתפקים" from the root meaning supply rather than doubt? What does "great" add? Do not invent three sefirot.

S26 — Read Zohar III 240–241 to the necessary extent before and after the quotation: who benefits, from what, what is the foundation and what the root, and to whom does "דילהון" ("their") refer? Separate the Zohar's text, translation and the commentaries Or HaChamah/Mikdash Melech/HaSulam.

S27 — What precisely does the Alter Rebbe infer from the exact wording in "as indicated by the precise wording"? Does "יסודא ועיקרא" ("foundation and root") prove the advantage of the lower's root, a kind nourishing its own kind, or a different kind of source of vitality? Does the translated reading preserve the direction of the relationship?

S28 — If the angels are the root of the beast, how does the beast complete them? Do the angels also belong to Ban/Tohu, so that "Tohu versus Tikkun" alone is insufficient? Examine target K4 in particular.

S29 — How does the existence of a small sacrifice supply a multitude of angels? The Zohar itself raises a nearby question; what does its explanation add to the plain meaning of the Epistle? Separate physi-

cal food and spiritual influence without emptying “are nourished” of content.

S30 — “And after these things and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know, through all the above”: identify biblical expressions, pronoun referents and the function of each phrase. Does “all” include the entire Epistle or only the final sequence?

S31 — What is the logical link from nourishing humans and angels to the advantage of practical mitzvot? Why is mere use of matter insufficient, and what do command, will, bittul, refinement and intention add? Do not infer that every material activity is a mitzvah.

S32 — The purpose of the souls’ descent versus the purpose of human creation, a dwelling in the lower realms, revelation of His powers and knowing Him: are these levels of explanation or different purposes? Choose precise parallels rather than the slogan “it is all the same.”

S33 — “Practical mitzvot” versus Torah: does the Epistle explicitly rank them against one another, or is their advantage established along a particular axis? What of Torah study as a mitzvah, speech as action, prayer and intention?

S34 — “Torah study is equivalent to them all” and “study is greater because it leads to action”: read the context and explain what is considered greater in each source. Compare Tanya 4–5, 35–37, and Kuntres Acharon 4 if relevant; the division Torah=apprehension/action=purpose is insufficient without a source applying it.

S35 — Examine in particular the assumption about the future: study is greater now/action is greater in the future, or another order? Distinguish the messianic age, the resurrection of the dead and Gan Eden, and the apprehension of Torah in the future. Read K3 and its sources; do not present the user’s question as fact.

S36 — “Today to perform them”: what do the verse and the exposition in Eruvin prove? Action versus reward, a time of opportunity, or the priority of action over study? Do not infer beyond the source’s scope.

S37 — “Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds…”: why repentance here, what are good deeds, and what is “all the life of the World to Come”? Read also the half of the mishnah about spiritual pleasure. Check Tanya 4 and parallels: does will/nature versus radiance/apprehension explain this, and what does it not explain?

S38 — Are ox meat→the face of an ox, taste→Daat→mitzvot, and the transition food→sacrifice an intentional structure? Separate an explicit thematic connection from a literary allusion that can only be proposed.

S39 — “Thus far we found in his holy handwriting”: who wrote the note, in which printed witnesses, and what may be inferred from it about the completeness/interruption/date of the Epistle? Do not turn a copyist’s note into evidence of an intended ending.

S40 — The overall map of the argument: what was proved, what served as an analogy, and what was learned by inference? At the end, write a continuous explanation of the entire unit, but do not replace the individual questions with the slogan “the lower is higher at its root.” Add newly discovered questions with the identifier N-[model name]-01, etc.

Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism and Alternatives

The files are arranged here by family of inquiry and round within the issue. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Labels such as PASS, SEALED and the like are historical determinations by the file’s author; they are not independent approval by the editor. English passages have been retained in their own language so as

not to replace original evidence with a conjectural translation. Document identifiers allow a return to the archive.

File 0074 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[30]

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Editorial Draft E1.4 — Stations 18–21 and the End of the Epistle

Continuation of E1.1, E1.2 and E1.3.

Station 19 — Elevating Vitality in Human Service — The Station's Function

This station translates the Kabbalistic structure into human service. Returning light is not merely an abstract idea; it is expressed in a person using the lower world and returning it to the service of G-d.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — The Concluding Wording

The Epistle concludes:

> «The great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent to this physical world».

It subsequently brings the wording of our Sages:

> «Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world than all the life of the World to Come».

[30]Document 0074: E1.4 — תחנות — חוברת הפשט 18-21 md.וסיום [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 18–21 and Conclusion]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Quotation from the Epistle's text: [E-subresearch]. The source of the mishnah in Pirkei Avot: [E-primary], as a separate source.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — Plain Explanation

After the entire Kabbalistic argument, the conclusion is not that a person should distance himself from the world. On the contrary: the soul's descent into the physical world is intended to allow an activity that cannot be performed in the same way in the spiritual worlds: fulfilling a mitzvah through body and matter.

Study, apprehension and feeling are very important, but they do not replace action. Action is where the reality of a command and a mitzvah is actually fulfilled. The Epistle therefore emphasizes the advantage of practical mitzvot.

The sentence «Better is one hour» does not say that the World to Come is without value. It says that at this time, in this world, there is a distinctive opportunity for repentance and good deeds. That opportunity is not measured solely by the spiritual feeling it provides, but by human action in the world.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — The Station's Function

This is the destination of the whole sequence. The Epistle returns from the abstract to action:

- Divinity in vessels.
- The power of creation in Malchut.
- Vitality through the kav and vessels.
- Vegetative power in earth.
- Ascent from the lower.
- Finally: a practical mitzvah through the body.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — What Does the Station Clarify?

It clarifies that practical mitzvot are not an appendix to the teaching of Kabbalah. They are the practical outcome of the whole explanation. If Divine power is revealed specifically in the ability to create and enliven a limited reality, then physical action is where the purpose is realized.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — What Remains Open?

The technical difficulties remaining in the course of the Epistle do not negate the conclusion. They require further explanation, but do not change the clear direction of the ending.

The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Station 21 — Summary of the Argument

The Epistle can be summarized as a single chain, each link adding something new:

1. **"He and His life-giving lights are one; He and His vessels are one"** — the lights and vessels of Atzilut are united with Divinity.
2. **Limit and finitude** — the vessels are indeed limited; a genuine difficulty therefore arises.
3. **Yesh from ayin** — the Divinity of the vessels is expressed in the power to create a new reality.
4. **Levels of yesh** — not every «yesh» is on the same level; Atzilut, souls before descent, palaces, angelic bodies and the vessels of BYA differ.
5. **Malchut and Atik of Beriah** — the root of separate yesh is in Malchut, the extremity from which a beginning is made for the world below.

6. **Letters and alma de-itgalya** — multiplicity and division arise from the letters, and there the power of creation is revealed.
7. **Chochmah and Keter** — the Ein Sof light is vested in Chochmah; Keter connects; Malchut becomes Keter from below upward.
8. **Gestation and birth** — what was concealed becomes a revealed reality.
9. **Mitzvot and Torah** — mitzvot are in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin; above, mitzvot and Torah are situated in different roots.
10. **An inverted seal** — below the order appears reversed, yet specifically the end is connected to the beginning.
11. **Placenta** — the practical mitzvah is primary and a root, although Torah is inwardness and Chochmah.
12. **The parsa and the kav** — Divine vitality passes through vessels and levels.
13. **Three radiances** — the light reaches the sefirot, their vessels and the created beings.
14. **Sovev** — Or Ein Sof is present equally, but the internal vitality operates through the kav and the vessels.
15. **The element of earth** — the vegetative power reveals yesh from ayin within physical reality.
16. **Returning light** — from the end, a movement shines upward.
17. **The mitzvot** — the purpose of the souls' descent is to turn the physical world into a vessel for the service of G-d.

This reading is an editorial plain-meaning map [I]. It follows the order of the wording and connects the stations, but the division into stations itself must not be attributed to the Alter Rebbe.

Open-Questions Box — «Mamash»

The word «ממש» ("actually," "literally") appears in the Epistle in different contexts. One comprehensive definition must not be established for it without examining each occurrence in its own place.

File 0153 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[1]

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze’ir Anpin — The Epistle’s Wording

> «And through this will be understood why the mitzvot are in Malchut — the hei of the name Havayah, and Torah in Ze’ir Anpin — the vav of the name Havayah».

A new transition begins here. The Epistle does not leave the subject of creation, but shows how it relates to mitzvot and Torah.

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze’ir Anpin — Terms

Ze’ir Anpin is the designation for the system of emotional attributes. In the Epistle’s text it appears here as the location of Torah in relation to the name Havayah.

Malchut is here the location of the practical mitzvah, and is connected to the final letter hei of the name Havayah.

The letters are not presented here merely as a grammatical lesson. They mark two levels and functions:

- Hei — Malchut, receiving and bringing into actuality.
- Vav — Ze’ir Anpin, the system of emotional attributes and Torah.

This is a local explanation of the Epistle’s structure, not an attempt to explain here all the secrets of the name Havayah.

---

[1] Document 0153: E1.2 — תחנות 6-10 ותחילת תחנה חוברת הפשט 11.md [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Stations 6–10 and the Beginning of Station 11]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — Plain Explanation

Mitzvot are situated in Malchut because they descend into actual activity, into the world and to the recipient of the command. Torah is situated in Ze'ir Anpin because it is connected to the more internal and ordered root of drawing down.

This does not mean that Torah is «high» and the mitzvah «low» in a simple sense. Precisely because the mitzvah is at the end, it is connected to the point of purpose and realization. The Epistle will explain this through «an inverted seal».

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — The Station's Function

This station connects the structure of the sefirot with human service. What was said earlier about Malchut as the beginning of separate yesh now begins to be explained in relation to mitzvot.

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — What Does the Station Clarify?

It clarifies that practical mitzvot are not a side issue introduced at the end of the Epistle. They are part of the structure itself: Malchut is where things become actual.

Station 8 — Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — What Remains Open?

It is not yet clear why specifically the practical mitzvah is called the primary element and root of Torah, although Torah is Chochmah. The answer will come through the description of Arich Anpin and the inverted seal.

File 0243 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[5]

From Unity in Atzilut to the Advantage of Practical Mitzvot — Editorial Draft E1.1 — The Opening Chapter and Stations 1–5

Textual status: an edited manuscript for further work.

Quotations from the Epistle's text were checked in digital witnesses marked «unchecked» — [E-subresearch]. The actual Kehot printed edition was not read at the glyph level — [U].

Notes marked [I] are editorial explanation, not the Alter Rebbe's wording.

File 0611 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Questions and assumptions for investigation — do not attribute them as a model's answer[525]

With G-d's help. YeshivahAI — Review of Four Booklets on the Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Base edition: 23.9.2026, 12 Tishrei 5787.

Your role: an advisory reviewer in writing only. Do not edit, modify, delete, replace, move, share or upload any file. Do not create a "corrected edition." Textual and design suggestions are to be provided only within the review report; the user and ChatGPT will decide

[5]Document 0243: E1.1 — חוברת הפשט — פרק פתיחה ותחנות 1-5.md [The Plain-Meaning Booklet — Opening Chapter and Stations 1–5]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[525]Document 0611: Review-Prompt-Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

which to implement. Do not send messages to others. The request does not authorize an endless research round.

The task: First read all the available investigative material, and then the four booklets. Examine accuracy, completeness, explanation, structure, Hebrew, English, sources, directionality and design. Your aim is to improve edited booklets on the concluding unit, from "ומזה יובן היטב" ("And from This Will Be Well Understood") to "עד כאן מצאנו" ("Thus Far We Found"), in the context of the earth unit. This is not a request to rewrite all of Epistle 20.

Files and reading order: 1. 00-START-HERE.md and PROMPT.txt in your folder. 2. 01-Rules-v4.7.md: the binding rules. Explicit user instructions take precedence over a template rule. The design-example images are examples, not a source for a Torah conclusion. 3. 02-Research-Archive.zip: open 00-ARCHIVE-README.md and A vailable-Research-Unified.txt. Read the initial research, the R1–R5 instructions, Bot reports, compiler assessments and closing document in round order. Distinguish a work instruction from work performed. Collector folders sometimes carry an assessment of the preceding round; the heading inside the file determines this. 4. In the same archive: manuscript/rounds.json, registers.json, all units*.json, sources.json, method.json, evaluation.json, as well as evid ence_archive and plate_manifest.json. These are the editorial and final-analysis materials, not original reports written by the models. 5. The four PDFs in the folder: Reader-HE, Reader-EN, Research-HE, Research-EN. Parallel TXT files permit searching, but do not replace a visual examination of the PDF. 6. QA-REPORT.json and RELEASE-MANIFEST.json: the production checks and the exact identity of the files. Examine these critically as well.

Limits of the material: The archive includes the available source files, documentation of all five rounds and the substantive interpretations that were processed. It is not a complete export of all corre-

spondence. Grok and Claude reports delivered in the conversation body were processed into the interpretation files and the histories of the rounds; that processing must not be presented as though it were a complete original response file. Part of R1 in the conversation is truncated. Do not fill a gap by invention. Early S identifiers in some Bot files are not always identical to the fixed map of forty questions: compare content, not number alone. Gemini did not participate in the original rounds; it must not be given a historical score.

Required content checks:

- Have all forty briefing questions, the explanation of the difficulty, answer, alternative and limit been preserved? Compare with ques tions_he.json and the final S map.
- Does every substantive interpretation that was accepted, rejected or corrected appear in its appropriate file and in the round history? Check the 18 A files and the N questions. Do not count stylistic repetition as new content.
- Are the initial research claims labeled historical, and is it clear that they are not the final conclusion? Check in particular Bava Kamma 72a, unverified attributions, elements, note 61 and the limit of transmission.
- Is there a positive explanation of the Epistle, not merely a list of things that must not be inferred? Check the causal force of “for it is” and the transition to mitzvot performed by command in matter.
- Is the difference between Tohu/Sag, sovev and memale, the kav’s returning light, refinement and elevation preserved? Structural similarity is not explicit identity.
- Is the reader’s booklet self-contained, clear and free of model scores and burdensome history? Is the research edition detailed without padding through blank pages or duplicating paragraphs without adding anything?

- Were all the analysis, hypotheses, corrections and assessments of the work provided in full

English? Facsimiles of the Hebrew sources are preserved as witnesses in both languages and are not claimed to be a full English translation of the photographed books.

A list of pitfalls already clarified — check; do not accept on the basis of the list: L6 is Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel"), not Parashat Tzav. Three pairs are explained; earth is given without a separate reason. Etz Chaim 50:10 reverses animal/speaking; a distinction in the object of the mapping is a proposed reconciliation. L1 is "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot"), not "מצה זו" ("This Matzah") and not the page "צו ז" ("Tzav 7"). It brings meat and then grain, only father, Chochmah and intellect. L7 is Kuntres Acharon 4, the content target of the Sag/forehead reference in L3. The author of the reference is undetermined. Note 61: "It" refers to the animal order; its original Hebrew wording has not been verified. There is no evidence for grain=Daat and meat=Chochmah, for expounding the two parents as Abba and Imma in the Epistle's sentence, or for a species-specific reason for an ox in particular. In Zohar 241a there are two occurrences and a variant in the same line; the pronoun alone does not determine the direction. An angel with a fixed attribute can be in a world that has already undergone refinement. Torah is not only descent and mitzvot are not only ascent. "Thus far we found" marks a limit of transmission, and does not decide interruption or an intentional conclusion.

Sources and evidence: Read the actual text wherever possible, and state what you read: a facsimile, transcription, search excerpt, later explanation or report. Do not write "verified in a facsimile" if you saw only extracted text. Do not invent a folio, column, date or quotation. Three copying websites are not three independent witnesses. Separate the Alter Rebbe's wording, an editorial layer, a later inter-

pretation and your own inference. For every substantive correction, provide a short exact quotation and a checkable location. If a source is blocked, state what is missing; do not attribute a conjectured failure to the booklet.

Mandatory visual inspection: View the PDF itself or page images. Check the title page, RTL Hebrew and LTR English, type size, vowel marks, note numbers and their direction, continuity and prevention of duplication, correspondence with notes at the bottom of the page, page numbers, a clickable table of contents and its numbers, tables, index, density and use of the page. Facsimiles of printed editions must be legible and retain the entire text. State precisely which pages were viewed; text extraction is not visual inspection. Preserve the fixed wording "under rabbinic supervision"; do not add personal names or disclaimers prohibited by the series rules.

Structure of the review report: A. Reading declaration: names of files read in full, what was read partially, page ranges viewed, sources opened and blockers. B. Up to ten principal recommendations, ranked by impact. For each: severity (critical/substantive/editorial /visual), edition and page, S or A identifier, quotation of the problem, reasoning and source, proposed change, impact on the conclusion, and corresponding wording in the other language. C. A coverage table of all 40 questions: satisfactory / missing / requires correction / unchecked. Do not suffice with "I went through everything." D. A table of interpretations and rounds: what is missing, what recurred after already being corrected, and what will be presented as history rather than conclusion. E. Translation check: a table of changes in meaning, degree of certainty and attribution; proposed HE/EN wording. F. PDF check: location and evidence for every defect. Do not propose an overall template change without explaining how it accords with the rules. G. Four concluding sections: explicit withdrawals of your previous claims, if any; answers to questions addressed to

you; a proposed corrected formulation of the position; a source or datum that could change your conclusion. H. Readiness recommendation: ready after specific corrections / requires substantive correction / lacks specific evidence. Do not declare “not ready” because a question remains that does not hold up the explanation. Distinguish a genuine omission from a stylistic preference.

Improvement proposals are provided here in writing only. No action on files, no changes to sharing, and no sending to a third party.

Specific focus of the review — Claude — interpretive, editorial and bilingual criticism: Examine the distinction between the Epistle’s text, an early parallel, a later explanation and the editor’s inference. Pay particular attention to the attribution of the reference in Emor, to an angel with a particular attribute that has already undergone refinement, and to the three layers root–action–result in Torah and mitzvot. Read the whole English version against the Hebrew: has an alternative become a conclusion, was source incorrectly translated as root, was returning light generalized to sovev, and were both meanings preserved precisely? Propose corrected wording in both languages for every substantive correction. Check whether the reader’s booklet leads to understanding without unnecessary research codes, and whether the study booklet discloses the research and retractions with complete fairness.

File 0613 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Questions and assumptions for investigation — do not attribute them as a model’s answer[526]

[526] Document 0613: Review-Prompt-Grok-Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Specific focus of the review — Grok-Bot — criticism of witnesses, references and production: Open the PDF files and the actual source facsimiles. Verify correspondence among transcription, facsimile, PDF page number and printed reference, without inferring a column from an index. Check in particular L1 versus "מצה זו" ("This Matzah"), L6 in Pinchas, L3 Emor "והניף" ("And He Shall Wave"), L7 Kuntres Acharon 4, and the two occurrences of the Zohar in 241a. Check plate_manifest.json: all four parts cover the original page; the pages from Mishnat Chassidim are complete. Report a cut crossing a letter or line, a tiny image, or a facsimile that does not support its caption. Check every page for directionality, overflow, spacing, orphaned headings, numbering, notes and links. Separate a content defect from a graphic defect and from an access blocker. Do not create or upload a corrected PDF.

File 0614 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Unnumbered Round

Questions and assumptions for investigation — do not attribute them as a model's answer[527]

Specific focus of the review — Grok — criticism of interpretation and construction of the explanation: Check in particular whether the explanation is positive and explanatory, rather than merely a collection of reservations. In each of the four transitions — earth to nourishment, nourishment to Daat, Daat to sacrifice, sacrifice to mitzvot — formulate the premise, the result and the missing link, if any. Examine the reading of "for it is" and the applicability of returning light separately. Check whether the distinction from Etz Chaim is proposed as a hypothesis or mistakenly presented as an explicit solution. Propose at least one serious alternative reading for each central

[527] Document 0614: Review-Prompt-Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

dispute, and a source test that could resolve it; do not renew a search already closed without a concrete reason. Explicitly withdraw a previous claim of your own if it contradicts the supported conclusions.

File 0227 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 2

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[34]

2. Editorial Corrections and Evidence Tags (Not Structural) — From Grok's Review — E1-QC-34 — Introduction as [I] Concerning the Connection to the Mitzvot Conclusion

- **Location:** opening chapter
- **Claim:** the concluding wording [E-subresearch]; reading of the structure → [I]
- **Evidence status:** [E]; the draft already labels it correctly
- **Type:** satisfactory
- **Proposed correction:** none (only replace [E]→[E-subresearch] for the quotation)

File 0345 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 4

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[35]

---

[34]Document 0227: 199 — E1 — Editorial QC for Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[35]Document 0345: 08 — R04 ARCHIVE — Packet. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Daily Tanya Study — Claude's Response, Round R03 — Key Findings (Principal Findings)

1. Read directly and verified in transcription in this round: Etz Chaim, Gate 44, chapter 1 (and a passage from chapter 2); Etz Chaim, Gate 42, chapters 1–5 and 11; Zohar, Idra Zuta (292b); Zohar, Idra Rabba (128b, through a parallel transcription); the wording of Iggeret HaKodesh 11; the discourse "אמר ר' אלכסנדרי" ("Rabbi Alexandri Said"), 5731 (an unreviewed transcript); and the chapter structure of Etz Chaim Gates 47 and 42.

2. Not opened — an honestly reported failed new attempt: Maamarei Admur HaZaken 5568, vol. I, pp. 114–125. I made a real new access attempt through the file address at hebrewbooks.org (hebrewbooks.org/32912); the site blocked the request through bot detection. The 5568 volume is therefore **not** on the read list, and I do not quote from it.

3. The text of Derech Mitzvotecha 129–130 (S24–S27) was not located verbatim. The sub-research (subagent) honestly reported that chabadlibrary pages display only a frame and that Sefaria loads through JavaScript. Only the conceptual context and a quotation from a later section were confirmed. Part of Q02 therefore rests on **reference + inference**, not on direct reading of the page, and I label that explicitly.

Daily Tanya Study — Claude's Response, Round R03 — Recommendations (Practical Steps)

1. **For the next round — actually opening the 5568 volume.** The attempt through hebrewbooks.org/32912 was blocked through bot detection. Routes not yet attempted should be tried: (a) otzar770 / teachings.chabad.org; (b) navigating the table of contents in Chabad Library to the internal text page (not the frame); (c) an al-

ternative scan of the printed edition. **Threshold for change:** only if the page actually opens should it be recorded as read and quoted; otherwise leave it "open."

2. **Derech Mitzvotecha 129–130 through the Sefaria API** (a JSON request for Derekh_Mitzvotekha,_Shoresh_Mitzvat_HaTefillah by section numbers, verifying correspondence between numbering and the printed edition's letters), to verify verbatim the three Q02 quotations that remained reference + inference. **Until then — do not present ChatGPT's conclusions on Q02 as textually supported.**
3. **Do not reopen** the difficulty concerning the inner dimension of Netzach, Hod, Yesod and Malchut, S08, or Or HaTorah 199 until a directly relevant source is found.
4. **In every future use of the mapping of the thirty vessels** — retain the explicit Malchut/ZA distinction (S23 distinguishes thirty for Malchut, twenty-seven for ZA), and do not silently substitute; mark that S11 says "of Atzilut" without qualification and is unreviewed.

Daily Tanya Study — Claude's Response, Round R03 — Caveats (Reservations)

- **Agreement between models is not evidence.** Every verification here comes from my direct reading of transcriptions, not from ChatGPT/Grok's agreement.
- **Transcriptions, not printed-edition scans** — copying errors are possible; I did not write "verified on the page," but "verified in transcription."
- **Reviewed versus unreviewed:** the Tanya transcription is of the printed text; the 5731 discourse (S11) is an **unreviewed** transcript, and a determination of exact wording must not be based on it; the

Etz Chaim and Zohar transcriptions on Wikisource are not critical editions.

- **What was not opened:** the 5568 volume (failed attempt), Derech Mitzvotecha 129–130, and the Torah Or supplements passage (S20) are known only from the packet/reference.
- **There is no booklet and no joint determination** at this stage; this is only a review round, and I am not declaring a determination.
- **Sections without a proved addition:** in Q03 (the body of an Atzilut angel and the reason for the examples' order) there is no new addition; I said so explicitly. Another round is unnecessary merely to repeat the same gap; the next round should focus on opening the 5568 volume and the text of Derech Mitzvotecha 129–130.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S20 — Torah Or, Supplements to Vayakhel, 114d–115a (קיד ד–קטו א)

Sefaria transcription, paragraph 20

The paragraph was read in full together with the neighboring paragraphs. Anchor: "For from the ten internal vessels the aspect of neshamah in Beriah is made." The continuation gives a parallel mapping for Yetzirah and Asiyah; at the beginning of the explanation, the external vessels of ZA are mentioned. Do not quote the paragraph as though it said only Malchut. The marker for the transition to 115a occurs in the middle of the paragraph.

Claude's reference to this location is useful. The old Chabad Library address did not supply us with the text itself; the direct reading here is in the Sefaria transcription identified with the Kehot edition.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S21 — Maamarei Admur HaZaken 5566, Vol. I, p. 78

"להבין בתוס' ביאור שרש ענין הנ"ל" ("To Understand with Additional Explanation the Root of the Above Matter"), p. 78

The entire page was read; the focus of examination was section 2. Anchor: "A general nefesh–ruach–neshamah in BYA, dividing into particular nefesh–ruach–neshamah in every world." The continuation distinguishes the light of the neshamah from nefesh and ruach, and the lights from their vessels. Editors' note 10 refers to Etz Chaim, Gate 44, the Gate of Names. This is how S23 was located; the note is by the editors, while the discourse's text is the Chassidic source.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S22 — 5566, Vol. I, p. 96

"ותוספת ביאור הדברים הנ"ל" ("And Further Explanation of the Above Matters"), p. 96

The entire page was read. Anchor: "In the neshamah of Asiyah, the vessel is an aspect of a created being, and the light is an aspect of Divinity." This is the precise location for the claim Claude reported from sub-research without a page. Later comes the statement that the lights of nefesh and ruach of Asiyah are also created. It must not be inferred from this that every individual neshamah in Asiyah is the Divinity described here.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S23 — Etz Chaim, Gate 44, Chapter 1: The Gate of Names

The chapter in the Wikisource transcription

The chapter was read, particularly the units on the ten sefirot of Nukva and nine sefirot of Ze'ir. Decisive anchor: "It follows that the parts of the neshamah that are in BYA are Divinity, but from the aspect of

ruach onward it is an aspect of the world of separation." For examination: the identification Malchut/Nukva in the opening; the three garments; the distinction between nefesh–ruach–neshamah for Nukva herself and neshamah for BYA; the parallel to ZA and the number twenty-seven. At the end of the chapter, reversal of the order of internal and external in the encompassing lights is discussed. This alone is no proof of the reason for the order of examples in the Epistle.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S24 — Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah, 129a (קכט א)

129a (קכט א) The page was read in full. It begins mid-sentence and continues the discussion of the power of creation. Focus: comparison of the advantage of the sefirot with the revelation of the power of creation in BYA. It must not be claimed that the beginning of the entire discourse was read from here.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S25 — Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah, 129b (קכט ב)

129b (קכט ב)

The page was read in full, including the continuation to 130a. Anchor: "The power of Ein Sof, blessed be He, is seen and revealed even more than He shows His power in bringing spiritual created beings into being, although they too were created yesh from ayin." For examination: what can develop by an ordered chain from spiritual created beings, where a leap to physicality is required, and what the explanation of their beginning being embedded in their end adds. Do not turn this advantage into apprehension of Essence in bodily consciousness.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S26 — Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah, 130a (קל א)

130a (קל א)

The page was read in full. It concludes the explanation of Adam Kadmon and Asiyah, followed by section 27 on the kav, the encompassing light and the power to bring into being. At the end of the page the distinction between the encompassing light and Essence begins; it must also be read with S27. This is an examination of the function of the levels of investment, not proof that they should be negated.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S27 — Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah, 130b (קל ב)

130b (קל ב)

The page was read in full, but not the entire continuation of the sections following it. The distinction between light and Essence is completed at its beginning. Section 28 opens a difficulty concerning the coming into being of Adam Kadmon and the sefirot in the language of creation, versus their being Divinity. The beginning of the continuation on 131a was also read, but there is no claim here that the research exhausted the entire discussion.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S28 — Zohar III 128b, Idra Rabba: Arich Anpin

128b (קכח ב) The continuous passage was read. Anchor: “In the skull dwell thirteen thousand myriads of worlds.” The identification with Arich Anpin does not rest solely on the website editor’s heading: later the text itself calls the partzuf Aricha de-Anpin and distinguishes Ze’ir Anpin from it.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S29 — Etz Chaim 42:3: Garments and Palaces

Chapter 3

The chapter was read and compared with neighboring passages already examined. Two short quotations for checking the claims:

> "The garments are the aspect of the vessels for the encompassing light."

> "Within the houses and palaces, which are very, very large vessels, they cannot be contracted there."

The continuations of the sentences must be read in the source. Do not delete the negation from the second quotation, and do not identify the vessels with the light in the first quotation.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S30 — Derech Mitzvotecha, Mitzvat Haamanat Elokut, 49b–50a (מט ב–נ א), First Version

49b (מט ב) · 50a (נ א)

Both pages were read. The paragraph concerning the vessels of Atzilut as a neshamah for BYA begins at the end of 49b and is completed at the beginning of 50a. The location is in the first version, according to the site's identification of the pages. Do not substitute 129b or the location 44–45 given in Claude's response.

Sources Read — R03 Packet — S31 — 5566, Vol. I, p. 130

p. 130

The page was read; it contains a further use of the relativity of light/vessel and nefesh–ruach–neshamah, as well as a discussion of angelic bodies in BYA. It is not a sufficient source for describing the material of the bodies of angels of Atzilut.

File 0575 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 5

Report or witness from the history of the research[476]

The Forty Research Questions and Their Status

The wording of the fixed brief has been preserved; the explanation and status reflect the closure of R5.

S19 · Good Discernment and Knowledge as a Transitional Sentence

“And through this will be well understood, with good discernment and knowledge”: syntax, the source of the wording, and whether there is a proved connection to the taste of grain/Daat/mitzvot or merely a literary echo.

“Taam” previously meant the taste of grain, and now can signify a reason and explanation. The resemblance is attractive, but we must first understand the transitional sentence in its plain meaning and its role in transferring the discussion to the chariot.

Status: linguistic anchor and interpretation

S20 · The Face of a Man and the Man upon the Throne

What is the chariot in the sentence: living creatures, angels, Beriah/Yetzirah, a general category or a particular aspect? Read Ezekiel 1 in context; do not identify levels without a source. What is its relationship to the man upon the throne?

Ezekiel’s vision includes faces in the likeness of a man and also a figure with the appearance of a man above the throne. The resem-

[476] Document 0575: IGK20-From-Lower-to-Higher-Research-HE.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

blance in wording may merge two different levels. The Epistle itself speaks of angels in the chariot, and the distinction must therefore be maintained.

Status: supported

S21 · Mutual Inclusion Does Not Abolish Function

Four faces for each living creature and mutual inclusion: how are they nevertheless called ox/eagle/lion/man? What is primary in each name, and how many mutual inclusions are actually required by the source? Do not produce an infinite multiplicity as an explanation for everything.

If all the faces are included in one another, it must be explained why particular faces are still the source of beasts and others of birds. In addition, mutual inclusion must be distinguished from refinement, which mistakenly became interchangeable words in the course of the research.

Status: supported within limits

S22 · Ox for All Beasts, Eagle for Birds

Why is the ox the root of beasts and the eagle of birds, including different species? How does this relate to clean/unclean species and to the fact that an eagle is not offered? Bring a source, not a zoological generalization.

The name of the face is not a list of the species actually offered. If eagle signifies a root of birds, it does not follow that an eagle is offered. The species enumerated by the Zohar itself and the scope of the correspondence must be examined.

Status: explicit relationship; partial overall reason

S23 · The Lion and Man Do Not Disappear from the Zohar

Why does the Alter Rebbe mention only the ox and eagle when the adjacent Zohar also discusses the lion and man? Give an answer suited to the Epistle's argument and the strongest evidence against it. The absence of wild animals from the sacrifice is not the end of the discussion.

An early answer said that a lion is not offered and therefore does not belong in the discussion. But the Zohar itself gives the lion and man a role. The Epistle's choice must be explained without erasing the source's continuation.

Status: strong contextual explanation

S24 · A Spirit That Descends, a Spirit That Returns

"The spirit of the beast and bird that ascends to them": what ascends, who elevates it, and what is the relationship between the physical branch and the source of the spirit? Does the spirit return to the root from which it came or reach above it, and in what sense?

If the beast's spirit already came from the angels, it is difficult to understand what they receive when it returns. This is the central question concerning the mechanism of the sacrifice: return to the source does not in itself explain an addition within the source.

Status: supported with marked extensions

S25 · Enjoyment, Nourishment and Supply

"Derive great enjoyment, are nourished and receive their supply": explain each verb, including its source if found. Is "מסתפקים" from the root meaning supply rather than doubt? What does "great" add? Do not invent three sefirot.

Three adjacent verbs may elaborate one relationship or indicate three levels. Their linguistic meaning must first be explained, and which of them already occur in the Zohar must be checked.

Status: plain interpretation; a division has not been proved

S26 · The Same Line or a Different Location?

Read Zohar III 240–241 to the necessary extent before and after the quotation: who benefits, from what, what is the foundation and what the root, and to whom does "דילהון" ("their") refer? Separate the Zohar's text, translation and the commentaries Or HaChamah/Mikdash Melech/HaSulam.

Two different word orders on the same page are not necessarily textual variants. They may be two different occurrences. The location must first be identified, and only then should witnesses of that same location be compared.

Status: digitally supported

S27 · What Does "As Indicated by the Precise Wording" Teach?

What precisely does the Alter Rebbe infer from the exact wording in "as indicated by the precise wording"? Does "יסודא ועיקרא" ("foundation and root") prove the advantage of the lower's root, a kind nourishing its own kind, or a different kind of source of vitality? Does the translated reading preserve the direction of the relationship?

The Epistle does not merely quote, but emphasizes the quotation's precision. The question is what is present in the words themselves, and what is added from the preceding explanation or the Chassidic parallels.

Status: supported contextual interpretation

S28 · The Angels Too Are from Ban — What Is Added to Them?

If the angels are the root of the beast, how does the beast complete them? Do the angels also belong to Ban/Tohu, so that "Tohu versus Tikkun" alone is insufficient? Examine target K4 in particular.

If both recipient and food belong to Ban, the general contrast Tohu–Tikkun is insufficient on its own. We must determine not only where they came from, but their condition and what is newly brought about in the service of the sacrifice.

Status: combined reconciliation

S29 · A Small Sacrifice and Many Recipients

How does the existence of a small sacrifice supply a multitude of angels? The Zohar itself raises a nearby question; what does its explanation add to the plain meaning of the Epistle? Separate physical food and spiritual influence without emptying "are nourished" of content.

If nourishment is interpreted too literally, the problem of dividing a quantity arises. If it is made merely figurative, the addition of vitality is lost. The Zohar's analogy proposes a way to preserve the reality of the influence without calculating portions.

Status: supported within the analogy's limits

S30 · "All the Above" Returns the Conclusion to the Entire Epistle

"And after these things and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know, through all the above": identify biblical expressions, pronoun referents and the function of each phrase. Does "all" include the entire Epistle or only the final sequence?

The transition to the conclusion is written in elevated language, but has a logical role. We must determine what has already been estab-

lished so that the advantage of mitzvot is "easy to understand," rather than suffice with identifying the verses.

Status: anchors and a preferred reading

S31 · The Advantage of Matter and Commanded Action

What is the logical link from nourishing humans and angels to the advantage of practical mitzvot? Why is mere use of matter insufficient, and what do command, will, bittul, refinement and intention add? Do not infer that every material activity is a mitzvah.

The fact that lowly food enlivens a person does not imply that every meal is a mitzvah. It must be shown where the command enters, and what sacrifice adds to the transition from nature to human service.

Status: supported

S32 · The Souls' Descent and Revelation Below

The purpose of the souls' descent versus the purpose of human creation, a dwelling in the lower realms, revelation of His powers and knowing Him: are these levels of explanation or different purposes? Choose precise parallels rather than the slogan "it is all the same."

Several expressions of purpose appear in the Epistle and its parallels. To combine them we must distinguish who descends, what the person does, and what result is revealed in the world, rather than replace them all with a single slogan.

Status: supported; reference open

S33 · The Advantage of Action Is Not a Single Scale

"Practical mitzvot" versus Torah: does the Epistle explicitly rank them against one another, or is their advantage established along a particular axis? What of Torah study as a mitzvah, speech as action, prayer and intention?

The conclusion praises practical mitzvot, but it must not immediately be inferred that Torah is inferior in every respect. Both the Epistle's text and the criterion by which each source says "greater" must be examined.

Status: supported

S34 · Study Is Greater, Action Is Greater

"Torah study is equivalent to them all" and "study is greater because it leads to action": read the context and explain what is considered greater in each source. Compare Tanya 4–5, 35–37, and Kuntres Acharon 4 if relevant; the division Torah=apprehension/action=purpose is insufficient without a source applying it.

Different advantages can appear contradictory when each is turned into an overall ranking. The sources allow examination not only of what is more important, but in which question each advantage is decisive.

Status: supported from the parallels

S35 · Four Times, Not One "Future"

Examine in particular the assumption about the future: study is greater now/action is greater in the future, or another order? Distinguish the messianic age, the resurrection of the dead and Gan Eden, and the apprehension of Torah in the future. Read K3 and its sources; do not present the user's question as fact.

"World to Come" and "in the future" do not always refer to the same time or the same kind of reward. The question asked for an assumption to be tested, so it must not be copied into the conclusion without reading the source.

Status: separated according to sources

S36 · Today to Perform Them

“Today to perform them”: what do the verse and the exposition in Eruvin prove? Action versus reward, a time of opportunity, or the priority of action over study? Do not infer beyond the source’s scope.

The exposition sounds like praise of action, but its explicit contrast is today versus tomorrow. We must see what it adds to the Epistle’s conclusion without turning it into a discussion of study versus action that it does not contain.

Status: supported

S37 · The Two Halves of “Better Is One Hour”

“Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds…”: why repentance here, what are good deeds, and what is “all the life of the World to Come”? Read also the half of the mishnah about spiritual pleasure. Check Tanya 4 and parallels: does will/nature versus radiance/appre hension explain this, and what does it not explain?

The mishnah first praises an hour in this world and then an hour in the World to Come. These are not two contradictory determinations if we understand that each measures something different. We must also be careful not to provide a special reason for the word repentance without a source.

Status: supported within limits

S38 · Echoes That May Be Heard but Cannot Be Proved

Are ox meat→the face of an ox, taste→Daat→mitzvot, and the transition food→sacrifice an intentional structure? Separate an explicit thematic connection from a literary allusion that can only be proposed.

The sequence of expressions creates an attractive connection between the examples. The question is when this attractiveness becomes evidence, and when it should remain a suggestion that helps the reading.

Status: proposed echo

S39 · Thus Far We Found: The Limit of Transmission

"Thus far we found in his holy handwriting": who wrote the note, in which printed witnesses, and what may be inferred from it about the c ompleteness/interruption/date of the Epistle? Do not turn a copyist's note into evidence of an intended ending.

The concluding note sounds like historical testimony, but it says first of all what was found by those transmitting the text. To infer from it why the author stopped requires information not contained in these words.

Status: supported limit of transmission; history open

S40 · The Complete Argument and Its Limits

The overall map of the argument: what was proved, what served as an analogy, and what was learned by inference? At the end, write a continuous explanation of the entire unit, but do not replace the individual questions with the slogan "the lower is higher at its root." Add newly discovered questions with the identifier N-[model name]-01, etc.

After all the precise observations, we must return and read the unit continuously. The result is not a collection of reservations: there is a positive explanation, with places within it where the evidence stops.

Status: completed

Contents and Reading Routes

The forty questions and their status · The wording of the unit · Study files · Continuous explanation · All five rounds · Method and its limits · Register of hypotheses and questions · Contributions and assessment · Opening research — a historical witness · Enlarged source readings · Sources · Index

YeshivahAI · Under rabbinic supervision · Study edition, 12 Tishrei 5787

The Wording of the Concluding Unit

> And from this will be well understood the matter of the order of the levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, which are the aspects of earth, water, fire and air: although the animal is above the vegetative and the speaking is above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both of them, and also Chochmah and Daat, for an infant does not know to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain, etc.; and "I have not yet eaten ox meat," etc. For it is an aspect of returning light from below upward, from the lowest level of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force, from Or Ein Sof that encompasses all worlds and from the kav of Or Ein Sof at the termination of the feet of the upright configuration of Adam Kadmon, in the aspect of returning light, as above.
>
> And through this will be well understood, with good discernment and knowledge, how the supernal angels in the chariot, the face of an ox and the face of an eagle, derive great enjoyment, are nourished and receive their supply from the spirit of the beast and bird that ascends upon them from the sac-

rifices upon the altar, and as indicated by the precise wording of the holy Zohar, “and they derive enjoyment from their foundation and root.” And after these things and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know, through all the above, the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls’ descent to this physical world, as it is written, “today to perform them,” and “better is one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world than all the life of the World to Come.” (Thus far we found in his holy handwriting):

Working text according to the digital witness of the Epistle; abbreviation marks were adjusted typographically. This witness reads: “העולה עליהם” (“that ascends upon them”); the research reports frequently quoted “העולה אליהם” (“that ascends to them”). No determination of the wording between printed editions is made here. Paragraph division and punctuation are reading tools. The English translation is this edition’s working translation. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text.

Study Files: Forty Questions

S19 · Good Discernment and Knowledge as a Transitional Sentence

The phrase echoes Psalms 119:66. In the Epistle it presents a reasoned understanding of the angels’ enjoyment of the sacrifice on the basis of the preceding explanation. A connection to the taste of grain and Daat is possible, as is a connection to the verse’s continuation concerning mitzvot; there is no evidence that it is an intentional literary program or the name of an additional Kabbalistic level. Psalms 119:66 — “Teach me good discernment and knowledge, for I have be-

lieved in Your commandments"; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text.

Reading the transition in its plain meaning already yields a result: what was explained about nourishing the speaking order also enables an understanding of the chariot. The words "through this" and "will be understood" hold the sequence together, and "good discernment and knowledge" emphasizes understanding that has a reason. The phrase need not be turned into a technical term in order to contribute to the argument.

The initial research proposed a sequence literal taste–Daat–mitzvot, because the verse in Psalms continues "for I have believed in Your commandments." The proposal is not without a linguistic basis: the words are indeed close to the Epistle's subjects. But the Epistle does not quote the verse's continuation here or explain that it alludes to it. The question is therefore not whether the reader can hear the echo, but whether a proved design can be attributed to the author.

There is also a difference between the source of the wording and the source of the idea. Identifying the verse explains where the phrase was taken from; it does not prove that the Kabbalistic explanation of sacrifice is present in the verse. Transferring the entire sequence from the Epistle into the verse creates a circle in which the resemblance itself serves as evidence for content the reader has introduced into it. The file preserves the biblical identification and the contextual explanation as two different pieces of evidence.

The simple alternative is a biblical expression well suited to the transition. This does not reduce its literary value. An expression can deepen the reading sequence even if we cannot prove a calculated allusion in every word. The reader's booklet can present the echo in

a short sentence; the study booklet must also preserve the broader proposal and the reason for narrowing it.

The decisive test remains clear: a source from the Alter Rebbe or a focused interpretation explaining this connection could strengthen the claim of intention. Without one, the present conclusion is not that the allusion is wrong, but that it is proposed. This is the same rule needed for ox meat and the face of an ox, but the resemblance does not turn the two cases into cumulative proof.

S20 · The Face of a Man and the Man upon the Throne

In Ezekiel 1, each living creature has four faces, including the face of a man; the figure upon the throne appears later, above the firmament. These are not the same detail in the vision. The Epistle speaks of the face of an ox and the face of an eagle as supernal angels in the chariot. K5 also distinguishes, in the roots of souls, between the face of a man and the man upon the throne. An identification of world or level must not be added to every detail without a focused source. Ezekiel 1 — verses 6, 10, 26; the four faces and the man upon the throne; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; "ונגלה כבוד ה'" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), 5722 — §§3–8, especially the substance of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537.

The first step is to read the biblical description before using the names as Kabbalistic shorthand. The verses about four faces and the face of a man belong to the living creatures. The verse about the likeness of a throne and a figure with the appearance of a man adds another layer. Saying only "man in the chariot," without distinction, can mistakenly transfer a root of souls from one place to another.

K5 contributed an explicit distinction between the face of a man in the chariot and the supernal man upon the throne, in the context of the roots of nefashot and neshamot. It is a later source explaining a related system and does not change the verses' order. Its value here is that it shows that the biblical distinction is also maintained in Chassidic explanation and is not a meaningless visual detail.

The examined material did not provide a complete map of all the worlds in every occurrence in answer to the user's question about the chariot's world. The Epistle says "supernal angels in the chariot." Other sources may distinguish between chariots and levels, but the heading alone cannot decide whether every detail belongs to Beriah or Yetzirah in the same sense. Positive precision sometimes means preserving the author's definition without adding a broader map to it.

An example of a counter-test is the question of how man can be a face among animals when, in the order of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking, he is above them. The difficulty diminishes when one distinguishes levels of physical created beings from the faces of the chariot as symbols and spiritual roots. The subject is not a physical man standing beside a physical ox. Nevertheless, the distinction must not become permission to invent any relationship between the maps; the parallels determine which connections may be explained.

The result is necessary for the continuation concerning sacrifice. When saying that the beast's spirit returns to the faces in the chariot, it must not be transferred without explanation to the figure of the man upon the throne. Even when L3 describes ascent as far as Malchut of Atzilut, the stages of explanation it supplies must be maintained. Distinguishing locations does not dismantle the vision's unity; it enables us to follow each source's claims.

S21 · Mutual Inclusion Does Not Abolish Function

The Zohar describes mutual inclusion and, in the same sequence, assigns defined functions to the ox and eagle. There is no contradiction between these two things. L6 shows that even in a world already refined, there are Michael in love and Gabriel in fear. A fixed attribute does not prove a lack of refinement, and refinement does not prove that all attributes have become one function. Root, condition, structure and bittul must be distinguished. Ezekiel 1 — verses 6, 10, 26; the four faces and the man upon the throne; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag.

The first datum is local and simple: the Zohar does not see its description of the faces gazing at and included in one another as a reason to stop calling them ox and eagle. Immediately after this description it continues with the spreading of spirit to beasts and birds. The names therefore signify functions within an interconnected system, not a claim that every aspect is completely isolated.

R4 posed a difficulty between "each with a particular attribute" in L3 and "Ban that has already undergone refinement" in K4. Behind the difficulty lay the assumption that refinement must abolish the particular attribute. L6 §1 explicitly challenged that assumption: it describes a refined world that has already been refined, and within it the camp of Michael in love and the camp of Gabriel in fear, each in its

place. Fixed character is compatible with refinement and does not in itself testify against it.

The analogy of the fetus in L6 must also be read. There, a condition in which head and foot are included together describes the state before formation is complete. This is not the same rectified mutual inclusion of attributes in the human partzuf discussed in L3. The same word can signify early lack of differentiation or integration of distinct aspects. Using it as a uniform term without context produces contradictions that the texts themselves do not pose.

L3 adds another kind of connection: peace between the minister of water and the minister of fire through a revelation above the attributes. It must therefore not be inferred from an angel's particular attribute that it has no relationship of mutual inclusion or common bittul at all. What is limited is a specific structure and function, not every possibility of connection. The closing wording also corrected the exaggeration that had developed in the opposite direction.

The combined reconciliation distinguishes a root in Tohu, a refined condition and a particular function. It rests on several sources, not on a single sentence enumerating all three. It can therefore be called a supported reconciliation provided that the combination is marked. There is no need to attribute to each source the words said by the other, nor to produce infinitely many levels of mutual inclusion in order to avoid every limit.

S22 · Ox for All Beasts, Eagle for Birds

In the Zohar, the spirit of beasts spreads from the face of an ox, and the sequence also mentions bulls, sheep, he-goats and goats. The spirit of birds spreads from the face of an eagle, and pigeons and turtledoves are mentioned in the sacrifice. Ox and eagle are therefore names of spiritual roots, not a restriction to two physical species. This

does not yield an exhaustive theory of all clean and unclean species. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180.

The difficulty becomes sharper when "root" is translated into simple identity. If the face of an ox were an enlarged physical ox, it would be difficult to understand why a sheep belongs to it. But the source itself lists several species under the same spreading forth. The answer is not a generalization invented by the editor to rescue the correspondence; it is a datum within the Zoharic sequence.

With the eagle too, there is no need to invent a sacrifice not mentioned. The Zohar separates the face from which the spirit spreads forth from the birds brought upon the altar. The difference between source and branch allows the higher name to be eagle and the practical example to be a turtledove or pigeon. This does not change the Epistle's wording, which places the face of an eagle beside the spirit of the bird ascending from the sacrifices.

What has not been fully answered is why specifically the form of the ox or eagle is the name of that root in the whole system of Kabbalah. Additional discourses on the natures of species and on attributes can be found, but the present investigation did not construct a comprehensive map of them. The report must explicitly state what it proves: the relationship between the face and the group of animals appears in the source; the full reason for the symbolism of each name is not proved from it.

Impurity and purity require similar caution. That the source concerns sacrificial birds does not by itself determine all the roots of

birds not offered. The limits of sacrifice must not be transferred to the limits of the chain of descent, or vice versa. For the Epistle's sentence, it is sufficient to identify the spirit ascending from the sacrificial species and its connection to the faces; a complete system of all species is a broader demand.

Another implication concerns the evidence from meat. Since the face of an ox includes a source for sheep and goats as well, the transition to ox meat does not prove that the reason for added intellect is specific to the ox species. The connection between the passages is strengthened at the level of the structure of nourishment, but does not solve all the questions of species selection in the Talmudic discussion.

S23 · The Lion and Man Do Not Disappear from the Zohar

The Epistle concerns the spirit of the beast and bird, so the face of an ox and the face of an eagle suit the example. In the Zohar, the lion participates through fire and man through the spirit and neshamah of the person offering the sacrifice. The local explanation for choosing the two faces is strong, but is not an explicit statement by the Alter Rebbe about the reason for the omission. It must not be said that the other two do not participate in the sacrifice. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text.

The initial error arose from an explanation that was partly correct but closed too soon. There is no sacrifice from the lion as there is from the beast and bird mentioned. This can explain why there is no parallel example of a lion's spirit from a physical lion. It cannot be inferred that the face of a lion has no function in the sacrifice. The Zohar's continuation is a direct counter-test to that extension.

Paragraphs 539–541 discuss man and lion. Man is connected to the spirit and neshamah of the person offering the sacrifice; the lion descends in fire and is included in the course of the sacrifice. The complete sacrifice is therefore broader than two categories of animals. The Epistle can select from it the part needed to demonstrate nourishment of the higher from the lower, without purporting to convey the Zohar's entire teaching on sacrifice.

The preferred explanation is thus delimitation of the example. Previously grain and meat were discussed as sources for a person; now the spirit of beast and bird as a source for angels. These two types correspond explicitly to ox and eagle in the Zohar. Lion and man are not examples of the same kind, although they belong to the ritual and the higher structure. The Epistle's choice is thus preserved, and the strong evidence against it ceases to be a contradiction.

Why, nevertheless, is this not a definitive determination of the reason for the omission? Because the Epistle does not add "and therefore I did not mention lion and man." There may be additional considerations of brevity or emphasis that we do not possess. Strong contextual evidence justifies a preferred explanation; it does not become the author's testimony concerning his editorial work. The difference is especially important after the investigation has already corrected an earlier categorical claim.

The answer should be given to the reader without burdening it with the diary of the error: the two faces correspond to the spirit of the beast and bird, and the other two are discussed in the Zohar in other roles. The research has an obligation also to preserve why "there are no wild animals in the sacrifice" was insufficient. This shows that the correction added context rather than merely replacing one cautious expression with another.

S24 · A Spirit That Descends, a Spirit That Returns

In the Zohar, spirit spreads from the faces to the lower and returns through the sacrifice; the lower is also a foundation and garment in this world. The Epistle explains the nourishment of the higher through returning light at the lowest level. L3 adds that refinement reveals lights of Tohu. An immediate source and a higher root may be combined, provided that the entire wording of the parallels is not attributed to the Zohar itself. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ואכלתם אכול" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag.

The Zohar describes more than one direction of relationship. The face of an ox is the source of the beast's spirit; the hosts draw near to their foundation and garment below and derive enjoyment from it. There is no need to choose which direction is true and erase the other. The expression "foundation" refers in different contexts to the spirit's origin and its base in this world. This was one of the principal distinctions that criticism added to the initial research.

The analogy of the Shechinah and the righteous person's spirit in paragraph 535 connects origin and return. Enjoyment is related to the spirit having come from the one enjoying it. It explains affiliation, but does not by itself formulate the entire mechanism of added light developed by Chassidic explanation. The Zohar must therefore

not be summarized as though it said only “a kind derives enjoyment from its own kind,” nor should the termination of Adam Kadmon’s feet be introduced into it without marking this.

The Epistle places the ascending spirit after the explanation of returning light. It thereby gives a reason for the addition from the lower, rather than merely describing a circular movement without change. The interpretive inference is that passage through the lowest level, where the radiance is revealed with greater force, explains why the return is not merely a restoration of the same quantity of vitality. This must be formulated as an understanding of the Epistle’s sequence, not as an explicit quotation from the Zohar.

L3 details the refinement of the beast’s spirit and its elevation to the face of an ox and as far as Malchut of Atzilut, followed by the revelation of lights of Tohu and the angels’ enjoyment. This is a significant Chassidic witness for reading the addition. The reference to the Epistle is printed there; its personal attribution to the Alter Rebbe or an editor was not decided. The parallel’s value as content does not depend on the historical decision about who wrote the pointer.

An immediate source may be distinguished from a high root: the spirit is drawn from the chariot, and the root of the lights revealed through refinement is higher than the recipient’s present level. K4 adds the difference between Ban already refined and that which has not yet been refined. The combined explanation does not claim that every source stated all the stages. It presents how the addition may be understood through distinctions with separate anchors.

Caution is also needed with the word “unrefined.” The beast before the service is discussed as requiring refinement; what nourishes the angels must not be described as though it remains in its unrefined condition after being offered. The addition is connected to service and elevation, not to the transfer of raw impurity to the higher. This

is a small but necessary correction of scope for continuous wording that does not conflict with the parallels.

S25 · Enjoyment, Nourishment and Supply

"נהנים" signifies enjoyment; "ניזונים," receiving vitality; "מסתפקים," receiving the supply of their needs, not casting doubt. The pair enjoyment and nourishment occurs in the Zohar; "מסתפקים" was not located in the examined sequence. "מאד" ("greatly") intensifies the enjoyment. No source was found assigning the three expressions to three separate sefirot or levels. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Stanford/Pritzker variants apparatus — 241a, especially lines 2 and 14.

The initial research proposed a useful linguistic division: pleasure, vitality and supply. It is preserved as a plain interpretation, provided it is not turned into a Kabbalistic table. Different words do not require three separate sources of light. They may enrich the description of reception, taking it beyond merely external enjoyment and indicating genuine dependence.

Investigation of the source added weight to two of the verbs. The Zohar has "אתהנון ואתזנו" ("derived enjoyment and were nourished"); the apparatus also reported reverse order in some witnesses. Enjoyment and nourishment are therefore not necessarily two verbal inventions of the Epistle. Nevertheless, the mere existence of the pair in the Zohar does not prove that there is no conceptual difference between them. It only places them in the context within which the difference must be read.

“מסתפקים” (“receive their supply”) was not found in the examined sequence. This is a limited search result, not proof that the Alter Rebbe coined the word in this context or that it has no other source in the literature. The booklet therefore does not attribute an exclusive linguistic innovation to the author. It provides a plain interpretation of supply, alongside the limit of comparison with the Zohar.

The word “מאד” (“greatly”) raised the possibility of connecting the enjoyment to the intensity of the root’s revelation. This fits the explanatory sequence, but no explicit separate reason was found for the adjective itself. It is preferable to say that the enjoyment is described as great and that the Epistle’s explanation accounts for the importance of the addition, rather than assign “greatly” to a fixed level without a source applying it.

The translation must avoid a misleading double meaning. In English, doubt and supply are not close as they are in the Hebrew structure, so a word meaning doubt should not be chosen. Nor need nourishment become a caloric mechanism. A translation of received sustenance preserves the reality of reception without replacing spiritual food with physical food.

S26 · The Same Line or a Different Location?

The wording closest to the Epistle is in the passage about birds, paragraph 537 on the site, in Zohar III 241a near line 2. In paragraph 540, near line 14, there is a different order and also an actual witness variant in the same line. The preceding context is on 240b. Pronoun referents are determined separately in each paragraph. The actual texts of Mikdash Melech and Or HaChamah were not read in the documented investigation. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle’s quotation is close to 537; Stanford/Pritzker variants apparatus — 241a, especially lines 2 and 14; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from

“ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107.

The first stage was correcting the location itself. The context of the spreading of spirit is on the preceding folio, but the quotation close to the Epistle’s wording is on 241a. Throughout the reports, designations of folio, website paragraph number and apparatus line were interchanged; in one place “240 line 14” was written and corrected to 241a. Such an error must not be left in the source list merely because the conceptual argument remains correct.

The second stage separated two occurrences. In the birds paragraph it says “ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דלהון” (“and they derive enjoyment from their foundation and root”). Later, in the discussion of the four figures, the order root and foundation appears in the printed wording examined digitally. A difference between two sentences does not teach that copyists disagreed over the same sentence. A claim of a textual variant requires comparing the same unit in different witnesses.

The third stage found an actual variant in the later line in the Stanford apparatus: the order root–foundation in some printed editions versus foundation–root in some witnesses. The R1 criticism thus did not eliminate the entire claim of a variant; it required precision concerning where it exists and what it shows. The Epistle’s wording is particularly close to the earlier occurrence, so it need not be explained solely through an exceptional witness to the later one.

The pronoun referents also changed in the record. In the ox and bird passages, the subject is hosts or holy spirits; later, the four figures; and in the passage on priests, Levites and Israelites, additional relationships of affiliation appear. It must not be said that every “דילהון”

("their") in the sequence refers to the same noun. A possessive pronoun is not a cosmological map by itself: context determines whose foundation it is and where that foundation is found.

The visual evidence is limited. A digital text and apparatus were read, and a facsimile of a printed Zohar serving as the basis for all the determinations was not completed. The Bot documented locations, but a website screenshot is not a facsimile of an early edition. Nor is mention of Or Yakar in the apparatus a reading of the Or Yakar commentary. These distinctions are preserved so that anyone wishing to continue the textual investigation will know precisely what has already been done.

The comparison yields an interpretive result even without determining which printed edition lay before the Alter Rebbe. There is a clear location for wording close to the quotation; there is a relationship of a lower foundation to the higher beings in context; and there is an actual variant elsewhere that does not determine the direction of the relationship. The question of the historical printed edition remains a separate demand, not a condition for reading the present sentence.

S27 · What Does "As Indicated by the Precise Wording" Teach?

The precise wording emphasizes that the higher beings derive enjoyment from their own foundation and root. In the Zohar there is a source for the spirit above, as well as its base and garment in this world below. L3 explains the addition through revelation of the lights of the root in Tohu. The combined reading is useful, but the possessive pronoun alone does not prove that the word foundation signifies a hidden higher root in every occurrence. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן

אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — “It” refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation.

In the initial research, foundation and root were almost always translated as the deep root of the higher beings. The criticism required reading “יסודא דהאי עלמא” (“the foundation of this world”) in its plain contextual meaning: a base in this world, connected to the spirit’s garment and to sacrifice. The correction was necessary because a uniform translation erased the fact that the Zohar points downward. But the correction likewise cannot erase the places where spirit issues from above.

The direction of the chain of descent must therefore be distinguished from the relationship of nourishment. The higher source gives spirit to the lower branch; the branch becomes a base in this world that the higher beings approach and enjoy. The word foundation participates in both relationships. There is no lexical contradiction, provided that in every occurrence the subject and the thing founded upon it are explained.

L3 changed the status of the Chassidic reading. It says that the angels derive enjoyment from the revelation of lights of Tohu and brings the Zohar’s wording with a reference to the end of the Epistle. The interpretation in terms of root therefore need not be treated as an addition by Lessons alone. A parallel in Likkutei Torah connects the quotation to revelation of the root. The presence of the reference is proved in the witness read, but its author is undetermined.

What does “as indicated by the precise wording” add within the Epistle? The preferred reading is that the food is not something foreign that the higher happens to receive; it has a relationship to its founda-

tion and root. The preceding explanation shows how the lower can bear an addition for the higher. The Zohar quotation joins this as an expression of such affiliation. This is a strong contextual interpretation, but it must not be turned into a claim that the entire interpretation of the Zohar is already identical to the Epistle's map of lights.

The alternative of mere kinship of kind remains too narrow if it erases the Epistle's treatment of returning light. The alternative of a higher root alone is too narrow if it erases the base in this world in the Zohar. The full explanation preserves both connections and marks where the parallel adds the language of Tohu. There is thus no need to choose between the two halves of the evidence.

S28 · The Angels Too Are from Ban — What Is Added to Them?

K4 distinguishes angels, who are Ban already refined, from beasts not yet refined whose root is higher. L3 describes revelation of lights of Tohu, and L6 shows that a refined condition is compatible with a fixed function. Root, condition and function can be combined in one explanation, but no single source was found explicitly formulating the whole combination. "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation.

K4 is important because it explicitly asks the difficult question. This is not a general reference to a discourse on sacrifices, but a distinction within Ban itself. What has not yet undergone refinement is low-

er in its condition, and the discourse reads this lowliness as an indication of a higher root. Refinement raises it above the level of the refiner. There is thus no need to assume that the angel belongs to a system with no connection at all to the beast's root.

In R3, the difference between L3 and K4 was described as a different location of the angel. R4 narrowed the claim: one source may describe a root and the other a condition after refinement, so there is no necessary disagreement. The correction matters because two non-overlapping vocabularies are not necessarily two contradictory positions. We must first determine which question each sentence answers.

L6 supplied a test for an additional assumption. Michael in love and Gabriel in fear are described in a refined world that has already been refined. A particular function must therefore not be identified with a lack of refinement. The proposed reconciliation need not say that the angel changed its nature between the sources; it can say that affiliation with a root, a condition of refinement and a mode of action are different descriptions of the same recipient.

Nevertheless, the combination remains a combination. L3 does not say in the same sentence "the particular attribute is a trace of Tohu although it has already been refined"; L6 does not present a map of Sag and Mah here; K4 is a later explanation in an unreviewed transcript, referring to earlier sources. The inference label must therefore not be erased once the reconciliation becomes persuasive. The strength of a synthesis does not turn it into a quotation.

The angels' enjoyment does not teach that they lack all completeness before the sacrifice. The discourses describe addition and revelation. Even something refined can receive an addition from what is revealed through the lower's service. The word "completes" in the question must therefore be read cautiously: there is no necessity to remedy a

moral deficiency or impurity in an angel in order to explain spiritual nourishment.

The evaluation of the sources remains differentiated. K4 gives a direct distinction addressing the difficulty about Ban; L3 gives content to revelation; L6 negates an assumption of contradiction based on the attributes' fixed character; L7 explains a Sag–Mah relationship in food and drawing down. Each contribution is defined separately, and this is the basis for the reasoned combination in the booklet.

S29 · A Small Sacrifice and Many Recipients

The Zohar uses the analogy of the slender light of a candle and a great influence coming from little. This explains how a small source can allow illumination for many. The analogy is not a quantitative formula for spiritual food and does not negate nourishment. It removes the need to measure recipients by the physical sacrifice's mass. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text.

The question teaches that the Zohar is not satisfied with an unexamined description of enjoyment. It itself gives room to wonder about the relationship between the size of the thing below and the multitude of recipients. The difficulty must therefore not be dismissed by saying that all the words are spiritual and have no content. The analogy is intended to give the reader a way to understand a relationship that is not ordinary material division.

A candle can illuminate for many without each recipient receiving a piece of the wick. This is the useful point of the analogy. There is no need to copy an exact physical mechanism from it to the higher lights. Nor does the analogy's use of a small object prove a numeri-

cal relationship between the size of the sacrifice and the number of angels. It demonstrates how the small perceptible cause does not by itself measure the extent of the result.

This reading fits "are nourished" in the Epistle. There is an addition the higher beings receive; it is not merely knowledge that someone below has done a good deed. But the addition is connected to the spirit of the sacrifice and to revelation, not to meat eaten in heaven in the human manner. The language of nourishment can thus be maintained without turning it into a description of an angelic digestive system.

The limit is that the analogy does not replace the explanation of returning light. It mainly answers the question about quantity. The question of the source of the addition — why what came from above adds something on its return — requires the discussion in the preceding questions. Distinguishing the two difficulties allows each source to contribute what it actually explains without overburdening the candle analogy.

S30 · "All the Above" Returns the Conclusion to the Entire Epistle

"After these things and this truth" echoes II Chronicles 32:1; "it is easy for one with understanding to know," Proverbs 14:6. The preferred reading also includes the Epistle's main text within "all the above": the command addressed to separate beings, the root of mitzvot and the drawings down. Nourishment and sacrifice are the last links, not the entire foundation. The pronoun's scope is a contextual conclusion, not an explicit definition by the author. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; II Chronicles 32:1 — "after these things and this truth"; Proverbs 14:6 — "and it is easy for one with understanding to know."

Identifying the biblical expressions is only a first stage. A verse from Chronicles supplies transitional wording following things established; a verse from Proverbs supplies wording of ease of understanding for one with understanding. The Epistle uses them to announce a transition from an explanatory system to a conclusion. There is no evidence that every detail of the verses' historical context is drawn into this as an allusion.

The broad reading of "all the above" rests on earlier explicit anchors. Separate beings were created to fulfill the command; mitzvot are called Torah's primary element and root; drawings down of lights are connected to the purpose of human creation. Without these anchors, the transition from natural nourishment to the advantage of a mitzvah can appear a leap. Finding them in the Epistle's text restored to the explanation the links that did not need to originate with a later interpreter.

The narrow alternative is not illogical: "all the above" can sometimes summarize only the immediate sequence, which already contains sacrifice as a mitzvah act. Even then, however, understanding the conclusion is influenced by the earlier discussion of the root of Torah and mitzvot. There is therefore no need to claim that the pronoun grammatically requires every line from the beginning of the Epistle; it is sufficient to show that the concluding argument naturally rests on the body of the discussion.

"And as below" in the paragraph on outer and inner dimensions remains a forward reference not developed in the existing material at the same level of detail. The conclusion may fulfill part of the promise, but this does not prove that the entire distinction was explained in it. L7 gives a detailed parallel for inwardness in Torah and outwardness in mitzvot. This assists the explanation; it is not a proved identification of "below" or evidence of interruption.

The sentence “easy to understand” does not authorize skipping the inferential link. Precisely in the booklet it must be set out: the advantage of the lowest level, action according to the command, and the purpose of revelation in the physical world. What is easy for one with understanding after reading the whole Epistle is not necessarily clear to a reader beginning only with the last sentence. The explanation’s role is to restore the premises, not replace them with a declaration that the conclusion is obvious.

S31 · The Advantage of Matter and Commanded Action

The command is already explicit in the Epistle’s text: separate yesh was created to fulfill mitzvot. The advantage of the lowest level explains why action in matter can reveal a higher power; sacrifice demonstrates commanded service in matter. The conclusion concerns practical mitzvot, not physicality in general. Intention and refinement are explained in the parallels, but must not be inserted as a condition for every phenomenon of natural nourishment. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “להבין מ”ש בפע”ח” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements”) and the continuation; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — “better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah.

The transition does not start from zero in the concluding paragraph. The Epistle’s body has already connected the creation of yesh to

Malchut and the command. When reports sufficed with food and sacrifice, a need arose to add "physicality according to G-d's will" from outside. Reading the entire Epistle showed that this component was present from the beginning. The correct editorial addition is to bring it back to the forefront of the explanation, not present it as the explanation's invention.

Natural eating serves as an example of the lower's ability to add. Sacrifice serves as an example that also contains an act of service and elevation. It is therefore an important link between the person receiving nourishment and practical mitzvot. It must not be inferred that the altar is merely a higher nutritional system, since the Zohar itself connects sacrifice to repentance and breaking the spirit. But it must not be projected from this that every infant tasting grain already performs that same intentional service.

L3 explains human eating with a blessing and intention, and the precedence of prayer, in the context of refinement and revelation. L1 marks a separate transition to the service of G-d after its discussion of food and the proofs. Both parallels teach that the language of refinement can appear on several levels. The requirement is to read each paragraph's conditions in their own place, not turn every use of the word refinement into an identical system of conditions.

Will and bittul can explain the relationship between the act and the mitzvah within the framework of Tanya, but here we must begin with the explicit point: a mitzvah is a command. It must not be said that intention alone turns every material activity into the same mitzvah praised by the Epistle. Nor should a new halachic ruling concerning details of action and intention be constructed from the discussion; the booklet interprets the Epistle's argument and the parallels examined.

The positive formulation is that commanded action realizes the higher will in the separate world, in the place where the Epistle described a distinctive revelation of power. This is the link connecting the foundation of creation to the purpose of service. Matter is important because action is performed in it; the command is important because it determines the action's relationship to the King. If either component is erased, the Epistle's conclusion changes.

S32 · The Souls' Descent and Revelation Below

The Epistle connects drawings down of lights to the purpose of human creation and practical mitzvot to the purpose of the souls' descent. L7 explains elevation and drawing down whose purpose is revelation of the light below; L4 also describes an addition in the animal soul. These are contributing aspects, not synonyms. Kuntres Acharon 4 is a close parallel to the sowing analogy, but not a proved identification of "elsewhere." Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37 — the purpose of descent, action and Torah study.

The subject of the purpose must be distinguished from the description of the result. "Descent of the souls" emphasizes the soul's movement into the world; "creation of man" presents the person within creation; "drawings down" describes an action and result in the lights; "a dwelling in the lower realms" describes the goal of revelation. The connections among them can be explained, but they must not be called four definitions the author gave in the same sentence.

L7 is particularly useful because it does not leave elevation as the ultimate purpose. It emphasizes that revelation of the higher light below is the purpose of the chain of descent, whereas the lower's ascent is temporary. Raising mayin nukvin participates in drawing down. It must therefore not be said that the mitzvah takes a person out of the world and that this alone fulfills its purpose; the movement returns to revelation in the lower.

The sowing analogy connects the small act to a power not present in the seed alone. In L7 the etrog and parchment arouse their root, and in the Epistle fruits that come through sowing are superior. The proximity clarifies how an action in the lower can participate in a higher drawing down. It does not, however, prove that the words "as written elsewhere" point specifically to this chapter; additional evidence of the reference is required.

The R5 correction also concerned Torah. If study also draws down light, the goal of revelation below cannot be used to exclude Torah from the purpose. The distinction between Torah and mitzvot is explained through inner and outer dimensions and through different roots, not through a contrast between something that has a purpose and something that has none. The Epistle emphasizes the practical character of mitzvot from within the subject it has been addressing.

Expressions such as "to know Him" or "revelation of His powers" may appear in other contexts, but do not replace the requirement here for an applicable parallel. The research need not combine every formulation of the purpose of creation found in the literature. It is sufficient to explain the anchors that were read and to leave the broad comparison of all purposes outside what was proved in the concluding unit.

S33 · The Advantage of Action Is Not a Single Scale

The Epistle's body contains an explicit comparison between the roots of mitzvot and Torah and between outer and inner dimensions. In the conclusion, the emphasis is on action in this world versus life in the World to Come. L4 distinguishes aspects in which study is greater and action is greater; L7 also includes study in drawing down. It is therefore incorrect to say there is no comparison at all, and incorrect to turn it into an absolute ranking. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — "better is one hour"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 5 — the union of knowing Torah; food and garment; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37 — the purpose of descent, action and Torah study.

At one stage the criticism sufficed with the sentence "there is no comparison to Torah here." The sentence is correct only if its scope is the narrowly defined concluding unit, in the sense of an explicit comparison in those lines. It is not correct about the Epistle as a whole: the root of mitzvot in the skull and of Torah in the concealed mind, as well as outer and inner dimensions, are discussed in the text. R3 and R4 corrected the scope so that the qualification would not erase an explicit claim.

Another proposal divided Torah into revelation and mitzvot into purpose. This gives a useful direction but does not alone supply the full comparison. L4 explains two aspects of embedding and concludes

that both must be present in the person. L7 distinguishes the inner dimension of the mochin from the outer dimension of the vessels, and in the same discussion includes Torah and mitzvot in drawing down. A description of one dimension must not be transferred to all the others.

In R4 a sharp formula was proposed: Torah is descent, mitzvot ascent. R5 corrected it from L4's own continuation. At the root of the structure, Torah is likened to descending water and mitzvot to their end in their beginning; in human service, Torah leads to ratzo, running forth, and mitzvot to shov, returning; in the result, the power of fire is drawn down as far as the animal soul. Ascent to the root thus participates in drawing down and is not the whole action.

The concept of a practical mitzvah does not exclude Torah itself being a mitzvah. Speech and thought are also discussed in Tanya within systems of garments and drawing down. But here the Epistle emphasizes action in the physical world through an argument about the lowest level. There is no need to use it to resolve every halachic question about the status of speech as action, or to equate prayer without a source with every detail of a bodily mitzvah.

A good comparison asks in every sentence what is being measured: root, manner of investment, quality of union, required action or purpose. It does not suffice with "everything is relative," because it gives each relationship content. The advantage of action that the Epistle seeks to establish can thus be preserved, together with the advantage of Torah explained by the other sources.

S34 · Study Is Greater, Action Is Greater

Kiddushin 40b connects the greatness of study with its leading to action. Tanya 4 includes Torah and mitzvot versus radiance; chapter 5 explains a distinctive union in apprehending Torah; chapter 37 dis-

tinguishes a mitzvah that can be performed by others from one that cannot. L4 gives two aspects of “greater,” and L7 establishes that study also draws down light. The axes combine and do not cancel one another. Kiddushin 40b — study is greater because it leads to action; Mishnah Peah 1:1 — and Torah study is equivalent to them all; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — “better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 5 — the union of knowing Torah; food and garment; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37 — the purpose of descent, action and Torah study; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “כי תצא למלחמה” (“When You Go Out to War”) — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “להבין מ”ש בפע”ח” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements”) and the continuation.

The mishnah “Torah study is equivalent to them all” and the discussion of “study is greater” are not the same sentence and must not be merged without context. Kiddushin brings a decision explaining the greatness of study through its leading to action. It contains a relationship between study and result, but not, in that same sentence, a division between our time and the messianic age. The addition of the future axis comes from other Chassidic sources and must be marked accordingly.

Tanya chapter 4 matters because it uses the same mishnah “better is one hour” that appears at the end of the Epistle, and applies the advantage to Torah and mitzvot. The mishnah itself is therefore no evidence for excluding Torah from the advantage of this world. Chapter 5 adds the quality of union in apprehension: the intellect is vested in the wisdom and the wisdom within it. This is an axis that cannot be replaced by a claim about the place of action alone.

Chapter 37 gives a practical test for preserving both sides. A mitzvah that cannot be performed by others takes precedence over study,

whereas, if it can be performed by others, Torah study is not interrupted. The discussion connects the purpose of descent and a great illumination in study without requiring either to cancel the other. The booklet uses it as a parallel for explanation, not as a source for a new ruling outside the question's subject.

L4 is explicit that both statements about the greatness of Torah and action are true in different aspects. Its continuation, however, requires distinguishing root, service and result. Reading a complete passage is preferable to extracting a line that will seem a perfect answer to all the sources. R5 restored drawing down below to the description of the mitzvot's action and corrected the one-directional formula R4 had already tried to establish.

L7 sharpens the point that the principal contrast in part of the discussion is between drawing down and the mere elevation of intellectual love and fear. Study and halachot also draw down light. "Specifically practical mitzvot" must therefore not be read while skipping the adjacent sentences about Torah. Responsible source comparison does not collect only the line suited to the desired side.

The status of reading Tanya changed among researchers and rounds: sometimes the full text was opened, and sometimes only a search excerpt was received. This edition preserves the file's conclusion as it was closed and does not present it as though every participant reread every chapter in every round. The argument derives its strength from the sources and their scope, not from counting the number of times a book's name was recorded.

S35 · Four Times, Not One "Future"

K3 says explicitly that in the messianic age the greatness of action will be revealed; this must not be turned into Torah being greater in the future. K5 distinguishes Gan Eden and resurrection in the contex-

t of reward and revelation in the body. Tanya 4 explains the World to Come in the context of the pleasure of apprehension, and Eruvin distinguishes action today and reward tomorrow. Actual study at resurrection must not be inferred from the exposition "You made with wisdom." "ציון במשפט תפדה" ("Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice"), 5735 — §§14–16: study and action now and in the future; "ונגלה כבוד ה'" ("And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed"), 5722 — §§3–8, especially the substance of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — "better is one hour"; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; Eruvin 22a — today to perform them; tomorrow to receive their reward; Mishnah Avot 4:17 and Tosafot Yom Tov — the two halves of the mishnah: action and spiritual pleasure.

The preparatory check had already found in K3 the direction of action being greater in the future. This corrected a possible assumption that specifically Torah would then stand above action. The question itself was not a fact, and the researcher was required to let the source correct it. In presenting the history, a categorical position must not be attributed to the user merely because he asked for a possibility to be examined.

The table must distinguish action, study, reception of reward and revelation of an advantage. A statement that the advantage of action will be revealed in the future does not necessarily mean that the same framework of action as today obtains at that time. A statement that Torah's reward is in Gan Eden is not a complete description of all study there. Without separating the columns, adjacent cells become claims never made.

K5 explains the World to Come in the mishnah "All Israel" in the context of the resurrection of the dead. This interpretation must not be transferred automatically to the World to Come in the mishnah "better is one hour." The expression "derive enjoyment from the radiance of the Shechinah" also receives different interpretive contexts. The

booklet does not seek to resolve every dispute over the definition of the World to Come, but to preserve the local meaning given by each source.

A specific error was corrected in the R3 table: “with wisdom” and “You made” in K5 were interpreted as describing study and action actually occurring at resurrection. The context concerns the causes of reward and the revelation resulting from the service. The correct rendering of the source’s claim is therefore not an unstated new future activity. This is a test of temporal scope, not merely of a word’s interpretation.

Nor should “tomorrow” in Eruvin be labeled specifically Gan Eden without a source. The exposition sets the time for action against the time for reward. It can serve the Epistle’s conclusion without itself filling all the cells concerning the future. An empty table cell is sometimes the most precise finding: that source provides no statement on the particular question.

The conclusion concerning the relationship to Torah remains measured. K3 is a later Chassidic explanation of direct importance, but its wording must not be attributed to the Alter Rebbe at the end of the Epistle. It adds an axis of future revelation to the advantage now being explained. It must not be used to replace the axis of service and reward in the Epistle’s two quotations.

S36 · Today to Perform Them

The verse in Deuteronomy 7:11 and the exposition in Eruvin 22a set the time for action against the reception of reward: today to perform them, tomorrow to receive their reward. L6 explains the difference between the world of action and choice and an ordered world that has already undergone refinement. The exposition alone does not decide that action is greater than Torah in every respect. Deuteronomy 7:11 — “which I command you today to perform”; Eruvin 22a — today

to perform them; tomorrow to receive their reward; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text.

The quotation has a role concerned with time and opportunity. The advantage discussed is not merely an abstract advantage of matter, but the advantage of the soul’s service in this world. “Today” defines the arena in which action takes place. The exposition thus supports the purpose of descent without addressing every detail of the scale between Torah and mitzvot.

L6 §1 supplies a close parallel: this world is the world of action and choice; in the world that has already undergone refinement, every level is in its place. The comparison does not say that the World to Come contains no content or revelation whatsoever, but that the opportunity for service and change discussed here belongs specifically here. This explains why action in the lower world can be superior along the axis the Epistle seeks to show.

The wording “and not tomorrow to perform them” is not permission to construct a complete table of all future periods without additional sources. Rashi and the parallels help in reading the time of reward, but the subject at the end of the Epistle remains the difference between action and the result received afterward. In this context there is no need to introduce into the exposition a promise about every detail of life after death.

The error to prevent is the substitution of one contrast for another. Today versus tomorrow is not Torah versus action, just as apprehension versus essence is not necessarily study versus a bodily mitzvah. Another source may connect these axes, but that connection must be shown. The Epistle brings the exposition after the advantage of

practical mitzvot, and it therefore serves the local conclusion; this does not change the explicit contrast within the exposition itself.

S37 · The Two Halves of “Better Is One Hour”

The first half praises the service of repentance and good deeds; the second, spiritual pleasure in the World to Come. Tanya 4 explains attachment through Torah and mitzvot versus radiance and apprehension. L6 explains the two concluding quotations through memale and sovev. The word repentance is in the mishnah quoted by the Epistle; it has not been proved that it was chosen here to allude specifically to the refinement performed by penitents in K4. Mishnah Avot 4:17 and Tosafot Yom Tov — the two halves of the mishnah: action and spiritual pleasure; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — “better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; “פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text.

Reading the second half of the mishnah prevents the superficial claim that the World to Come has no advantage. The mishnah itself praises its spiritual pleasure above life in this world. The distinction is between the opportunity for service and the reward and enjoyment. Thus the superiority of an hour of service does not mean that every experience in this world is greater than every revelation in the World to Come.

Tanya 4 adds the quality of attachment, not merely time. Torah and mitzvot allow grasping and investment in what is not apprehensible through thought alone, whereas enjoyment of a radiance is illumination and apprehension. This corrects reports that based the two

quotations on time alone. The time for action and the quality of the connection both contribute to the explanation, and each must be stated in its own place.

L6 is especially close because it brings “today to perform them” and “better is one hour” in the same discourse, alongside the system of memale and sovev and the discussion of the sacrifice. The two quotations should not be called “two verses”: one is a verse and its exposition, the other a mishnah. Nor should it be said that this is the only place in all the literature where both appear together; this is a parallel found in the investigation that explains the sequence well.

The proposal to connect repentance to K4 §8 was preserved as a possible echo. There the transformation of evil in the service of penitents has a place in refinement. But the Epistle does not separately expound the word repentance here. Merely quoting a mishnah that contains it does not prove that the author chose the mishnah specifically for the sake of that exposition. Conversely, there is no evidence that the word is accidental or meaningless; the result is the absence of proof for a special reason.

What are good deeds? In the mishnah’s context, these are service in this world; in Tanya 4 the explanation includes Torah and mitzvot. In the Epistle the emphasis is on practical mitzvot. Translation and explanation must preserve the general word in the quotation and its local application in the argument, without restricting the mishnah itself to bodily mitzvot alone or expanding the Epistle to every beneficial human action.

The meaning of the World to Come is determined by context. The discussion in K5 of the mishnah “All Israel” does not automatically decide it here. The examination can draw on commentators to the mishnah who distinguish action and reward, but it need not eliminate every difference between interpretations in order to understand

the end of the Epistle. This is a limited determination concerning the subject that the verse and mishnah come to serve.

S38 · Echoes That May Be Heard but Cannot Be Proved

The transition from food to sacrifice and from there to mitzvot is explicit in the Epistle's order and connective words. The echoes ox meat–the face of an ox and the taste of grain–good discernment and knowledge are possible and illuminating. It has not been proved that they are a deliberate program of allusion, or that they provide an independent reason for choosing an ox and the names Chochmah and Daat. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Psalms 119:66 — "Teach me good discernment and knowledge, for I have believed in Your commandments"; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57.

We must begin with what is not conjectural: the Epistle itself marks "and from this," "for it is," "and through this will be well understood," and "and after these things." These are not connections invented by the reader. They build a sequence of argument from the preceding explanation to nourishment, sacrifice and conclusion. Even without any additional verbal allusion, the unit has a clear structure.

The echo adds a reading experience: the ox that already appeared as food returns in the faces of the chariot; the taste that already appeared in eating grain returns in the discernment and knowledge of understanding. This may be presented as a literary suggestion. The error begins when it is used to justify a claim not proved in another way, such as that ox meat specifically was chosen because of the face of an ox, or that grain refers to just one sefirah.

L1 helps test the limit of the claim. It brings the two pieces of evidence from food in reverse order and in another context, and they still function as joint evidence. This does not disprove a special design in the Epistle, but it shows that the evidence does not specifically require the echo in order to fulfill a conceptual role. The principal explanation must rest on the content, and the allusion may accompany it.

The biblical continuation “for I have believed in Your commandments” in Psalms adds the possibility of an echo, not proof that the Epistle deliberately abbreviates the entire verse. If every continuation of a quoted verse were necessarily considered part of the argument, one could construct many connections with no indication in the text. Identification of the source and the proposed allusion are therefore recorded separately in the register of hypotheses.

The editorial decision is to preserve the suggestion in the research and present it briefly to the reader, with the wording “one may hear here.” There is no need to choose between erasing all literary sensitivity and declaring a proved intention. This exemplifies a rich possibility that the research preserves precisely by limiting its status.

S39 · Thus Far We Found: The Limit of Transmission

The formula marks the limit of the material transmitted from his handwriting. It does not prove that the Epistle was interrupted, nor does it prove that it was deliberately concluded at this point. The tradition concerning Piena and writing close to his passing was reported in later sources, but its earliest source and an early printed edition were not fully verified here. This decision is unnecessary to explain the existing conclusion. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh

20, note 61 in English — “It” refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation.

R2 included wording that the note testifies that the manuscript was interrupted here. R3 corrected it: it testifies only to the point up to which material was found. The difference is not a stylistic softening. “Was interrupted” asserts an event in the text or the writing; “we found” describes a state of transmission. There may be a lacuna, there may be an ending, and the transmitters may simply be indicating the extent of the witness before them.

The opposite conclusion is likewise impermissible. That the conclusion concerning mitzvot sounds complete does not prove that the author intended to end there. It is possible to explain a thematic ending in the existing material without turning it into an intentional historical conclusion. Literary reading and testimony concerning the manuscript’s history are two different claims.

The tradition concerning Piena was mentioned in Lessons in the name of the Tzemach Tzedek, and it was proposed to examine the source and the Shklov 5574 edition. These targets were not completed to a sufficient standard of original evidence in the present investigation. A Hebrew date must therefore not be converted to a secular year and used to construct an argument about authorship without verification. In particular, an approximate timeframe must not be used to decide who added a reference in Likkutei Torah.

The question of “אג”ה” (an abbreviation for Iggeret HaKodesh) in L3 led to a circumstantial inference about an editorial layer. R5 gave up the more categorical tendency: the abbreviation also refers to content that appears before us in Kuntres Acharon. This teaches us about usage of the designation, not the identity of the writer. A manuscript or an editor’s correction may resolve this in the future; at present we cannot replace such a witness with a plausible story.

In the reader's booklet, a sentence clarifying that the line is a transmission note is sufficient. The research also preserves the rejected formulations, the targets for examination, and the reason they do not hold up the explanation. Leaving the history open does not erase the Torah conclusion that the text itself brings; it prevents that conclusion from becoming evidence for what is not written.

S40 · The Complete Argument and Its Limits

Earth prepares the advantage of the lowest level; the food chain applies it to vitality and Daat; returning light explains the higher receiving from the lower; sacrifice demonstrates this relationship in the chariot; the command and the root of mitzvot within the Epistle lead to the purpose of action in this world. The parallels expand on the root and refinement of food and the advantage of drawing down, without identifying all the mechanisms with one another. The closure is that of a responsible explanation, not a declaration that every detail has been solved. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation.

We can now read the transitions without skipping the details. “And from this” does not introduce an unrelated subject, but applies what was learned concerning earth. The levels of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders provide a visible scale on which the paradox becomes sharper. “From both of them” prepares two examples, and “also Chochmah and Daat” shows that the dependence is not restricted to a low bodily need. Each part contributes to the argument and not merely to a list of symbols.

“For it is” returns from the examples to the explanation. It does not suffice with grain and meat having an effect, but connects that effect with the structure of illumination at the lowest level. The sovev illuminates and the kav returns; the distinction is maintained even when the first sentence calls the whole phenomenon an aspect of returning light. The explanation thus rests on the Epistle’s own wording rather than a later identification of every high root with every returning light.

“And through this will be well understood” transfers the structure to the sacrifice. The spirit descends from the chariot and returns from below; its return allows enjoyment and an addition. The Zohar supplies the relationships of origin, garment and affiliation. L3 supplies the language of revealing the lights of Tohu, and K4 the distinction in the status of refinement. These additions illuminate the reading provided they are not presented as the words of the Zohar or the Epistle.

“And after these things” deduces the advantage of mitzvot from the entire foundation. The command is already explicit in the text, so the conclusion is not that all physicality is holy in the same sense. Action according to the command takes place where a distinctive power is revealed, and fulfills a purpose of revelation within the separate world. L4 and L7 prevent this from being restricted to ascent alone, restoring both drawing down and the place of Torah.

The final two quotations add time and quality: now is the time for action, and service allows a connection that is not identical to enjoyment of a radiance. They do not negate the advantage of reward, nor do they rank every aspect of Torah against every mitzvah. The transmission note concludes the material in our possession without determining the author's intention concerning the end of the writing.

The remaining questions are not equal in weight. A specific reason for the ox and the doubling of the parents is lacking; an explicit authorial reconciliation with Etz Chaim is lacking; details of references and textual history are lacking. In contrast, anchors were found for the structure of nourishment, the map of the elements and the conclusion concerning mitzvot. The research can end because the explanation does not depend on turning every gap into a solution, and the booklet can show the progress without hiding its limits.

Continuous Explanation

From Earth to the Order of Life

"And from this" opens an application of what was explained earlier. The element of earth, lowest of the elements, produces growth again and again. The Epistle explained the power revealed in it through the radiance at the lowest level of Asiyah: the sovev illuminates beneath the feet of Adam Kadmon, and the kav that terminates there shines from below upward as returning light. Sowing and planting add the role of human action, and the fruits that come through it are superior. From here we move to another phenomenon in which the lower adds to the higher: nourishment.

The Epistle arranges the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders opposite earth, water, fire and air. The correspondence is one of aspects, not material identity. Water itself is inanimate, but the act of producing growth characterizes its connection to the vegeta-

tive. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, explains animal in fire through the root of animal souls in the servants of the chariot, and speaking in air through the Targum of Onkelos, "a speaking spirit." Earth is given there without a separate reason. In Etz Chaim the order of the upper two pairs differs; one may propose that the mappings answer different questions, but no explicit reconciliation of the difference is before us. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Etz Chaim, Gate 50, chapter 10 — the portions of the four elements and the composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders.

The Higher Needs the Lower

The animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal. This is an advantage in the revealed order of vitality, not a determination that the root of everything higher is always above the root of everything lower. Nevertheless, the animal is nourished from the vegetative, and the speaking from both. The dependence does not abolish the levels; it is what requires explanation. The higher receives from the lower a power not measured solely by its apparent position.

The chain is not an exhaustive list of all foods. Water and salt belong to the inanimate, and Kuntres Acharon 4 explicitly says food from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders. It must therefore not be inferred from omission of the inanimate that a person is not nourished by it. Note 61 proposes understanding the omission of earth through everything being from earth, and cautiously adds dependence after Creation as well. This is a qualified later explanation, not an explicit statement of the Epistle about every instance of eating. Tanya, Ig-

geret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation.

Also Chochmah and Daat

The words "and also Chochmah and Daat" sharpen the argument. The person receives not only bodily existence; his intellectual power also receives an addition. The evidence from grain is Rabbi Yehudah's statement in Berachot, within the discussion of the Tree of Knowledge: the infant does not call father and mother until it tastes grain. The evidence from meat is Rav Nachman's words to Rava in Bava Kamma 72a. Rashi and Tosafot connect the wording to lack of precision and fasting. The Epistle combines the two expressions to show that Daat too receives from the vegetative and animal orders.

Likkutei Torah, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot"), brings both proofs together and explains: foods are low in their revealed state, but their root is in Tohu, above the Chochmah of Tikkun in the person. After their refinement, they add vitality and intellect. This does not mean that revealed bread has more developed thought than the person. Vaetchanan adds a specific reason concerning wheat: its root is Daat of Tohu. "מצה זו" ("This Matzah") uses father alone to explain knowledge in a state of immaturity. This does not prove that in the Epistle's sentence father and mother are necessarily Abba and Imma, or that grain corresponds specifically to Daat and meat specifically to Chochmah.

L1 subsequently transitions explicitly to the service of G-d. The conditions of eating for the sake of Heaven, reciting the Shema and

prayer must not be transferred to the very fact that an infant receives Daat from grain. Both the spiritual mechanism in the parallel and the difference between a description of nourishment and intentional service are thereby maintained. Berachot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat and father and mother; Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, "להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום" ("To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse 'And You Shall Know Today' ") — §5, the root of wheat in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; beginning of the discourse 11c (יא ג); PDF 51–53.

For It Is an Aspect of Returning Light

"For it is" supplies a cause for the phenomenon. The preferred reading refers it to the entire matter of the higher being nourished from the lower; it can also be understood in relation to the nourishing food. In both readings, the subject of "that is revealed" is the radiance. At the lowest level, a radiance from the sovev and the kav is revealed with greater force. In the preferred reading, the final returning light is attached to the kav at the termination of the feet of the upright configuration, as stated earlier and as referred to by "as above." There is no need to attribute returning to the sovev as well in this sentence.

The repetition of the structure is not merely a geographical address. It explains why the lower can add to the higher. What was previously described concerning growth is now applied to vitality and Daat. The parallels about Tohu and Sag explain the root of food and its refinement, but no sentence identifies them with the kav's returning light. Malchut's returning light in the future in "ואכלתם אכול" ("And

You Shall Eat Plentifully") is likewise an explanatory parallel, not the same claim in time and subject.

"A radiance of a radiance, etc." apparently refers to the earlier description of radiances. The abbreviation may include the third radiance, or it may also evoke the entirety of what was said. It provides no evidence for a new fourth level. A good explanation preserves the backward reference without claiming to know with certainty every word the author chose to abbreviate. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ואכלתם אכול" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully") — discussion of eating, elevation and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation.

From Food to Sacrifice

"And through this will be well understood" applies the structure to the chariot. From the higher faces, spirit is drawn to beast and bird; in the sacrifice the spirit ascends, and the higher beings derive enjoyment and nourishment from it. The Zohar describes both the higher source and the foundation and garment in this world. These are two relationships, not a contradiction within one direction. The expression "יסודא ועיקרא" ("foundation and root") requires reading in its full context, and the pronoun "דילהון" ("their") alone does not prove what kind of root it is.

The Epistle chooses ox and eagle because it discusses the spirit of beast and bird. In the Zohar itself, lion and man also appear, in other roles. It is incorrect to make them disappear, or to turn the face of

an ox into an identity with every physical ox. The name of the face signifies a spiritual connection to the species detailed in the passage. The eagle is a root for the birds under discussion; this does not mean that an eagle is offered.

Likkutei Torah, Emor, adds that refinement of the sacrifice reveals lights of Tohu from which the angels have their root. K4 distinguishes Ban already refined from what still requires refinement and has a higher root. Pinchas shows that an angel with a fixed attribute can belong to a world already refined. Root, condition and structure can thus be combined without calling them one thing. This is a supported interpretive completion from different sources, not one quotation encompassing them all. Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537; Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' ") — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" ("The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel"), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180.

The Advantage of Practical Mitzvot

"Through all the above" also connects the conclusion to the body of the Epistle. It has already said that separate beings were created to fulfill His mitzvot and that mitzvot are Torah's primary element and root, although in their revealed state the mitzvah is bodily and Torah is Chochmah. It must not be inferred from the advantage of matter that every use of it is a mitzvah. The command and will give the act its function; the advantage of the lowest level explains why action takes place specifically in the physical world.

The conclusion is not that mitzvot only elevate. In L4, ascent to the root brings a drawing down of the power of fire as far as the animal soul; in L7, the purpose is revelation of higher light below, and Torah study also draws down light. Each direction must therefore be explained in its own place. The advantage of the mitzvot's root, the inwardness of knowing Torah, and the purpose of descent are not a single criterion by which one of the two forms of service is erased.

"Today to perform them" indicates the time for service as against the time for reward. "Better is one hour" indicates the advantage of repentance and deeds here compared with life in the World to Come; the mishnah's second half praises spiritual pleasure there compared with life in this world. In Tanya 4, Torah and mitzvot together allow attachment surpassing the pleasure of apprehending a radiance. The two quotations therefore do not prove that every act is above every study at every time.

Then comes the transmission note: "Thus far we found in his holy handwriting." It marks what was found and transmitted, without deciding whether the author intended to conclude here or whether a continuation is missing. The unit in our possession nevertheless reaches a clear conclusion: the soul descends into the physical world to act within it according to the command, and at this lowest level a power is revealed that cannot be measured solely by its revealed rank. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — "להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation;

Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — “better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37 — the purpose of descent, action and Torah study.

History of the Investigation: From the Opening to R5

The Starting Point: A Persuasive Explanation That Still Requires Testing

The first in-depth study proposed reading the conclusion as one sequence: earth, nourishment, Daat, sacrifice and mitzvot express the lower’s ability to add to the higher. This was its most important contribution. Rather than explain every saying of the Sages separately, it asked what each sentence does within the argument. The distinction between the sovev illuminating at the lowest level and the kav described as returning was also already present at the opening. The later investigation did not erase this perspective; it examined which details genuinely support it and which were added solely through interpretation.

Alongside this advantage, the first report sometimes tended to present a possible explanation as though a source for it had already been found. Animal–fire was explained mainly as warmth and movement, and air–speaking as speech and expression. These are understandable connections, but we did not yet possess a single Chassidic paragraph that gives the four pairs and explains them. The difference matters: an attractive explanation of a given system is not evidence that this is the author’s system. In particular, four associations must not be combined and the combination called a source.

A second example was the addition of Daat from food. The initial research mentioned Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah as though evidence had already been brought from their actual texts. In the following rounds, the texts of those parallels were not found in a manner that

allowed reliance on them. The claim therefore had to be returned to the status of a search target. The search did not end in negating the idea: L1, a different and precise discourse, finally supplied both proofs together. Correcting an attribution can thus strengthen the content rather than weaken it.

Third, the report attributed to Or HaChamah an explanation concerning the face of a man and mutual inclusion. Here too, the conceptual possibility itself did not prove that the commentator had been read. Since the commentator's actual text was not opened, the attribution was removed from the determinative explanation. Sources that were read — Ezekiel, the Zohar and parallels in Likkutei Torah — now carried the explanation, and every unread addition was marked as such. The history is preserved to prevent restoration of the old attribution through quoting the first report.

The original report is preserved in the archive in its own wording. It is not printed here as final truth alongside the corrected explanation without distinction. Its documentary purpose is to show what prompted the opening of the forty questions: there was an overall argument with explanatory power, but checks were needed of pronoun referents, contexts, sources, wording and evidential status. From this stage the working principle was established: every conclusion must carry with it the route by which it became known and the limit beyond which it is unproved. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text.

R1: Turning the Sequence into Forty Testable Questions

The first round divided the concluding unit into forty fixed questions. The division was not intended to shatter the Epistle into fragments, but to prevent the slogan "the lower is higher at its root" from answering in place of the text. Separate answers were required for the

elements, omission of the inanimate, grain and meat, the syntax of returning light, the chariot, the Zohar's precise wording and the conclusion concerning mitzvot. Each question retained an identifier so that a correction in a later round would not erase the earlier wording it corrected.

The work was divided among three roles. Grok focused mainly on the first half and on explaining the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, food and Daat. Claude focused mainly on the Zohar, syntax and the transition to mitzvot. Grok Bot was intended to locate and preserve witnesses, pages, wordings and references. The compiler compared them and converted criticism into tasks for continuation. These were actual roles in the file, not a prior ranking of the models' abilities. Later each also contributed beyond its field, and sometimes a report from one role required verification by another.

Reading Berachot and Bava Kamma established that the two examples are not general statements about the value of food. Grain is brought in the context of the Tree of Knowledge and calling the parents; ox meat appears within a Talmudic conversation about an answer not given precisely at night. Their very juxtaposition in the Epistle teaches a new use within its argument. Already here, what the Talmudic discussion says in its plain meaning had to be separated from what the Epistle seeks to learn from it. Comparing wording became part of the explanation, not merely a bibliographic detail.

In the Zohar it became clear that the text before and after the quotation had to be read. The face of an ox and the face of an eagle do not appear there as an isolated analogy, but within a description of spirit drawn below and returning through sacrificial service. Lion and man are in the same sequence, so the Epistle's choice of ox and eagle cannot be explained by claiming that the source knows only them. The questions of foundation and root, the pronoun "דילהון" ("their"), and

the order of the two words were opened for examination of separate occurrences.

The round also distinguished three claims about action: its advantage in this world, its relationship to Torah study, and the future revelation of its advantage. K3 was particularly important for the third question; Avot and Eruvin alone could not prove it. A later comparison does not turn the Gemara's wording into the future-oriented wording of the Chassidic discourse. Here arose the need for a table of times distinguishing Gan Eden, the messianic age and resurrection.

The reason for continuing was substantive. A precise source for the order of the elements was still lacking, as were an actual Chassidic textual connection between the two food proofs, a complete reading of the Emor target in the 5723 note, and sufficient separation between textual findings and understanding of "root." It was not enough for the report to sound plausible. On the other hand, the list of gaps did not negate all R1's achievements: the wording of the questions, delimitation of the issues and requirement for a continuous explanation became the foundation for everything that followed.

Grok's R1 report as it appeared in the user's message was truncated. There is no fictitious reconstruction here of the missing words. The historical description rests on available material, the compiler's criticism and explicit corrections in subsequent rounds. The witness archive clarifies what is a complete document, what is a work instruction and what is later testimony about an earlier claim. This distinction is particularly important in a booklet seeking to show the entirety of the work. Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from "ועוד זאת" ("And Furthermore, This") to the end of the transmitted text; Berachot 40a — Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat and father and mother; Bava Kamma 71b–72a — Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation

is close to 537; “ציון במשפט תפדה” (“Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice”), 5735 — §§14–16: study and action now and in the future; “פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag.

R2: A Counter-Witness in Etz Chaim and Separation of Explanatory Layers

The finding that changed the beginning of the round was negative and precise: Etz Chaim, Gate 50, chapter 10, does not confirm the Epistle’s order in the upper two pairs. According to the digital witness read, the animal is constructed from the air portion in each of the four elements, and the speaking from the fire portion. In the Epistle, the order is animal–fire and speaking–air. The use of Etz Chaim as straightforward confirmation of all four pairs was thereby eliminated. A Mishnat Chassidim passage initially found in a secondary witness also tended toward Etz Chaim’s order; there is no book called “Mishnat Chassidim, Gate 50.”

The correction does not mean that either source was emended. On the contrary, reading Etz Chaim emphasized that every created being is composed of all the elements, and that the mapping concerns a particular portion in each element and the additional soul. This fact opened the possibility of distinguishing the objects of the mapping. At that stage, however, there was still no Chassidic source explaining the Epistle’s order. The possibility was therefore preserved as a proposed reconciliation, not as proof that the difficulty had vanished. An explanation involving yosher and igulim proposed to solve the reversal receded in the absence of a decisive source.

In the grain file, research advanced in two different directions. Vaetchanan gave wheat a root in Daat of Tohu, thus adding a specific reason beyond merely “every food has a high root.” “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”) gave father a role in the mochin of Abba in a state of imma-

turity, in knowledge beyond developed apprehension. Both sources strengthened the need to distinguish recognition from conceptual understanding of fatherhood. Nevertheless, neither explained the combination of father and mother in the Epistle’s sentence as a complete system of Abba and Imma.

A common source for grain and meat had not yet been verified by all readers. A report of “צו ז” (“Tzav 7”) arrived, and the round retained it as a target for examination in the text. There was a double danger here: a website label could look like a page number; and a paragraph found under Parashat Tzav could mistakenly be assigned to the heading “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”). Both indeed required correction in the next round. R2’s value lay in explicitly declaring what had not yet been read, even when a promising finding had already been reported.

In the Zohar, the relationships of source and substrate were distinguished. The spirit descends from the faces in the chariot, but the higher beings have a foundation in this world from which they derive enjoyment. The analogy of the Shechinah and the righteous person’s spirit connected origin and return without claiming that every “יסודא” (“foundation”) in that sequence means one technical term. Examination of variants established an actual variant in the line corresponding to paragraph 540, whereas the Epistle’s wording is close to the printed wording of the birds paragraph, 537. A difference between two paragraphs is not in itself a textual variant.

K5 was read during part of the round’s work but blocked for another reader. This produced reports with different access statuses, and “did not open for me” must not be turned into “does not exist.” The source explained vitality from the substance of food and its root in sovev. Initially this was presented as a change of subject compared with the spirit of the sacrifice; later the formulation was corrected to a contribution to a particular component of the question. Tanya 4

added another limit: “better is one hour” is said there of Torah and mitzvot together versus radiance, so it is no evidence for an absolute ranking of action over Torah.

The round ended with genuine achievements and tasks capable of changing a conclusion: opening the common source in Tzav, clarifying the precise source in Emor, and seeking a reasoned witness for the Epistle’s order. There was no longer a need to repeat all forty questions unchanged. The next search was defined by the claims still capable of changing. This is the difference between research persistence and accumulating searches with no decisive test. Etz Chaim, Gate 50, chapter 10 — the portions of the four elements and the composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders; Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah — Krakow 5649; 91–92; PDF 210–213; Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, “להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום” (“To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse ‘And You Shall Know Today’ ”) — §5, the root of wheat in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “להבין מ”ש בהגדה מצה זו” (“To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, ‘This Matzah’ ”) — §2; beginning of the discourse 11c (יא ג); PDF 51–53; Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4 — “better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah; “ונגלה כבוד ה’” (“And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed”), 5722 — §§3–8, especially the substance of food and sovev; notes 49, 54; Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a — paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle’s quotation is close to 537; Stanford/Pritzker variants apparatus — 241a, especially lines 2 and 14.

R3: Both Proofs Together and the Precise Source in Emor

R3’s central achievement was identifying L1: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ששת ימים תאכל מצות” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”), §§2–3. Here ox meat and grain were found in the same argument, with an explana-

tion that the root of foods from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders is in Tohu, above the Chochmah of Tikkun, and that after refinement they also add to the power of Chochmah and intellect. This result canceled the claim that no explicit source in the Alter Rebbe had been found for meat adding intellect. It also corrected the bibliography: the source is not "מצה זו" ("This Matzah"), and "צו ז" ("Tzav 7") is not a printed page.

Precise comparison prevented the success from becoming excessive identification. L1 brings meat first and grain afterward, says father without mother, and uses Chochmah and intellect. The Epistle brings grain first and meat afterward, retains father and mother, and uses Chochmah and Daat. A common source for the mechanism was thus obtained, but not a source deciding every stylistic detail. The round laid a foundation for a reading in which both examples serve "from both of them," without forcibly assigning them to two sefirot.

L2, "ואכלתם אכול" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully"), widened the field of comparison: eating, food's return to its root, sacrifice and returning light in the future. It supplied an important parallel for the language of Keter and Malchut and for embedding, but no sentence equating the kav's returning light at the termination of Adam Kadmon's feet with Daat of Tohu. Preserving the difference between future time and the structure explained in the Epistle was part of the achievement. The shared term opened an examination; it did not complete it.

In the second half, the Emor target was corrected. The source is "ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם" ("Explanation of the Verse 'And the Priest Shall Wave Them' "), §4, not "וספרתם לכם" ("And You Shall Count for Yourselves"). It connects refinement of the beast's spirit, elevation to its root, revelation of lights of Tohu and the angels' enjoyment, and prints the Zohar quotation and the reference to Iggeret HaKodesh. This canceled the claim that a later explanation was the only accessi-

ble Chassidic parallel. Nevertheless, the opening of one report went further and said that the author himself supplied the connection; that same report's body acknowledged that the reference layer had not been verified. The gap between a summarizing opening and an internal qualification itself became an object of criticism.

In syntax, two determinations previously connected unnecessarily were separated. The question of what "it" refers to does not decide what "in the aspect of returning light" at the end applies to. One can read "it" as referring to the food and still attach the final returning to the kav. The argument that the word "nourishment" is feminine is likewise not decisive, because the word is not in the sentence under discussion. The preferred reading now rested on the sequence and on "as above," not on a noun the interpreter introduced from outside.

The conclusion concerning Torah and mitzvot was strengthened through Tanya 37, but caution was still needed. The Epistle itself already speaks of mitzvot as Torah's primary element and root; it must not be said that it contains no comparison at all. Conversely, the two halves of the rule in Tanya 37 — interrupting Torah study for a mitzvah not performed by others and continuing study when it can be performed by others — prevented a single ranking. "Thus far we found" was corrected from a boundary of interruption to a boundary of transmission.

R3 did not close the elements file. A proposal of two axes, composition versus function, was useful but not yet supported by an explicit Chassidic witness for the upper pairs. The division of labor between L1 as "why" and the Epistle as "where" was also too narrow: "for it is" in the Epistle supplies a cause, not merely an address. These two gaps, alongside attribution of the Emor reference and the reading of note 61, defined the next round. Progress was substantial precisely because it was possible to say which sentences were still unsuitable for final printing. Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days

You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ואכלתם אכול” (“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”) — discussion of eating, elevation and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; “פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; “ונגלה כבוד ה׳” (“And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed”), 5722 — §§3–8, especially the substance of food and sovev; notes 49, 54.

R4: An Explicit Source for the Pairings and Correction of the Directional Model

R4 brought the source missing since the file’s beginning. L4, “כי תצא למלחמה” (“When You Go Out to War”), §1, explicitly says that fire is the aspect of the animal soul and air the aspect of the speaking order, and brings “a speaking spirit.” L5, the discourse on the passage of libations in Shelach, strengthens animal–fire. Afterward L6 was found, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”), §3, containing all four pairs together and three explanations. From that moment it was no longer correct to write “there is no Chassidic source for the Epistle’s order.” The remaining question was the relationship to Etz Chaim, not the order’s very existence.

The reason for fire changed significantly. Body heat and independent movement may illustrate, but L6 explains through the servants of the chariot, who are fire and from whom animal souls come. This is an internal reason concerning the root of vitality, not merely a description of an observable characteristic. Water is explained through its causing growth, and air through the Targum of Onkelos. Earth is given without a corresponding “because.” The wording “four pairs

with four explicit reasons” is therefore still inaccurate, even after the discovery.

This success was accompanied by a bibliographic error: L6 was initially called a discourse in Parashat Tzav because of its opening. R5 corrected it to Pinchas. Preserving even this apparently small correction matters, because it teaches why a discourse’s opening is no substitute for its parashah heading or page. The words “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) do not by themselves identify Parashat Tzav. In the present booklet every mention bears the corrected name, while the mistaken name appears only within the history of the correction.

Note 61 underwent correction of its subject. “It” refers to the animal, which is above the vegetative, not to the lower and not to earth. The sentence says that the animal’s advantage also exists from the standpoint of its creation, yet it is nourished from the vegetative. This is followed by the proposal about omitting earth, with an additional qualification concerning dependence after Creation.

An early reading reversed the subject and constructed an opposite argument from it. Restoring the pronoun to its place showed that even a short English note can change the structure of the explanation if read without the anchor to which it belongs.

In L1, the transition to service was distinguished more precisely. The beginning of the discussion explains food’s ability to enliven and add intellect; later an application to the service of G-d is explicitly opened. A blessing, reciting the Shema and prayer must therefore not become a condition for every vitality and Daat mentioned by the Epistle. Refinement is not erased from the first mechanism, but the conditions of service in the next stage are not copied into it without evidence. At the same time, the description of “for it is” was corrected: the Epis-

tle explains nourishment through returning light, rather than merely indicating where the light is found.

In the second half, L4 §4 gave a rich explanation of Torah and action through the embedding of beginning and end. Initially it was formulated simply: Torah descends and mitzvot ascend. But in that same section, Torah produces ratzo, mitzvot are shov, and their result is drawing the power of fire down as far as the animal soul. R4 had already quoted part of the continuation, but its summary did not carry the full complexity. This gave rise to R5's task: distinguish root, human action and result, rather than establish one directional vocabulary for all the concepts.

The angels question also changed. L3 describes a particular attribute, and K4 describes Ban already refined. It was no longer correct to say that the two sources locate the angel in two contradictory systems. A complementary account according to root and state of refinement was proposed, but the question remained whether a particular attribute indicates a lack of refinement. The Pinchas target was opened in the next round to test precisely that assumption. The Emor reference was preserved as printed; the direct attribution to the Alter Rebbe was canceled, and the chronological tendency to attribute it to editing remained weak and non-determinative. Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, "כי תצא למלחמה" ("When You Go Out to War") — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "בפרשת נסכים כתיב כי תבאו" ("In the Passage of Libations It Is Written, 'When You Come' ") — §1 and the reference to Ki Tetze; PDF 109–112; Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel") — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Etz Chaim, Gate 50, chapter 10 — the portions of the four elements and the composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders; Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, note 61 in English — "It" refers to the animal order; omission of earth and

the qualification after Creation; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ששת ימים תאכל מצות” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”) — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; “פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag.

R5: Supported Closure, Not Erasure of the Remaining Questions

The fifth round opened with two defined texts: L6 in Pinchas and L7 in Kuntres Acharon 4. The choice was focused. No further general search through all Chassidic literature was opened; instead, two targets were examined that could resolve particular claims: the reason for animal–fire, a fixed attribute in a refined world, the target of the Sag and forehead reference, and the relationship between elevation and drawing down. Closure could therefore be reached without claiming that every possible reference in the world had already been checked.

L6 §3 confirmed the four pairs and three reasons, and definitively corrected the discourse’s attribution to Pinchas. Section 1 provided a finding no less important: Michael in love and Gabriel in fear are described within a refined world that has already been refined. The attribute’s fixed character is therefore not evidence of a lack of refinement. Moreover, the inclusion of head and foot in a fetus before completion of its formation serves here as an analogy for a state not yet differentiated, not for the rectified mutual inclusion of a partzuf. The same word does not guarantee the same concept.

L7 resolved the target of L3 §2’s reference. The wording about Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and Mah issuing from the fore-

head as a radiance is found in Kuntres Acharon 4, in the paragraph "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements"). This is a strong identification of content, close to a verbal match. It is not found in the body of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The fact that Likkutei Torah calls the target "אג"ה" (Iggeret HaKodesh) does not authorize determining who wrote the reference or which collection lay before him. The question of the heading remained bibliographic; the content location was closed.

The same source says that a person lives on foods from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders, refines them through Mah, and lives through them because they are from Sag. This added an explicit inanimate component to the description of food and weakened every reading of the Epistle's chain as an exhaustive food list. It does not provide an explicit reason for the omission, but gives a clear limit to what may be claimed on its basis. The analogy of sowing, the etrog and parchment connected raising mayin nukvin to drawing higher light down below, without identifying Sag with the kav's returning light.

The conclusion concerning Torah and mitzvot stabilized on three levels. L4 has root, human service and result; in L7 Torah also draws down light, and the principal contrast is between drawing down and intellectual fear and love as elevation alone. The Epistle itself concludes with practical mitzvot after detailing the advantage of the lowest level and the command addressed to separate beings. The advantage of mitzvot is therefore not "ascent alone," and Torah must not be defined as "descent alone." The purpose is revelation below, although acts of elevation are required along the way.

L6 also connected the two concluding quotations: "today to perform them" and "better is one hour." The first emphasizes a world of action and choice versus a fixed world; the second is explained through sovev versus revelation of memale. This is an explanatory source

very close to the unit. There is no need to claim that it is the only source in all the literature, nor to call the two quotations “two verses”: one is a verse and its exposition, the other a mishnah. Such a small precision preserves the reliability of a large explanation.

Closure is not a solution of every detail. The Hebrew of note 61 was not verified in a facsimile; the author of the Emor reference was not determined; Etz Chaim and the Epistle were not reconciled in an explicit sentence by the Alter Rebbe; the reason for an ox specifically, the doubling of the parents and the identification of “elsewhere” remained limited. These are not gaps preventing a responsible continuous explanation. The final status is therefore “sufficient for writing, with marked limits.” The move to the booklet is a change in the kind of work — from a search capable of deciding issues to editing, comparison and making the material accessible — not a declaration that nothing remains to be learned. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180; Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4 — “להבין מ”ש בפע”ח” (“To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim”); “ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין” (“And Furthermore, This: That in Truth, the Refinements”) and the continuation; Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “כי תצא למלחמה” (“When You Go Out to War”) — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294; Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107; “פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723 — §§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag; Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — the entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore, This”) to the end of the transmitted text.

Method and Its Limits

How to Read the Study Booklet

The booklet opens with the forty questions fixed in the research brief, with an explanation of the difficulty and the answer's status. They are followed by the complete study files, the histories of the rounds, checks of inference, source readings and registers. One may begin with a single question and follow it to a source and a round, or read the history continuously and see how the picture changed. The indexes and internal references are part of the structure of verification, not decoration at the end of the book.

The Hebrew wording of the questions was preserved from the fixed brief. It is not presented as a verbatim transcript of an earlier oral question. A full translation is provided in English, alongside the original Hebrew wording to allow criticism. The editor's answers and continuous explanations are newly formulated on the basis of the file; when a historical document is brought as it stands, its status is indicated. An early conclusion must not be read as though it remained valid merely because it is preserved in the booklet.

The printed-source readings are preserved in their original language in the English edition as well. They are enlarged according to Hebrew reading order so that letters and parentheses can be checked. All explanation, discussion of the witness's importance, quoted key paragraphs and critical conclusions are provided in both languages. Additional contextual material visible in a facsimile is not presented as a new English translation of all Likkutei Torah. This is a bilingual research edition of the unit with Hebrew source witnesses, not a translated edition of the photographed books in their entirety.

Explicit, Proved, Preferred and Open

"Explicit" means that the claim is present in the wording of the source read, within the portion read. L6 gives animal–fire; that is an explicit

claim. “Proved” may also signify a conclusion from a limited comparison: Etz Chaim does not give the same order for the upper two pairs. That determination does not depend on a hypothesis about why the mappings differ. One can know that the maps differ before knowing how to reconcile them.

“Preferred” indicates a reading with a strong rationale but also a reasonable alternative. Thus “for it is” as referring to the phenomenon of nourishment. The reading rests on the sequence and is not canceled by the possibility of referring it to the food. Conversely, “open” does not mean the file is empty. The question of omitting the inanimate, for example, contains a later proposal, a parallel mentioning the inanimate in food, and a distinction between earth as substrate and the inanimate as a class; the precise reason for choosing the examples remains undecided.

“Not found” is always limited to the file and the search performed. It is not a claim that no source exists in the whole literature. “Not opened” is an access status, not an interpretive result. “Reported as read” respects the earlier reader’s work without turning it into the editor’s own reading. Consistent use of these words allows the strength of the research to be presented without turning it into a promise of certainty we do not possess.

What Was Closed and What Remains Owed to Research

The file on pairing the levels with the elements was closed in the sense that the Epistle’s system received an explicit, reasoned Chassidic source. It was not closed in the sense that Etz Chaim was explained exhaustively. This distinction prevents returning to a stage already completed: there is no need to search again for whether there is any source for animal–fire at all. The remaining debt is a sentence bridging the two maps, if one is found, not the very clarification of the Epistle’s wording.

The food file was closed in the sense that both proofs were found together in L1, the distinctive character of wheat in Vaetchanan, and the Sag–Mah mechanism in L7. This does not require inventing a species-specific reason for the ox or a sefirotic division of the two examples. A question can receive a sufficient answer without every detail becoming another secret system. Preserving such a limit is a positive research determination: the explanation presents what has power to explain the sentence.

The Zohar file was closed for purposes of explanation through reading the context, distinguishing the two occurrences, separating pronoun referents and describing the two relationships. The actual texts of Mikdash Melech and Or HaChamah at the requested locations were not obtained, so they remain a debt rather than an authority cited in support. Nor do we possess the manuscript of the Emor discourse. Explanation need not be delayed until every debt is paid, but a debt must not be entered in the list of witnesses as though already read.

The conclusion file was closed on the basis of the command, the advantage of the lowest level and drawing down below, with comparisons to Torah that are not an absolute ranking. “Elsewhere,” “as below” and the dating of transmission remain. None proves that the conclusion in our possession is deficient or that the author intentionally concluded specifically here. A responsible edition ends where a checked explanation can be written, not where one can declare that there are no questions.

Completeness of the File and Limits of the Archive

For the booklet, the first in-depth study, fifteen work instructions for the five rounds, four compiler reviews, five Bot packets of available reports and registers, the closing documents and forty statuses, and Grok and Claude reports delivered in conversation were collected. The R3–R5 facsimile-witness packets were downloaded and opened

during production. Historical files were preserved separately from the new wording without overwriting earlier rounds.

There is no claim here that a full raw export of the entire conversation was received. The R1 report visible in the message was truncated, and some complete reports delivered in messages were not received as independent source files. The booklet therefore provides a full analytical account of the documented interpretations, but does not reconstruct in quotation marks words that have not survived. The difference between substantive completeness and archival completeness is stated so that readers can know exactly what is before them.

In the English edition, all editorial units correspond to the Hebrew. Hebrew texts are preserved as source witnesses, not as a substitute for English explanation. The accompanying file archive also contains repeated instructions and technical registers not copied many times into the body of the book. This selection does not erase a research stage: each round's function, contribution and required correction are presented in the booklet; the available original document is accessible in the packet. Both a readable sequence and the possibility of checking the work behind it are thus preserved.

Register of Hypotheses and Questions Born in the Research

The A identifiers below preserve the Bot's early register of hypotheses. The S identifiers in the booklet are the fixed brief's identifiers. An early Bot table assigned different evidentiary topics to the same S numbers; a status must not be transferred from it by number alone. Comparison here was made according to the question's content. This is an index of corrections, not a list of eighteen independent conclusions already proved in R1.

A01 · The Order of the Elements Corresponds to the Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal and Speaking Orders

Explicit in the Epistle; L4 and L6 added reasoned witnesses. This does not reconcile Etz Chaim.

To file S02

A02 · The Higher Animal Is Nourished from the Vegetative, and Returning Light

“For it is” gives a causal explanation. It must not be restricted to location alone.

To file S15

A03 · Grain Gives Daat as Evidence

Berachot supplies the statement; the Epistle uses it for an addition of Daat from the vegetative. The Talmud does not explain returning light there.

To file S07

A04 · Ox Meat as Parallel Evidence

The Gemara’s context is study and fasting; L1 explicitly connects both proofs to added intellect.

To file S11

A05 · Omission of Earth Because Everything Is from It

A qualified later explanation. Earth as substrate must be distinguished from the inanimate as a class; “It” in the note is the animal.

To file S04

A06 · An Additional Source for the Fixed Mapping

Open in R1; found in L4 and L6. The old “not found” status must not be left in the current conclusion.

To file S03

A07 · Nourishing Ox and Eagle through Sacrifice

The Zohar and the Epistle are explicit; L3 adds lights of Tohu, and K4 a state of refinement.

To file S24

A08 · The Precision of “יסודא ועיקרא” (“Foundation and Root”) Is Intentional

The Epistle says “as indicated by the precise wording.” The nature of the precise inference is an interpretive question; direction must not be decided from the pronoun alone.

To file S27

A09 · Mitzvot as the Epistle’s Conclusion

The conclusion is explicit; according to the preferred reading, the scope of “all the above” includes the anchors of command and root in the Epistle’s body.

To file S30

A10 · Grain and Father and Mother in an Additional Source

Father was found in L1 and “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”), and the distinctive character of wheat in Vaetchanan. The interpretation of the two parents as Abba and Imma in the Epistle’s sentence was not proved.

To file S09

A11 · Lion and Man Appear in the Zohar's Continuation

Confirmed; the omission must not be explained as though they were absent from the source.

To file S23

A12 · The Reason for Choosing Ox and Eagle

The spirit of beast and bird is the example's scope. This is a contextual reading; there is no proof of an additional editorial intention.

A13 · "Thus Far" as the End of the Manuscript

The limit of what was found and transmitted. No proof of interruption or intentional conclusion, and no manuscript was examined here.

To file S39

A14 · Action Is Greater in K3

Read after an R1 access blocker; the future-oriented discussion is determined by the discourse's sections, not by extending it to every World to Come.

To file S35

A15 · Angels and Refined Ban in K4

Read and became an important witness. L6 prevents inferring lack of refinement from a fixed attribute.

To file S28

A16 · Correction of the Meat Reference

The target is Bava Kamma 72a, in the context of 71b. Identifying the correct target does not prove who caused the reference error in a later witness.

A17 · Correction of the Zohar Reference

241a is the target; 240b is the context. 341a is not the target found. Two locations on the same folio are preserved separately.

To file S26

A18 · “My Food for My Fire-Offerings” and the Text of the Unit

The verse in Numbers 28:2 belongs to the framework of sacrifice and the parallels; it is not a quotation in the body of the concluding unit as transmitted.

To file S31

Further Questions and Closure Status

N-R2-Grok-01 / N-R3-Grok-02 · A Reasoned Source for Animal–Fire and Speaking–Air

Closed through the existence of L4 and L6; the comparison to Etz Chaim remained qualified.

N-R2-Grok-02 · The Text of Tractate HaHarkavah

Facsimiles were added; text and commentary are distinguished. It does not change the Epistle’s map.

N-R2-Claude-01 · The Gender of the Pronoun “For It Is”

The argument from the feminine “nourishment” was canceled; the word is not in the sentence’s text. The determination is contextual.

N-R2-Claude-02 · The Scope of “Etc.”

A third radiance or the earlier whole: a plausible decoding, not a proved expansion.

N-R2-Claude-03 · The Radiance of the Shechinah and the World to Come

The mishnah “better is one hour” and the mishnah “All Israel” were separated; the shared word does not determine a period.

N-R2-Claude-04 · The Inanimate and Action in K3, and Omission of the Inanimate

It was not proved that this is the reason for the omission. L7 adds the inanimate as food and does not determine the intention.

N-R2-Claude-05 · The Beast’s Spirit from the Face of an Ox, “As Written Elsewhere”

The parallels are close; the precise target was not identified.

N-R3-Grok-01 · A Printed Page for L1

Beginning of the discourse 13a; the site label is not a page. Witnesses 55–57 were preserved.

N-R3-Claude-01 / N-R4-Claude-01 · Who Wrote the Emor Reference

Presence in print confirmed; author or editor undetermined. No decision is needed for the explanation.

N-R3-Claude-02 / N-R4-Claude-06 / N-R5-Claude-01 · Outer and Inner Dimensions and “As Below”

L7 is a close parallel; this does not identify “as below” or prove interruption.

N-R4-Grok-01 · Ki Tetze in Print

Witnesses of the sections and the wording “the animal soul” were preserved. A website index alone must not be relied on.

N-R4-Grok-02 · Note 61 in Hebrew

The Hebrew source was not verified; the English must not be translated and the translation presented as a source found.

N-R4-Claude-02 · A Particular Attribute and Refined Ban

L6 places fixed attributes in a refined world; the assumption of contradiction was rejected. The synthesis with Tohu is marked as inference.

N-R4-Claude-03 · To Whom Does “Their Root” Refer in Emor

The reading referring to the angels is plausible in context; a single pronoun must not be turned into complete proof of the whole mechanism.

N-R4-Claude-04 · “אג”ה” (Iggeret HaKodesh) near Its End: Sag and Forehead

The content target is Kuntres Acharon 4. The heading’s meaning and the reference’s attribution are separate.

N-R4-Claude-05 · Direction of the L4–L5 References

A reciprocal reference was reported and verified at the level of the file’s witnesses; the personal reading status of each researcher is preserved.

The reversal was documented. Components of composition versus characterization is a proposed reconciliation, not an explicit solution from the author.

Contributions and Criticism of the Work

The following assessment is an editorial assessment of the work documented in the file, not a general measurement of the models. It concerns the entire course, including corrected errors, and is not a separate score for the reliability of the final conclusions. Scores on the 1–10 scale are intended to show where correction was needed;

the weights were set according to the booklet rules. No unmeasured time, cost or statistical-accuracy data are given.

Grok contributed particularly to food, Daat and distinguishing the parallels; Claude particularly to the Zohar, syntax and the conclusion concerning mitzvot; Bot to locating witnesses and distinguishing folio, column and site label. The compiler contributed to cross-criticism and converting a focused gap into a new task. The assessment exempts no role from criticism: the compiler too had to correct directions of inference and resist the temptation of premature closure. The compiler's assessment is a self-assessment by the editing system and is therefore not presented as an independent external score.

Gemini is invited to review the prepared booklets, but did not participate in the research rounds documented here. It has no retrospective score, and no discovery or correction in the file should be attributed to it. Receiving a prompt does not itself indicate that an opinion was delivered: four review packets are ready for delivery, and future responses will be added only if received.

Criterion	Weight %	Grok	Claude	Grok Bot	Compiler
Content accuracy	15	8	8	8	8
Source accuracy	15	8	8	9	8
Marking certainty	15	8	7	9	8
Discovery of new sources	10	9	9	9	9
Verification and checking witnesses	10	7	7	9	8
Logical precision	10	8	8	8	8
Self-correction	10	9	9	9	9
Response to criticism	5	9	9	9	9
Clarity of explanation	5	8	8	7	8
Quality of the conclusion	5	8	9	8	9
Weighted score	100	8.15	8.05	8.60	8.30

Content Accuracy

Grok corrected Etz Chaim and the food mapping; Claude corrected the one-directional ranking; Bot corrected Tzav to Pinchas; the compiler preserved the distinction between a finding and a reconciliation. A perfect score is not awarded because the errors appeared in summary formulations before their correction.

Source Accuracy

Locating L1 and L3 was decisive, but “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”) and “ששת ימים” (“Six Days”) were initially confused. Bot’s advantage is in printed witnesses and PDF numbers; its limitation is in places where a column or facsimile remained inferred. The compiler finally separated content location from authorial attribution.

Marking Certainty

The later reports mark “not read” and inference well. Conversely, Claude’s R3 opening attributed to the author what the body left open, and Grok sometimes presented two axes as too strong a solution. Bot generally took care over blockers and a local witness versus a report.

Discovery of New Sources

The route from Vaetchanan and “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”) to L1, followed by L3, L4–L6 and finally L7, actually changed the explanation. Not every discovery should be attributed to a single reader when reporting, locating and verifying were divided among roles.

Verification and Checking Witnesses

Grok and Claude sometimes relied only on digital text or on another report. Bot preserved facsimiles and crops, but not every heading and reference was determined. The compiler repeatedly demanded reading the text and did not suffice with a search excerpt.

Logical Precision

Achievements: separating the two syntactic determinations, not identifying Tohu with the kav, and distinguishing root/action/result . Weaknesses: attributing “for it is” to location alone, and inferring a lack of refinement from a fixed attribute before opening Pinchas.

Self-Correction

The rounds document explicit retractions: Etz Chaim does not confirm; L6 is Pinchas; “It” is the animal; there is no proved attribution of the reference; and Torah does not only descend and mitzvot only ascend. This is a central advantage of the process, even when the original error remains a debit against accuracy.

Response to Criticism

The compiler's criticism became precise targets, and the targets produced wording changes rather than merely added sources at the end of the report. R5 is the strongest example: a fixed attribute and drawing down below were examined in the actual text and changed the explanation.

Clarity of Explanation

The continuous explanations made the material readable. Bot tables are good for locating things, but do not replace explanation. The compiler helped separate terms, and sometimes had to correct its own summaries so that they would not be sharper than the evidence.

Quality of the Conclusion

The final conclusion allows positive writing without forcibly closing the ox, Abba and Imma, or "elsewhere." The purpose of revelation below is preserved alongside the advantage of Torah. The achievement is an explanation capable of bearing its limits, not the number of questions declared solved.

Grok — Explanatory Power and the Need for a Precise Witness

The outstanding contribution was unpacking the food paradox: revealed bread need not be wiser than the person; high root, fall and refinement must be distinguished. The reports traced the distinctive character of wheat, the differences concerning father and mother, and the limits of the Chochmah/Daat division. The main point of criticism is the occasional transition from reasonable proposal to strong assertion: heat as the reason for animal–fire, two axes as the solution to Etz Chaim, or the Epistle as a map of location alone. Later discoveries and explicit corrections substantially improved the text.

Claude — Depth of Comparison and Checking the Opening

The outstanding contribution was reading the Zoharic sequence, distinguishing source and foundation in this world, and separating the axes of Torah, action and reward. The reports identified the danger of a one-to-one vocabulary well, but also fell into it before correction. The clearest case is Torah as descent and mitzvot as ascent: L4's text contains a descending result of action, so a more complex model was required. The confidence of the report's opening also had to be brought into line with the qualifications within it, particularly in attributing the Emor reference.

Grok Bot — Witnesses, Locations and Facsimile Limits

The outstanding contribution was preserving material one could return to: pages of Likkutei Torah, a facsimile of Mishnat Chassidim, the location of the two food proofs, and separation of a site heading from a printed page. The packets allow checking what was seen rather than merely what was claimed. Alongside this, a Wikisource screenshot is not a facsimile of a printed edition, a crop does not always prove a heading, and an uncertain column glyph does not become certain because of a filename. The later care over these limits is part of the work's quality.

The Compiler — Determination through Comparison

The outstanding contribution was creating a memory of corrections: each round received what its predecessor had changed and was sent to places still capable of changing a conclusion. L6 and L7 were thus not accidental additions, but answers to focused questions. The weakness to remember is that a summary of several reports is not independent verification of all their sources. The present editing therefore separates personal reading, reporting and an image opened in

production. The compiler's role is not to declare agreement, but also to preserve differences that agreement does not resolve.

Opening Research: A Documented Historical Text

The following document is preserved to show the starting point. Its claims must not be accepted as the edition's conclusions: Bava Kamma 71a was corrected to 72a; attributions to Torat Chaim and Or HaChamah were not verified; the reasons for the elements and note 61 were qualified; the limit of transmission is not proof of an intended ending. The question files and histories of the rounds are the binding critique of this document.

The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — In-Depth Research in Plain Meaning, Kabbalah and Chassidut. The Map of the Passage and the Point Holding It Together. First, a small technical precision: the passage before us is the end of Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20, not the end of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. This is also how it appears in Tanya's division and in the daily lesson. In my view, the key to reading the whole paragraph is that these are not several separate examples — the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, food, grain, meat, chariot, sacrifices, mitzvot — but one chain of proofs. The Alter Rebbe seeks to establish a paradoxical principle:

In the revealed order, the higher is above the lower; but at the root, precisely the lowest can bear a more elevated power and is therefore capable of nourishing, elevating and completing what is above it.

This is exactly the continuation of what was explained in the preceding paragraphs: at the lowest level of Asiyah, and especially in the physical element of earth, that radiance reaching the end of the chain of descent shines with particular strength; the kav ends there and shines from there from below upward as returning light. The Alter Rebbe previously demonstrated this in the vegetative power in

the earth and in the superior fruits produced specifically after sowing and planting — raising mayin nukvin on the person's part. Hence the structure: the lowest level of Asiyah → returning light → the lower nourishes the higher → the vegetative enlivens the animal → the vegetative and animal add Daat to the speaking → the spirit of beast and bird nourishes supernal angels → hence the advantage of the practical mitzvah performed in physical matter. That is: the conclusion concerning practical mitzvot is not a new subject. It is the result toward which the whole of Epistle 20 progresses. This is particularly important for understanding the Epistle as a whole. Lessons in Tanya explains that Tanya's earlier sections already explained the advantage of practical mitzvot in terms of making "a dwelling in the lower realms" and refining the animal soul; Epistle 20 adds a deeper layer: physicality itself has a higher root in a manner not revealed in the order of ranked spirituality. From here we can approach every detail.

Inanimate, Vegetative, Animal and Speaking — Why They Are Earth, Water, Fire and Air

This is not material identity but a correspondence of "aspects." The difficulty you raised is very real: water in itself is apparently inanimate. Fire is not an animal. Air is not a human. The sentence

> "The inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, which are aspects of earth, water, fire and air"

therefore cannot be read as though the Alter Rebbe were saying zoologically: water = plant, fire = beast. The decisive word is "aspects." Within the four elements, every created being is composed of a combination of the elements; the correspondence here is between the dominant character of the created being's level and the internal characteristic of the corresponding element. The commentary at this

location likewise presents the four elements as a system from which reality is composed, not four simple "biological classes." Water can therefore itself be an inanimate object from the standpoint of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, while at the same time "the element of water" can represent the power characteristic of the vegetative.

Inanimate — earth. Here the connection is most direct. Earth is the element of below, rest, fixity and absence of independent movement. It thus becomes the most distinctive expression of "inanimate." But in this Epistle there is a far deeper novelty: precisely earth, which seems most devoid of vitality, is where the Alter Rebbe located in the preceding paragraph the "vegetative power," a power repeatedly producing an astonishing multiplicity from a tiny seed. He described the power in "the termination of the vessel of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah in the element of earth" as a power operating "within the earth constantly." That is, earth is not merely an example of "low." It is the central paradox of the whole Epistle: outwardly it is the most inanimate; inwardly it bears an unexpected power of creation. This is also why the Rebbe's note emphasizes, regarding the later omission of earth, that "everything was from earth," and that even after Creation everything depends on it and is nourished from it.

Vegetative — Water

The internal connection is growth, spreading and generating multiplicity. Water is the power that allows earth to bring its power from concealment into revelation. This therefore does not say that "water is a plant"; rather, the dynamic of the element of water — spreading, irrigation, multiplicity and vitality — is the dominant aspect at the vegetative level. This is particularly important in this Epistle: the Alter Rebbe is not describing "objects" but forms of vitality. Inanimate

— hidden, fixed vitality; vegetative — vitality already spreading and growing; animal — inward, warm, moving vitality; speaking — vitality reaching recognition and expression.

Animal — fire. At the animal level two characteristics appear that are not present in the vegetative in the same way: internal heat and independent movement. In the terms of the four elements, both characteristics particularly suit fire: fire is hot, active, leaping and rising. This does not mean that the living body is composed "mainly of fire" in the modern scientific sense. This is cosmological-Kabbalistic language in which fire is the principle of warmth and motion. Thus, after the vegetative, whose life is expressed mainly in growing in one place, the animal already moves of itself.

Speaking — air. Here the connection is both bodily and spiritual. Speech emerges through air, breath and voice; in Kabbalistic and Chassidic language, letters are "engraved" in the voice and the breath of speech. A foundational biblical-Targumic source for this is Onkelos's translation of the human "living soul" as "רוח ממללא," a speaking spirit. Tanya too explains the direct connection between the letters of speech and the voice and breath. But there is an additional layer: "air" is the subtlest of these aspects in the present correspondence. In the speaking order, vitality is no longer merely growth or movement; it becomes intellect, meaning, relationship and speech. The sequence is therefore not accidental: earth — existence; water — growth; fire — vitality and movement; air — consciousness and expression.

Why, then, does the Alter Rebbe immediately omit the inanimate? He says:

> "For although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nour-

ished and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both of them."

Your question is strong: why not begin, "the vegetative is nourished from the inanimate"? Here we have an almost explicit answer from the Rebbe. In the note at this location he writes that the omission of the element of earth is understandable because everything comes from the earth, and even after being created everything depends on it and is nourished from it. That is, earth is not merely one more link in the chain; it is the chain's general foundation. I would therefore divide the answer into two parts. First, factually and conceptually, the Alter Rebbe is not denying that the vegetative, animal and speaking need the inanimate — water, salts, earth, etc. On the contrary, the Rebbe's note explicitly says that everything depends on it. Second, from the standpoint of the argument, the Alter Rebbe now seeks to illustrate the paradox of a higher being nourished from a lower. The animal is above the vegetative yet lives from it; the speaking is above both yet depends on them. Earth has already been demonstrated at length in the preceding paragraph as the lowest place where the higher power is unexpectedly revealed. There is therefore no need to restart the sequence from it. In other words: the inanimate was not omitted because it is less relevant; it was omitted because it is already the foundation on which everything stands.

Grain, "Father and Mother," Ox Meat — How Lower Food Produces Higher Daat

Why does the Alter Rebbe move from "vitality" to "Chochmah and Daat"? Up to "and the speaking receives its vitality from both of them," one might have thought the claim was merely biological: the body needs calories. He therefore adds:

"And also Chochmah and Daat."

This is an enormous sharpening. Not only does the higher body subsist on lower matter; even the most characteristic powers of the speaking level, Chochmah and Daat, can receive an addition through food lower than it. This is precisely the argument the Alter Rebbe needs for the conclusion about returning light. He therefore brings two very different proofs.

"An infant does not know to call father and mother until it tastes the taste of grain." The source is Berachot 40a. Within the discussion of the Tree of Knowledge, Rabbi Yehudah says it was wheat, and the proof is that an infant does not attain recognition of "father and mother" until tasting grain.

The source note in Lessons in Tanya explicitly specifies Berachot 40a. The Alter Rebbe's point is not the botanical dispute over what the Tree of Knowledge was; he extracts from the statement the phenomenon: grain from the vegetative is connected to the appearance of Daat in the human being. And why grain specifically? Because this is the rabbinic source presenting most sharply the emergence of Daat as dependent on a food from the vegetative. This is not merely "food that gives strength"; grain stands at the transition where the infant becomes capable of recognizing, distinguishing and calling by name. Later Chassidut explicitly says that food can cause an "addition of light" in the intellect specifically after its refinement. Torat Chaim by the Mitteler Rebbe says that after food a new intellectual insight is revealed to the person, which he was incapable of originating before, actually using the proof "I have not eaten ox meat"; in the Tzemach Tzedek's Or HaTorah it is emphasized that the food itself is lower than the person before refinement, but after refinement causes an addition of light in the person. This is precisely the structure of Epistle 20: low in revelation, high at its root.

Why "father and mother," and why both? On the first level, the answer is simple: this is the Sages' own wording, not a new formulation

by the Alter Rebbe. He quotes the proof as it stands. But there is depth in the wording itself. "Father and mother" are not merely two words the infant learns. This is relational recognition: the infant identifies two distinct people, understands its relationship to them and calls each by the appropriate name. It is an excellent expression of "Daat" in the sense of recognition and connection, not merely accumulation of information. Of course, in Kabbalistic language "Abba" and "Imma" are also designations for Chochmah and Binah. A Kabbalistic reader therefore cannot fail to hear an additional echo. But I would be cautious about claiming that here the Alter Rebbe says technically "Abba = Chochmah and Imma = Binah," because he himself begins "and also Chochmah and Daat," not "Chochmah and Binah." The Kabbalistic echo is real; it need not be the central plain meaning. The more inward plain meaning is: tasting grain marks the appearance of human recognition.

Why grain specifically, and not any food? Because grain here is not an accidental food example. The Sages themselves chose it as an indicator of the emergence of Daat and even connected it in the Berachot discussion to the Tree of Knowledge. It is therefore perfect for the Alter Rebbe's argument: here is a lower vegetative thing influencing not merely "bodily life," but what defines the human as speaking. The word "taste" will also matter two lines later, when the Alter Rebbe says "good discernment and knowledge." He constructs a verbal and conceptual sequence here: actual taste of food → Daat → "good discernment and knowledge."

"And I have not yet eaten ox meat." The second proof is different. Here there is no infant receiving Daat for the first time; there is a sage who already possesses intellect, yet eating meat adds clarity or strength in study. The Talmudic source is marked in Lessons in Tanya as Bava Kamma 71a, and Chassidut repeatedly expounds it as an example of lower food bringing an addition of intellect to a person.

This is an important distinction: grain shows vegetative → speaking, particularly the emergence of basic Daat. Ox meat shows animal → speaking, particularly added depth and clarity in an intellect that already exists. The two examples are therefore not duplicative. They correspond exactly to the preceding words:

> "And the speaking receives its vitality from both of them, and also Chochmah and Daat."

Vegetative and animal — both can nourish the higher power of the speaking. There is even a fine literary sequence here: "ox meat" leads almost immediately to "the face of an ox" in the chariot. The ox meat below nourishes human intellect; the beast's spirit below will immediately nourish "the face of an ox" above. The same pattern moves from human to angel.

What is the central Chassidic point in the two proofs? Not that food is "wiser" than a person, but that at the root of food there is a power not measured by its revealed level. Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah explicitly explained that food is low before refinement, but after the person refines it, a power is revealed from it that adds to the person himself. That is, this does not contradict the order of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking. From the standpoint of revelation: speaking > animal > vegetative. From the standpoint of the hidden root uncovered in refinement and elevation: the lower can give the higher something the higher cannot produce from within itself alone. This is already direct preparation for "for it is an aspect of returning light."

"Returning Light," Sovev and the Kav — Precision in "A Radiance of a Radiance, Etc."

Here, in my view, your precise reading of the syntax is essentially correct and very important. The sentence is:

> “For it is an aspect of returning light from below upward, from the lowest level of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., is revealed with greater force, from Or Ein Sof that encompasses all worlds, and from the kav of Or Ein Sof at the termination of the feet of the upright configuration of Adam Kadmon, in the aspect of returning light, as mentioned above.”

Is the encompassing light itself “returning light”? Not in the technical sense in which the Alter Rebbe uses it here. The strongest proof is not merely syntactic; it is found several lines earlier. In the preceding paragraph, the Alter Rebbe explicitly separates the two things: in the place beneath the “feet of Adam Kadmon,” Or Ein Sof that encompasses all worlds illuminates; then he adds: “And also the kav… shines from below upward in the aspect of returning light.” That is, the sovev illuminates there, while the kav is described as shining there by way of returning light. I would therefore punctuate the present sentence conceptually as follows: from the lowest level of Asiyah a radiance is revealed with greater force — A. from Or Ein Sof that encompasses all worlds; B. and from the kav of Or Ein Sof, at the termination of the feet of the upright configuration of Adam Kadmon, in the aspect of returning light. The final words attach most directly to the kav. This is important: sovev kol almin is not “a ray that fell below and now returns upward.” “Sovev” indicates a light not contracted according to vessel and level in the same way as the internal light is ordered in the chain of descent. “Returning” here belongs to the kav that reached the end of the upright order and shines from there in a direction from below upward. The preceding paragraph almost compels this reading.

Why, Then, Does the Beginning of the Sentence Say of the Whole Phenomenon "For It Is an Aspect of Returning Light"?

Because there are two levels of usage of the concept here. At the opening, "for it is an aspect of returning light from below upward" is a name for the phenomenon being explained: why does the lower give vitality to the higher? Because at the lowest point an order of returning and ascent operates. In the continuation he analyzes the mechanism and says what is there: a radiance from sovev, and in addition the kav at the termination of the upright configuration actually illuminates as returning light. That is: the first "returning light" is a heading for the result; the second "returning light" is a technical description of the kav. This explains well why both are needed.

But why repeat at all everything he already explained several lines earlier? Because without this repetition one could understand the food examples as something incidental: "That is how the Holy One, blessed be He, created the digestive system." The Alter Rebbe wishes to say: no. This reflects the entire cosmic structure. He therefore briefly repeats the three essential points: the lowest level of Asiyah; the illumination of sovev there; termination of the kav and returning light. He then concludes "as mentioned above," a clear sign that this is not a new Kabbalistic issue but an application of the mechanism just proved. This is also needed for the conclusion about mitzvot. Had he said only "lower food enlivens the higher person," we would still not have proved why a physical mitzvah object touches such a high root. Detailing sovev and the kav shows that the reversal is not merely biological; it is rooted in the very structure of the chain of descent.

"A radiance of a radiance, etc." — what does the "etc." conceal? Here there is an almost certain solution from the immediate context. In the preceding paragraph the Alter Rebbe wrote explicitly:

"A radiance of a radiance of a radiance."

He connected it to physical earth and ascent through returning light. Now, several lines later, he writes:

"A radiance of a radiance, etc."

The "etc." therefore does not, according to the plain meaning, allude to some mysterious missing fourth level. It abbreviates an expression just stated in full: a radiance of a radiance of a radiance. That is, your precise question, "why not write 'of a radiance' again?" is correct, but the abbreviation is precisely what is very understandable stylistically: the Alter Rebbe is effectively saying "that same radiance of a radiance of a radiance I have already discussed." The "etc." also leaves the expression open to all the orders of concealments and radiances discussed, but its immediate decoding is the third level stated earlier.

Why Is It Revealed There "With Greater Force"?

This is the heart of the entire paradox. Within the upright order, the further one descends, the more contracted the internal light becomes. But when one reaches the end of the order, a dimension not subject to the same ranking is revealed: the sovev illuminates there, and the kav reaches its termination and returning light is aroused from it. The very lowest can therefore be precisely the place where a very deep power becomes discernible. An important precision is needed here: sovev must not simply be identified with Essence. Sovev is still "Or Ein Sof." In Epistle 20 as a whole, the Alter Rebbe indeed leads to a deeper principle: the ability to create yesh from ayin ultimately belongs to His Essence, blessed be He, and hence the advantage of physicality; but in the present sentence he explicitly s-

peaks of a radiance from sovev and of the kav. This distinction is very important so as not to skip levels.

"Good Discernment and Knowledge," the Chariot, the Face of an Ox and the Face of an Eagle, and Nourishing the Angels

"And through this will be well understood, with good discernment and knowledge." This is not merely a turn of phrase. "Good discernment and knowledge" is a biblical phrase from Psalms 119:66:

> "Teach me good discernment and knowledge…"

There is an almost perfect correspondence here to what happened in the preceding sentence. Just before, we read:

> "Until it tastes the taste of grain" — "and also Chochmah and Daat"

and now:

> "Good discernment and knowledge."

It is difficult to ignore the wordplay: the "taam" that was a food's taste becomes "taam" in the sense of explanation and understanding, and the "Daat" added by food becomes the "Daat" through which the secret of sacrifices is understood. There is a further particularly fine echo: the verse's continuation in Psalms is "for I have believed in Your commandments." Two lines later, the Alter Rebbe reaches "the great advantage of practical mitzvot." I do not think this needs to become "proof" that everything is constructed as an intentional allusion, but as a literary-Chassidic structure it is a very strong correspondence: taste → Daat → mitzvot.

What is the chariot here? The basis is Ezekiel's vision: each living creature of the chariot has four faces — man, lion, ox and eagle. The

face of the lion is on the right, the face of the ox on the left, and the face of the eagle in the other direction; Kabbalistic sources interpret the faces as different spiritual aspects. A possible mistaken image therefore needs immediate correction: "the face of an ox" is not necessarily an angel that looks only like an ox, and "the face of an eagle" is not a separate angel that is simply a giant bird. The chariot vision itself is mutual inclusion — each living creature has several faces. Kabbalistic sources deepen this further. Or HaChamah on the Zohar says that "the primary element is the face of a man" and that the other aspects are included in it; that is, ox, lion and eagle are modes of revelation within an integrated structure, not four worlds sealed off from one another. This answers your question about mutual inclusion: yes, the fact that each aspect includes other aspects does not contradict the designation "the face of an ox." The name indicates which aspect predominates and serves as a root for a particular branch, not that there is nothing else within it.

Why is the face of an ox a root for all beasts, not only oxen? The Zohar in Pinchas, as explained by the author of HaSulam, explicitly says that from "the face of an ox" spirit spreads to species of beasts intended for sacrifice — bulls, sheep, he-goats and goats. That is, "ox" in the chariot is the spiritual archetype of the category of sacrificial beasts, not only an ox in the narrow biological-species sense. This resolves a strong question: sheep and goats also come upon the altar, so why "the face of an ox"? Because the face of the ox is the higher root of that spiritual family. In the same way, the Alter Rebbe places the face of an eagle beside birds. The meaning is not that eagles are offered — on the contrary, bird offerings come from turtledoves and young pigeons — but that the "eagle" in the chariot serves as a parent root for the aspect of birds. The Alter Rebbe's own wording, "the face of an ox and the face of an eagle… from the spirit of the beast and bird," makes the correspondence explicit.

Why Not the Face of a Lion?

Because the example here is sacrifices upon the altar from beasts and birds. The face of an ox — the root of sacrificial beasts. The face of an eagle — the root of birds. The face of a lion belongs to another aspect in the chariot, but there is no parallel branch here of wild animals ascending as sacrifices of the kind the Alter Rebbe is discussing. It is therefore unnecessary for this particular argument.

Why Is There a "Face of a Man" at All, When Man Himself Is Above the Animal?

Because we must be cautious about too simple a projection of the earthly inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders onto the higher chariot. "The face of a man" in the chariot is not "a physical person beside a physical ox." It is a higher aspect of human form, even described in certain sources as the inclusive and primary aspect within which the other faces are found. There is therefore no contradiction between "physical man is the speaking level, above the animal" and "in the higher chariot there are the face of a man, the face of an ox, the face of a lion and the face of an eagle." These are two parallel but not identical systems.

What does it mean that the angels "are nourished" from the spirit of the sacrifice? Certainly it does not mean that an angel needs smoke or meat as calories. The Alter Rebbe is precise:

> "From the spirit of the beast and bird that ascends to them from the sacrifices."

That is, the subject is the spiritual vitality of beast and bird, which through the sacrificial service ascends from its lower root to its higher root. The Zohar itself describes the face of an ox as the source

from which spirit spreads to sacrificial beasts, so when that vitality is refined and ascends, it returns to a high source connected to the angels of the chariot. This is in fact the same structure as human eating: lowly food → refined within a person → adds to the person; lowly beast → refined through sacrifice → ascends to its root → adds to the angel.

"Derive great enjoyment, are nourished and receive their supply" — three expressions. I did not find a good basis for turning these three verbs into three sefirot or three separate technical levels, so I would not burden them with such an interpretation. In the more precise Chassidic plain meaning, there is an accumulation: "derive enjoyment" — they have pleasure from the radiance; "are nourished" — it becomes influence and vitality for them; "receive their supply" — it supplies them with the influence they need. That is, the Alter Rebbe wishes to take this beyond "the angels are happy when they see a sacrifice" and establish a much more essential connection: the lower is actually a source of influence for the higher.

Why "Derive Great Enjoyment"?

Because this is not an influence foreign to them. This brings us to the great precision drawn from the Zohar.

"ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון" — this is the whole point. A plain translation: "and they derive enjoyment from their foundation and root." This adds something decisive. Without these words, we would say: the higher angel receives some addition from the lower animal. The Zohar says something far bolder: when the beast's spirit ascends, the angel receives from "יסודא ועיקרא דילהון" ("their foundation and root") — from its own foundation and root. That is, the animal below conceals within itself something reaching a deep root of the angel

above. This is exactly what the Alter Rebbe proved throughout the Epistle:

What is low as a branch can reach a place higher than the branch above it, because its root is not measured by its place in the revealed order.

He therefore says "as indicated by the precise wording of the holy Zohar." The mere fact that the angels "derive enjoyment" is not enough for him. The decisive wording is that the enjoyment comes from their own root. Incidentally, in source research a small inconsistency arises here in the reference: the online note in Lessons in Tanya displays "III, 341a," whereas another Chabad source quoting the passage explicitly specifies Zohar III 241a. For locating the passage, the reference to 241a is more useful.

The Concluding Expressions — Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot

The Alter Rebbe concludes:

> "And after these things and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know… the great advantage of practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent to this physical world…"

Here almost every word is carefully constructed.

"After these things and this truth." It sounds like a concluding expression, but the content matters: he is effectively saying — now there is no need for a new proof. If you have understood that lowly earth bears an extraordinary power; that the vegetative enlivens the animal; that the vegetative and animal add Daat to the speaking; that the spirit of beast and bird nourishes the angels of the chariot; and that the cause is revelation of light at the lowest level and return-

ing light — then the great advantage of the physical object through which a mitzvah is performed already follows from the entire argument. The expression "after these things and this truth" also echoes biblical wording in II Chronicles 32:1. There is no necessity to see an exposition of the verse here; it mainly gives the sentence an elevated, concluding biblical tone.

"It is easy for one with understanding to know." This too is actual biblical language: "and it is easy for one with understanding to know" — Proverbs 14:6. The meaning in our context is precise: someone already "understanding" — who has understood one thing from another throughout the Epistle — now needs no new lengthy treatment; "knowing" the conclusion becomes "easy."

Nor is this a one-time expression in the Alter Rebbe. He also uses "and it is easy for one with understanding to know" at the end of chapter 12 of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. It thus functions for him as a sort of transition formula from a long explanation to a conclusion that should be clear to one who understands.

Why are "practical mitzvot" the "purpose of the souls' descent"? Here several kinds of "purpose" must be distinguished rather than placed in competition. Within the same Epistle, shortly before, the Alter Rebbe spoke of "drawings down of higher lights in ABYA — which is the purpose of human creation." Now he says that practical mitzvot are "the purpose of the souls' descent to this physical world." These are not two contradictory goals. They describe the same movement from different angles: "a dwelling in the lower realms" — the overall Divine purpose, that Divinity be revealed specifically in the lower; "drawing down higher lights" — what a person effects in the order of worlds; "practical mitzvot" — the distinctive practical means for which the soul must descend into a body and a material world; refinement of the body, the animal soul and the physical object — the manner in which the goal is carried out. Lessons in Tanya empha-

sizes precisely this complementarity: chapters 35 onward in Likkutei Amarim explained action in terms of a dwelling in the lower realms and refinement of the vital soul; Epistle 20 adds the depth of the advantage of physicality itself and its root. The words "to this physical world" are therefore no incidental addition. They are the whole point. A soul does not need to descend into a physical world in order to be spiritual. Before its descent it is far more spiritual. What is distinctive about descent is that it becomes capable of taking physical wool for tzitzit, leather for tefillin, a coin for charity, an etrog, matzah, a Jewish person's body performing an act, and connecting the lower itself to G-d's will. This is exactly what the entire Epistle has proved is not "descent alone"; the lower contains a root unavailable to the higher as it stands at its revealed level.

What, Then, of "Torah Study Is Equivalent to Them All"?

There is no contradiction here, because "what is greater?" is a meaningless question until one says in what sense. Torah has an advantage that a practical mitzvah does not: the person apprehends the wisdom and will of the Holy One, blessed be He, with his intellect, and Torah becomes inward knowledge for him. In Tanya itself, Torah is described as a distinctive mode of union of human intellect with Divine wisdom. Conversely, the practical mitzvah has another advantage: it enters matter itself, and therefore specifically realizes the goal of descent into the lower. The Sages say:

> "Study is greater because it leads to action."

The reason itself is instructive. The advantage of study is not that it abolishes action, but that it brings a person to action. From the standpoint of the order of service, Torah is the light, guidance, understanding and union; action is where the Divine intention actually

takes hold in the lower. "Torah study is equivalent to them all" and "practical mitzvot are the purpose of the souls' descent" can therefore both be true: Torah — superior in revelation, apprehension and inward union; a practical mitzvah — decisive in fulfilling the purpose of descent and turning physicality into a dwelling for Him, blessed be He. Epistle 20 mainly addresses the second axis and therefore ends with "practical mitzvot," rather than an overall ranking of Torah versus mitzvot. The introduction to Lessons in Tanya formulates the Epistle's purpose exactly this way: to explain the distinctive significance of action and matter.

What of Torah in the Future to Come?

Here it is very important not to confuse three different questions: what is greater in this world — study or action; what will be the principal apprehension in the messianic age; and what "World to Come" means in the mishnah quoted by the Alter Rebbe. These are not necessarily the same period or the same criterion. Even if Torah will be apprehended in the future with a depth unavailable today, this poses no difficulty for Epistle 20. The Alter Rebbe does not say, "Torah study is lower than mitzvot at every time and in every respect." He says: the distinctive reason the soul descends into a physical world is the ability to act in physicality. Higher Torah can be an exceedingly lofty revelation; but the very existence of a higher revelation does not negate the question: why did the soul need to enter a material body? Here the answer is — for "practical mitzvot." On the contrary, "study is greater because it leads to action" shows that the complete order is not Torah or mitzvot, but Torah bringing Divine truth into action.

"Today to perform them." The verse is Deuteronomy 7:11, and the Sages expound it as a division between the time for action and the time for reward; the reference also appears in the notes on the pas-

sage. Why does the Alter Rebbe need this verse? Because he wishes to prove that it is insufficient to say "in the World to Come the light is greater." The Epistle's whole account is that the magnitude of revealed light is not the sole criterion. A world in which more Divinity is seen may be very elevated in revelation. But this world is the place where there is something not present there in the same form: action, refinement and renewal of the lower. This is exactly why he concludes with the mishnah from Avot.

"Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world than all the life of the World to Come." This is not a statement that the World to Come is bad. The mishnah itself continues in the opposite direction: one hour of spiritual pleasure in the World to Come is higher than all life in this world. That is, the mishnah itself supplies two criteria: in revelation, pleasure and apprehension — the World to Come is high; in the ability to act, repent and perform mitzvot — an hour in this world is more precious than all the life of the World to Come. The Alter Rebbe quotes specifically the first half because it is the half belonging to Epistle 20. This is a fundamental answer to the question of Torah versus mitzvot: there is no single scale on which everything is ranked "one to ten." There is an advantage of revelation. There is an advantage of root. There is an advantage of apprehension. There is an advantage of action. There is an advantage of pleasure. And there is an advantage of fulfilling the purpose. Epistle 20 addresses the last question: where does one reach the goal for which the soul descended? The answer is: in this world, in physicality, through practical mitzvot.

The Overall Picture — What Now Becomes Clear about the Entire Epistle

After examining all the details, I think we can reread the conclusion almost word for word and see how tightly constructed it is. The Alter Rebbe begins with:

> "And from this will be well understood…"

That is: do not see the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders as a new subject. "From this" — from the structure of the lowest level of Asiyah and returning light explained above — the tangible world will now be understood. He presents the ascending order: inanimate < vegetative < animal < speaking. Then he immediately dismantles the possibility of thinking that "higher" means "does not need the lower": the animal is nourished from the vegetative; man from both; and not only his body — also his Daat. Grain shows that the vegetative gives Daat to the speaking. Ox meat shows that the animal adds Chochmah to the speaking. The reason is not that the vegetative and animal are higher than man in their revealed state, but that returning light from the lowest level of Asiyah reveals in them something whose source is deeper than the revealed hierarchy. He then raises the entire structure one level: what is true among plant, beast and human in this world is also true between a physical beast and an angel. One would expect the higher angel to be the one giving vitality to the beast. The Alter Rebbe says: in the sacrifice, the beast's spirit ascends and the higher "face of an ox" is nourished from it. Not merely nourished from it. The Zohar is precise:

> "מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון" ("from their foundation and root") —

from their own root. That is, we have now proved the principle on two levels: within the world, lower nourishes higher; between worlds, a

physical lower nourishes a spiritual higher. Then comes the conclusion that requires almost no further explanation: if so, it is clear why a Divine soul, higher than matter, descends to it. Not because matter is higher than it as it appears, but because within matter lies something the soul cannot reach while remaining above. Therefore it descends. Therefore it is vested in a body. Therefore it encounters wool, leather, money, wheat, wine, oil, etrog, sukkah and an entire world of matter. A practical mitzvah is therefore not a compromise for a soul unable to remain in spirituality. It is the very reason for descent. I would add one more precision, perhaps among the most important for your whole booklet: Epistle 20 does not merely say "action is more important than understanding." That wording is too crude and even misleading. It says something far deeper:

The very lowest thing in the order of revelation may be the vessel for the very highest thing at the root; therefore a thing's value must not be measured by the degree of its revealed spirituality.

From this comes the power of earth. From this comes the power of food. From this comes the power of sacrifice. And from this comes the power of the practical mitzvah. This is also why, in my view, the three words at the end — "לעולם הזה הגשמי" ("to this physical world") — are not merely a description of place. They summarize all of Epistle 20. The soul did not descend despite the world being physical. It descended because it is physical. This is the depth of the connection between two sentences that at first seem almost opposite:

> "Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world than all the life of the World to Come"

and —

> "The purpose of the souls' descent to this physical world."

The World to Come reveals. This world acts. The higher illuminates. The lower fulfills the intention. "Returning light" is the concept connecting them. Finally, the printers' note also has significance: "Thus far we found in his holy handwriting." This is the end of the manuscript found, not the Alter Rebbe's usual stylistic conclusion; the tradition accompanying Lessons in Tanya connects the Epistle with the period close to his passing. It is therefore incorrect to seek an additional concluding sentence supposedly missing. The sentence about practical mitzvot is in fact the summit at which the manuscript ends, and it does close precisely the circle opened throughout Epistle 20: how specifically physical yesh, lowest in the chain of descent, becomes the place where the highest Divine intention takes hold.

Source Readings and Enlarged Printed Witnesses

Pages of Likkutei Torah were divided into four views to enlarge the printed letters without omitting content. Reading order: right column, upper and lower, followed by the left column. Pages of Mishnat Chassidim were preserved in full because of the structure of text and commentary. The number is the PDF page number in the preserved witness, not a printed reference newly inferred. The readings are an evidentiary appendix to the full explanation in the preceding parts.

"ששת ימים" ("Six Days"): Two Proofs within One Mechanism

The witnesses before us preserve the discourse's opening and continuation so as not to suffice with sentences torn from context. The food question has two levels: the utterance of G-d's mouth vested in it, and the advantage of its root in Tohu in relation to the Chochmah of Tikkun. The person refines the food, and the food adds to the person. Without these two levels, it is easy to think the claim attributes

developed intellect to revealed bread, or that refinement is an activity changing nothing in the refiner.

The key paragraph says that the root of foods in the world of Tohu is above the Chochmah of Tikkun, hence their power to add to the power of Chochmah. Both proofs are integrated into the same context: ox meat followed by grain. The connective sentences must be read, rather than merely marking the words meat and grain. Their presence in the same discourse matters; their explanation through the same relationship matters more.

In comparison with the Epistle, three differences are maintained: the order of the proofs, father without mother, and Chochmah and intellect versus Chochmah and Daat. These are not defects in the source but limits of its application. It explains the possibility of added intellect from food; it does not alone decide why every word in the Epistle was chosen. The discourse begins at 13a; this must not be confused with 11c (יא ג) of "מצה זו" ("This Matzah"), or with the discourse's number in the site's menu.

The discourse's continuation matters for the transition to service. When an application to the service of G-d is opened, eating for the sake of Heaven, refinement of sparks, recitation of the Shema and prayer appear. This layer does not cancel the preceding explanation or permit adding such a condition to the infant sentence in the Epistle. Contextual witnesses are printed so that the reader can see the transition, rather than merely receive the editor's announcement that it exists. Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" ("Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot") — §§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57.

Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ששת ימים תאכל מצות” (“Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot”)

Witness PDF 055 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-001

Witness PDF 055 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-002

Witness PDF 055 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-003

Witness PDF 055 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-004

Witness PDF 056 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-005

Witness PDF 056 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-006

Witness PDF 056 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-007

Witness PDF 056 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-008

Witness PDF 057 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-009

Witness PDF 057 · Right · Lower Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-010

Witness PDF 057 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-011

Witness PDF 057 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-012

“מצה זו” (“This Matzah”): Abba in Immaturity, without Merging Discourses

This discourse is preserved separately because confusing it with “ששת ימים” (“Six Days”) changed the evidential situation in R2. The fact that both are in Parashat Tzav and concern matzah does not permit transferring a paragraph from one to the other. The discourse’s opening, section and context are three independent means of identification; a menu number does not replace them. The facsimiles allow the distinction to be checked.

The point relevant to the file is calling father after tasting grain, which is used to explain the mochin of Abba in a state of immaturity. This knowledge is not described as full conceptual apprehension of the relationship of procreation. The initial image, “the infant understands its relationship to its parents,” therefore required qualification. The discourse explains how knowledge and faith can be drawn even where developed apprehension does not yet exist. This is a positive explanation, not merely a negation of the earlier account.

The wording father alone fits the local argument about Abba. It cannot be inferred from this that the Epistle, quoting father and mother, necessarily expounds both partzufim. Nor can it be inferred that the exclusivity of father in this discourse negates every possible meaning for mother elsewhere. The comparison teaches a precise limit: we possess a source interpreting father in a particular context, but do not yet possess a source transferring it fully to the Epistle's sentence.

The continuation pages preserve the matzah argument as a unit. They are not independent evidence for ox meat, and the reader is not asked to find in them what was found in L1. Separating the discourses is part of explaining grain itself: wheat in Daat of Tohu, grain in the food proofs and matzah in immaturity are not three names whose every detail is interchangeable. Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ") — §2; beginning of the discourse 11c (יא ג); PDF 51–53.

Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" ("To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, 'This Matzah' ")

Witness PDF 051 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-013

Witness PDF 051 · Right · Lower Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-014

Witness PDF 051 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-015

Witness PDF 051 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-016

Witness PDF 052 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-017

Witness PDF 052 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-018

Witness PDF 052 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-019

Witness PDF 052 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-020

Witness PDF 053 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-021

Witness PDF 053 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-022

Witness PDF 053 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-023

Witness PDF 053 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-024

"ואכלתם אכול" ("And You Shall Eat Plentifully"): Return, Future and Malchut

This is a witness for examining the term returning light outside the Epistle's sentence. Eating elevates what is eaten to its root, and the discussion continues to eating in the future and a state after the refinements. The shared connection of food, elevation and return helps understand the pattern, but is insufficient to prove identity of all the levels and mechanisms. In every occurrence one must ask what returns, who acts and when.

The future-oriented paragraph speaks of Malchut and the aspect of Keter from below upward. The language of embedding creates a genuine closeness to the Epistle, which also uses Malchut as Keter from below upward. In the Epistle, however, the kav at the termination of the feet of the upright configuration is the explicit subject of the returning discussed. Here the movement and time are different. Anyone skipping the difference presents a verbal correspondence as proof of identity; anyone erasing the closeness misses an important explanatory parallel.

Particular caution is needed with the abbreviations א"ח עט"ב. In this context they mean "אשת חיל עטרת בעלה" ("a woman of valor is her husband's crown"); א"ח alone must not be decoded as "אור חוזר" ("returning light") merely because the term occurs nearby. The contextual test precedes decoding a familiar abbreviation. The same rule applies to the entire comparison: a shared word invites examination; it does not award a result in advance.

For the final explanation, L2 remains a partial bridge. It shows how refinements, ascent to the root and Malchut as Keter can join within one movement. It is not the missing sentence "Daat of Tohu is the kav's returning light." Facsimiles of both pages are preserved so that the future and context do not disappear behind a quotation of

two words. Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ואכלתם אכול” (“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”) — discussion of eating, elevation and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45.

Likkutei Torah, Tzav, “ואכלתם אכול” (“And You Shall Eat Plentifully”)

Witness PDF 044 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-025

Witness PDF 044 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-026

Witness PDF 044 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-027

Witness PDF 044 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-028

Witness PDF 045 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-029

Witness PDF 045 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-030

Witness PDF 045 · Left · Upper Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-031

Witness PDF 045 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-032

Emor: Human Nourishment, the Angels' Enjoyment and a Printed Reference

The explanation of "והניף" ("And He Shall Wave") is the precise source where R2 mistakenly used "וספרתם" ("And You Shall Count"). It connects human nourishment from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders, refinement of the beast's spirit, elevation to the chariot and revelation of lights of Tohu. Its importance is therefore not merely the occurrence of the same Zohar quotation, but its offering a detailed explanation of the enjoyment described by the Epistle. Table and altar join within the same movement, subject to the conditions of service stated in the discourse.

The key wording in §4 is that the angels derive enjoyment from sacrifices through revelation of the lights of Tohu from which their root comes. After it are printed the quotation "יסודא ועיקרא" ("foundation and root") and a reference to the end of "איהו וחיוהי" ("He and His Life-Giving Lights"). The substantive translation: the angels' enjoyment comes from revelation of the lights of Tohu that are their root. The interpretive connection matters even if the author of the reference at the end of the sentence is undetermined.

There are three separate facts here. The discourse's content is in the printed text. The reference to the Epistle is also in print. Attribution of the reference to the Alter Rebbe or an editor is not learned from its mere presence there. Nor do we possess the discourse's delivery date and the Epistle's writing date at an evidentiary level allowing a decision on who added the pointer. The fixed wording is therefore "an explanation connecting them is printed in Likkutei Torah."

The context pages also contain the reference in §2 to Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and to the forehead. R5 identified its content target in Kuntres Acharon 4, not Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The same facsimile thus serves to examine two different references without assuming that every “אג”ה” (Iggeret HaKodesh) in the discourse designates the same Epistle. A particular attribute, a root in Tohu and refinement are examined here with L6 and K4; the three words must not be read as synonyms. Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”) — §§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107.

Likkutei Torah, Emor, “ביאור על פי והניף הכהן אותם” (“Explanation of the Verse ‘And the Priest Shall Wave Them’ ”)

Witness PDF 103 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-033

Witness PDF 103 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-034 Witness PDF 103 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-035

Witness PDF 103 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-036

Witness PDF 104 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-037

Witness PDF 104 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-038

Witness PDF 104 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-039

Witness PDF 104 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-040

Witness PDF 105 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-041

Witness PDF 105 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-042

Witness PDF 105 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-043

Witness PDF 105 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-044

Witness PDF 106 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-045

Witness PDF 106 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-046

Witness PDF 106 · Left · Upper Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-047

Witness PDF 106 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-048

Ki Tetze: Elements, Sacrifice and Two Directions of Service

Section 1 supplied the explicit witness for the upper pairs: fire is the animal soul and air is the speaking order. The Targum's "רוח ממללא" ("a speaking spirit") is not an association added by the editor; it is brought in the discourse. The explanation's status thus changed from possible to documented. The reference to the passage of libations shows that L5 must also be read, but the correspondence itself does not depend on the reader successfully opening both sites.

Section 4 uses "their beginning is embedded in their end and their end in their beginning" to explain Torah and mitzvot. At the root of the explanation, Torah is likened to descending water, while mitzvot are connected to the end of action being first in thought. But the paragraph's continuation is essential: Torah leads to ratzo, mitzvot to shov, and the result is drawing the power of fire down as far as the animal soul. Translation of the key passage: through this, the power of fire above is drawn to the animal soul.

The shorthand "Torah only descends and mitzvot only ascend" must therefore not be preserved. It takes one level and presents it as the whole discourse. The correct distinction is between the root of the structure, the person's movement and the result of service. Each bears a direction, and sometimes the direction changes. Describing action as ascent does not negate its purpose of drawing down.

The facsimiles encompass both sections to allow examination of the transition among elements, the animal soul, Torah and mitzvot. This

does not prove that everything said in Ki Tetze is a literal interpretation of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. This is a parallel containing the same mapping and vocabulary, whose local usages are preserved. Precisely a full reading of the section prevents excessive use of a single sentence from it. Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “כי תצא למלחמה” (“When You Go Out to War”) — §1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294.

Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, “כי תצא למלחמה” (“When You Go Out to War”)

Witness PDF 292 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-049

Witness PDF 292 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-050

Witness PDF 292 · Left · Upper Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-051

Witness PDF 292 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-052

Witness PDF 293 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-053

Witness PDF 293 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-054

Witness PDF 293 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-055

Witness PDF 293 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-056

Shelach: A Supporting Witness and References in Both Directions

L5 matters as another witness for animal–fire and as part of a system of references between discourses. In certain rounds one site was blocked for one reader while another obtained digital text or a facsimile. The sources register therefore does not summarize the status with a single “read” for all participants. It states who reported and what was preserved. The conclusion concerning the pairs does not rest on one blocked witness, since L4 and L6 supply explicit text.

In L4 the reference to libations was seen. The compiler also reported the reverse reference in L5 to Ki Tetze. These are two observations; one must not be proved from the other. The fact that two discourses discuss fire and soul does not prove that they contain reciprocal references. When this was located, it strengthened the combination of parallels; the author of the references is still not learned from it.

In this discourse, fire is not merely temperature. The discussion of elevating fire and Divine fire connects sacrifice and soul. The explanation of the root of life must be distinguished from its application in fervor and yearning in human service. This distinction allows heat to be used as an illustration without turning it into the sole reason for the correspondence. This is the difference between an analogy intelligible to the reader and the explicit source sought by the investigation.

The pages are preserved as a sequence of the required reading, not as evidence that every term in L5 is identical to a term in the Epistle. They provide no license to substitute a system of fire alone for the kav's termination. Their contribution is defined: strengthening the mapping, the context of sacrifice and service, and an additional reference allowing the reader to examine the connections independently. Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "בפרשת נסכים כתיב כי תבאו" ("In the Passage of Libations It Is Written, 'When You Come' ") — §1 and the reference to Ki Tetze; PDF 109–112.

Likkutei Torah, Shelach, "בפרשת נסכים כתיב כי תבאו" ("In the Passage of Libations It Is Written, 'When You Come' ")

Witness PDF 111 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-057

Witness PDF 111 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-058

Witness PDF 111 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-059

Witness PDF 111 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-060

Witness PDF 112 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-061

Witness PDF 112 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-062

Witness PDF 112 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-063

Witness PDF 112 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R4 · plate-064

Pinchas: The Witness Connecting the Unit's Beginning and End

This is Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the discourse "צו את בני ישראל" ("Command the Children of Israel"). Its opening caused the mistaken attribution to Parashat Tzav, and the R5 correction is preserved in all indexes. Section 3 gives the four pairs together: earth—inanimate; water—vegetative because it causes growth; fire—animal because of the servants of the chariot and animal souls; air—speaking according to "a speaking spirit." Three pairs are explained, and the fourth is stated. The reason for fire must not be restricted to body heat alone.

Section 1 is a counter-test for another question: Michael in love and Gabriel in fear are described in a refined world that has already been refined. Translation of the key passage: a refined world that has already been refined, with everything in its place. The mere distinctiveness of an attribute therefore does not indicate a lack of refinement. Head and foot in the refined world are distinct, while in the fetus before completion of formation they are included together in a different sense. Caution with the word mutual inclusion is part of the determination.

Sections 1–2 contain the two concluding quotations, "today to perform them" and "better is one hour." This world is the arena of action

and choice, and repentance and good deeds are explained in terms of sovev versus revelation of memale. The closeness to the Epistle is strong: the same discussion connects a physical world, action, levels, sacrifice and sovev. There is no need to claim that this is the only parallel in the literature or that every word of the Epistle was intended to refer to it.

In §§3–4, elevation is not the end of the story. “My food” is explained through the analogy of bread restoring vitality to the body; fragrance and satisfaction are connected to elevation and descent, and sacrifice differs from other mitzvot also in actual revelation. The continuation concerning Written Torah and Oral Torah explains why action must not be separated from the command and its interpretation. The facsimiles print this context so that the conclusion about mitzvot does not rest on the four pairs alone. Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”) — §§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180.

Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, “צו את בני ישראל” (“Command the Children of Israel”)

Witness PDF 179 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-065

Witness PDF 179 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-066

Witness PDF 179 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-067

Witness PDF 179 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-068

Witness PDF 180 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-069

Witness PDF 180 · Right · Lower Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-070

Witness PDF 180 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-071

Witness PDF 180 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-072

Witness PDF 181 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-073

Witness PDF 181 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-074

Witness PDF 181 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-075

Witness PDF 181 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R5 · plate-076

Vaetchanan: The Distinctive Root of Wheat in Daat of Tohu

The discourse is "להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום" ("To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse 'And You Shall Know Today' "). Section 5 is the target concerning wheat and Daat, and the preceding pages preserve the sequence of heading and sections. A PDF location is not a column letter; this distinction is preserved even when the filename suggests a page number. The witness's function is to allow a return to the sentence within its unit, not to add certainty absent from the photographed heading.

The decisive sentence attributes the root of wheat to Daat of Tohu, above the person, and explains that although it descended below, it enlivens the person and draws Daat into him. Substantive translation: wheat's root is in Daat of Tohu above the person; although it descended, it enlivens him and draws Daat into him. This is a specific reason concerning wheat, beyond the general explanation that all foods from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders can add from their root.

The difference between a specific and general reason must not become a competition between sources. L1 explains how both grain and meat add intellect; Vaetchanan explains why wheat is connected to Daat. The specific answer does not require every meat to receive the same mapping, and the general answer does not render wheat's distinctiveness unnecessary. This distinction also protects the words grain, bread and matzah from uncontrolled substitution.

Later the analogy is used for Torah vested in physicality. This strengthens its relevance to the Epistle's conclusion, but is not an identification of Daat of Tohu with the kav's returning light. The source supplies a root and an explanation of the addition of Daat; the Epistle supplies a rationale in the language of radiance at the lowest level. The two contributions can combine without our declaring the

technical terms identical. Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, “להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום” (“To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse ‘And You Shall Know Today’ ”) — §5, the root of wheat in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context.

Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, “להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום” (“To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse ‘And You Shall Know Today’ ”)

Witness PDF 235 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-077

Witness PDF 235 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-078

Witness PDF 235 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-079

Witness PDF 235 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-080

Witness PDF 236 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-081

Witness PDF 236 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-082

Witness PDF 236 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-083

Witness PDF 236 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-084

Witness PDF 237 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-085

Witness PDF 237 · Right · Lower Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-086

Witness PDF 237 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-087

Witness PDF 237 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-088

Witness PDF 238 · Right · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-089

Witness PDF 238 · Right · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-090

Witness PDF 238 · Left · Upper

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-091

Witness PDF 238 · Left · Lower

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-092

Mishnat Chassidim: The Mishnah's Text and the Taam Etzo Commentary

Mishnat Chassidim initially entered the file through a secondary excerpt, and only afterward were facsimiles added. The change in manner of access is not a marginal detail: it allows checking whether the sentence belongs to the mishnah's text or to the commentary below. In the preserved edition, the text of Tractate HaHarkavah appears above Taam Etzo. A sentence from the lower portion must not be quoted as though necessarily the mishnah's own wording.

The mapping discussed in the research is close to Etz Chaim: the speaking is likened to the fire portion relative to the other elements. This does not straightforwardly confirm the Epistle's order. Nevertheless, the discussion of composing every created being from all the elements helps distinguish constituent parts from classes of created beings. This is a genuine contribution even when the source does not solve the question for which it was opened.

The file contains no sentence by the Epistle's author explicitly saying how to compare the two mappings. The text of Mishnat Chassidim therefore does not license emending animal–fire to speaking–fire in the Epistle, nor prove that the difference is meaningless. Its function is a comparative witness: it shows what is said in the other system and in what kind of language. The broader claim requires additional evidence.

The facsimiles include the tractate's sequence to permit distinguishing chapters, text and commentary. The heading "Mishnat Chassidim, Gate 50" is incorrect: Gate 50 belongs to the Etz Chaim reference. Separating the names of books, chapters and commentaries

is a condition for using the shared idea. A study booklet cannot replace bibliographic precision with mixed wording, even when the general intention is understandable. Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah — Krakow 5649; 91–92; PDF 210–213.

Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah

Witness PDF 210 · Complete page: text and commentary

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-093

Witness PDF 211 · Complete page: text and commentary

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-094

Witness PDF 212 · Complete page: text and commentary

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-095

Witness PDF 213 · Complete page: text and commentary

Source facsimile from the file; cropped for enlargement only. R3 · plate-096

Sources and Reading Register

Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20

The entire Epistle; especially from “ועוד זאת” (“And Furthermore”) to the end of the transmitted text.

Digital text; also opened during editing. Not a diplomatic edition.

§§2–3; beginning of the discourse 13a; PDF witnesses 55–57.

Digital text and preserved facsimile witnesses; not “מצה זו” (“This Matzah”).

Discussion of eating, elevation and the future; PDF witnesses 44–45.

Digital text and facsimiles; no proved identity with the kav's returning light.

§§1–6, especially §4; 38c (לח ג) according to the reference in K4; PDF 103–107.

Text and facsimiles. The reference to the Epistle is printed; its author is undetermined.

§1: animal and fire; §4: Torah and mitzvot; PDF 291–294.

Digital text and facsimile witnesses. Root, service and result must be distinguished.

§1 and the reference to Ki Tetze; PDF 109–112.

A digital witness reported by the compiler, and facsimiles. Access status differs among readers.

§§1–4; the four pairs in §3; PDF 179–181, especially 180.

Digital text and facsimile; also opened during editing. Pinchas, not Parashat Tzav.

Tanya, Kuntres Acharon 4

"להבין מ"ש בפע"ח" ("To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim"); "ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין" ("And Furthermore, in Truth, the Refinements") and the continuation.

Reported digital text and a Wikisource screenshot; a screenshot is not a facsimile of a printed edition.

Etz Chaim, Gate 50, Chapter 10

The portions of the four elements and the composition of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders.

A digital witness reported as unchecked on the site; animal–air and speaking–fire.

Krakow 5649; 91–92; PDF 210–213.

Initially a secondary excerpt; afterward facsimiles. Text above, Taam Etzo below.

§5, the root of wheat in Daat of Tohu; PDF 235–242 as context.

Reported digital text and facsimiles; a column letter must not be inferred from an index alone.

§2; beginning of the discourse 11c (יא ג); PDF 51–53.

Abba and mochin in immaturity; not the common source for both food proofs.

Berachot 40a

Rabbi Yehudah, the Tree of Knowledge, wheat and father and mother.

Reading of the text reported in the research.

Bava Kamma 71b–72a

Rav Nachman to Rava; Rashi and Tosafot on ox meat.

The sentence is on 72a; preceding context on 71b. Do not specify 71a.

Zohar III, Pinchas, 240b–241a

Paragraphs 531–547 according to the site; the Epistle's quotation is close to 537.

Aramaic text distinguished from the site's translation and commentary. A printed facsimile was not verified.

Stanford/Pritzker Variants Apparatus

241a, especially lines 2 and 14.

A secondary scholarly apparatus; not a facsimile of the manuscript itself.

Lessons in Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20, Note 61 in English

“It” refers to the animal order; omission of earth and the qualification after Creation.

A later explanation and a note attributed to the Rebbe; the note’s Hebrew source was not verified.

“ציון במשפט תפדה” (“Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice”), 5735

§§14–16: study and action now and in the future.

The Rebbe’s explanation; the future-oriented wording must not be attributed to the Gemara itself.

“פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל” (“The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel”), 5723

§§6–8, note 37; Mah, Ban and Sag.

An unreviewed transcript; according to note 1, based on a discourse of the Alter Rebbe with notes by the Tzemach Tzedek.

“ונגלה כבוד ה’” (“And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed”), 5722

§§3–8, especially the substance of food and sovev; notes 49, 54.

An unreviewed transcript; access status varies between rounds.

Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 4

“Better is one hour”; Torah and mitzvot versus the radiance of the Shechinah.

Reading of the text reported in earlier rounds; not reopened in R5.

Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 5

The union of knowing Torah; food and garment.

At different stages: a search excerpt and a reading report; access route must be distinguished from content.

Tanya, Likkutei Amarim 37

The purpose of descent, action and Torah study.

Reading of the text reported in R3; not reread in R5.

Kiddushin 40b

Study is greater because it leads to action.

Context of the discussion; it does not itself contain a division between now and the messianic age.

Mishnah Peah 1:1

And Torah study is equivalent to them all.

Source of the comparative expression; not an overall mapping of all axes.

Eruvin 22a

Today to perform them; tomorrow to receive their reward.

Full text/search excerpts according to the round; a claim concerning the time for action and reward.

Mishnah Avot 4:17 and Tosafot Yom Tov

The two halves of the mishnah: action and spiritual pleasure.

Both halves are necessary to understand the comparison.

Ezekiel 1

Verses 6, 10, 26; the four faces and the man upon the throne.

The face of a man must not be identified with the man upon the throne without distinction.

Psalms 119:66

Teach me good discernment and knowledge, for I have believed in Your commandments.

Source of the biblical expression; the intention of the full allusion is not proved.

Proverbs 14:6

And it is easy for one with understanding to know.

The conclusion's biblical expression.

II Chronicles 32:1

After these things and this truth.

A linguistic source; no necessity for an exposition of the historical context.

Deuteronomy 7:11

Which I command you today to perform.

The verse of the commandment; distinct from the exposition in Eruvin and the mishnah in Avot.

Index of Questions and Concepts

S01 · From What Do We Learn the Order of Nourishment?

S02 · Four Levels and Four Elements

S03 · The Reverse Order in Etz Chaim

S04 · The Inanimate Left Outside the Examples

S05 · Higher in Revelation, Receiving from Below

S06 · “Is Nourished and Lives” and “Receives Its Vitality from Both of Them”

S07 · Grain and the Tree of Knowledge in the Berachot Discussion

S08 · Wheat, Grain, Bread and Matzah

S09 · Two Parents in the Quotation, Father in the Parallels

S10 · Chochmah and Daat without Binah

S11 · What Happened at Night without Ox Meat?

S12 · Why an Ox, and Why Two Proofs?

S13 · Tohu, Refinement and Returning Light: What Is Connected?

S14 · To What Does “For It Is” Refer?

S15 · Two Occurrences of Returning Light

S16 · What Does “Etc.” Abbreviate?

S17 · A Repetition That Activates the Explanation

S18 · What Is Revealed with Greater Force?

S19 · Good Discernment and Knowledge as a Transitional Sentence

S20 · The Face of a Man and the Man upon the Throne

S21 · Mutual Inclusion Does Not Abolish Function

S22 · Ox for All Beasts, Eagle for Birds

S23 · The Lion and Man Do Not Disappear from the Zohar

S24 · A Spirit That Descends, a Spirit That Returns

S25 · Enjoyment, Nourishment and Supply

S26 · The Same Line or a Different Location?

S27 · What Does “As Indicated by the Precise Wording” Teach?

S28 · The Angels Too Are from Ban — What Is Added to Them?

S29 · A Small Sacrifice and Many Recipients

S30 · “All the Above” Returns the Conclusion to the Entire Epistle

S31 · The Advantage of Matter and Commanded Action

S32 · The Souls’ Descent and Revelation Below

S33 · The Advantage of Action Is Not a Single Scale

S34 · Study Is Greater, Action Is Greater

S35 · Four Times, Not One “Future”

S36 · Today to Perform Them

S37 · The Two Halves of “Better Is One Hour”

S38 · Echoes That May Be Heard but Cannot Be Proved

S39 · Thus Far We Found: The Limit of Transmission

S40 · The Complete Argument and Its Limits

File 0013 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[39]

R08-BATCH-01 — YA-IGK20 / Tanya Iggeret HaKodesh §20 — 0. Sources actually opened this batch

[39]Document 0013: 14 — R08-BATCH-01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
1	Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh 20 (Hebrew)	https://www.sefaria.org/Tanya,_Part_IV;_Iggeret_HaKodesh.20?lang=he — API dump → `/workspace/ya-igk20/sefaria_igk20.json`, plain `/workspace/ya-igk20/igk20_plain.txt`	Full letter: vessels = Elokut for yesh me-ayin; souls pre-descent not yesh; parenthetical on tzaddikim ha-rishonim; “yatzeu ve-nifredu”; malchut→atik of Beriah; letters; birth; kav through parsa into BYA; BYA kelim get koach/oz
2	Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 17 (“עוד ביאור… יונתי” [“Further Explanation… My Dove”])	https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Shir_HaShirim.17?lang=he (same maamar as Chabad aid/5899043; Chabad HTML blocked by Cloudflare)	Full maamar: Z”N souls vs Atzilut souls; definition of tzaddikim ha-rishonim; Rashbi as example; masach/parsa; or yashar / or chozer
3	Tanya ch. 48	Sefaria API → `tanya48.txt`	Tzimtzumim as hester so limited yesh can exist; not a micro-formula for lo-yesh→yesh
4	Tanya ch. 52	Sefaria API → `tanya52.txt`	Shechinah / garments mediating descent (support for garment-frame, not micro-mechanism)

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
5	Etz Chaim, Shaar 1 Anaf 2	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_הנע/א_רעש/מייח_זעץ (raw)	Kav drawn as thin line into chalal after tzimtzum
6	Etz Chaim, Shaar 1 Anaf 3	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ג_הנע/א_רעש/מייח_זעץ	Kelim require prior diminution of light; then kav returned
7	Tikkunei Zohar 122b	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.122b + https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/בכק_רהז_ינוקית_ב	Full daf opened for R07-T09 verification

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
8	Tikkunei Zohar 122a, 123a, 123b	Sefaria API	Checked neighboring dafim for claimed Aramaic string
9	Drive docs 10–11 (read only)	`10 — R07 ARCHIVE — FINAL CLOSURE`; `11 — R08 WORKPLAN`	R07-T09 wording + R08 priority order
10	Secondary pointer only (not used as E)	Eshel Avraham cites TZ ~123a on nishmata de-Atzilut vs beriah-soul as "gufa"	Led to check 123a; did **not** recover R07-T09 string

Not opened successfully this batch: live Chabad aid/5899043 HTML (Cloudflare); Ohr HaTorah Shemot p.199; printed Kehot note 33 glyph; Avodat HaKodesh 1:8; Tikunei Zohar Tikkun 70 as separate unit with verified pagination.

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Short answer

R07-T09 is NOT confirmed on the opened page. The Aramaic sentence reported in R07 closure — «דסליק האי נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה» ["that this soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"] — **does not appear** on Tikkunei Zohar 122b (Sefaria + Wikisource). Neighboring 122a / 123a / 123b (Sefaria) also lack that string. Therefore: **no decisive source was found** for promoting R07-T09 to independent [E].

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — What 122b actually contains [E]

Opening (Sefaria TZ 122b): four tikkunim on «ואתה תחזה» ["And you shall discern"] — hair / moach / each **nima** called **alma setimaah**, sparks, divine names in limbs, etc. Relevant sample:

> וְאַתָּה תֶּחֱזֶה בְּשַׁעֲרָא... וּמִלְּגָאו מוֹחָא, דְּמִנֵּיהּ נָפְקִין מַבּוּעִין... לְאַשְׁקָאָה לְכָל נִימָא וְנִימָא דְּאִיהִי עָלְמָא סְתִימָאָה...

["And you shall discern in the hair… and within is the brain, from which springs issue… to give drink to each and every hair, which is a hidden world…"]

This supports hair→hidden worlds imagery; it does **not** state depart ure/separation of a nishmata de-Atzilut.

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Proven / not proven

Claim	Tag	Status
R07 reported a TZ 122b quote about Atzilut-soul ascending and separating	[E-reported] in R07 archive	Historical report only
That exact sentence is on TZ 122b	—	**Falsified by direct open**
TZ 122b discusses nima = alma setimaah	[E]	Confirmed
Same sentence exists elsewhere in TZ under another daf/tikkun title	[U]	Not found this pass; Eshel Avraham points near 123a for a related topic, but Sefaria 123a still lacks the R07 string
Title "Tikkun 70" for this claim	[U]	Must not be accepted without opening that unit's pagination

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Opposing source / difficulty

Secondary literature (Eshel Avraham) gestures to TZ **123a** for nishmata de-Atzilut vs beriah-soul as body — a different claim and still not the R07 wording on the Sefaria text opened.

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Verdict

Correct R07-T09 status: keep as `[E-reported; direct verification FAILED on 122b]` → do **not** elevate to [E]. New R08 claim below.

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Confidence

High (0.9) that the string is absent from the opened 122b witnesses. **Medium** that it is absent from all of TZ (corpus search incomplete).

1) Priority A — Tikunei Zohar 122b / R07-T09 — Next step

Search printed Mantua/Kushta TZ for the string; open Tikkun 70 by tikkun number with page map; if found, re-tag with exact daf. Until then leave R07-T09 non-[E].

File 0027 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[277]

R08-BATCH-05 QC — T27–T29 (E′ merge) — Corpora / dumps opened this QC

Path	Role
`/workspace/ya_igk20/batch04/oht_shemot_31630.txt`	OHT Shemot HB31630 — T27 lemma + T28 kav window
`/workspace/ya-igk20/r08b05/oht_q70_kav_block_clean.txt`	T28 cache (matches dump ~ll.1035–1050)

[277] Document 0027: 36 — R08-BATCH-05 QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Path	Role
`/workspace/ya_igk20/batch05/yo_root.json` + `yo_sample1` / `yo_279b7` / `yo_43b1` / `yo_65a28`	Yahel Ohr on Zohar (full + samples)
`/workspace/ya_igk20/batch05/es_*.json`, `name_shm*.json`, `name_yahel_*.json`, `hb_yahel.html`	B05 ES / name / HB search logs
`/workspace/ya-igk20/r08b05/yahel_יהל אור_ליקוטים.wiki` + `ws_yahel_search_log.json`	E′ WS supplement
B04 prior: `to_bereshit{2,4}.txt`, `to_miketz_14_plain.txt`, `lt_reeh_7_plain.txt`, `lt_tzav2.txt`, LT Shir 16–20, DMC Achdut + Peru, CA Nasso, `ec40_*.txt`, `igk20_plain.txt`, `lo_yesh_hits.txt`	T27 prior-corpus recheck
`/workspace/ya-igk20/r08b04/shk_sef_v5.txt` + `/workspace/ya_igk20/batch04/shk_vayaavor_5_plain.txt` + `r08b05/shk_v5_q74_blocks.txt`	T29 (same SHK dump as T25)
`r08b05/igk20_neshamot_block.txt`	T28 IGK20 body window

Missing / not opened (as claimed): `ec40.txt` monolithic (parts `ec40_*.txt` present); Sefer HaMaamarim / SHM on Sefaria (`index_SHM.json` = No book named…; name API → Yetzirah/HaMitzvot); HebrewBooks Yahel (~155 B redirect); Sefer HaLikkutim on Sefaria.

Yahel Ohr on Zohar (yo_root full ~1.0M plain)

לא־יש / לא-יש [“non-yesh”] = 0; lo-yesh = 0; יש מאין [“yesh from ayin”] = 0; מאין ליש [“from ayin to yesh”] = 0

raw «לא יש» [“not yesh”] = 16 — all verb substr (…ישמע/ישאר/ישקר [“will lie / will remain / will hear…”]); true existential 0

ES path filter es_yo_lo.json total=0; es_yo_yma.json total=0

File 0045 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[304]

R08-BATCH-02 stubs / land — R08-T11 (B02-A) — provisional from CoS

- **Tag:** [E locus]
- **Locus:** Tikkunei Zohar **124a §7** (vocalized)
- **URL:** https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124a.7?vhe=Tikkunei_Zohar_-_Vocalized
- **Quote:** אלא דסליק ההיא נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him."]
- **Delta:** R07-T09 stated locus **122b CORRECTED → 124a**; string variant האי/ההיא ["this/that"]
- **Application to Iggeret kelim-exit:** **[I]/[U]** — different sugya (avonot separating soul from person)
- **QC:** await Research Director seal (not sealed yet)

File 0120 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[172]

R08-BATCH-01 — QC log (Research Director) — CoS request T01/T06/T09

SUMMARY reviewed: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1v7qxKU8zT46xBdzPoEepomvvzoRf0qIILjEEdKF_tUI/edit

[304]Document 0045: ZZ — SUPERSEDED R08 ledger pre-T11-seal (see newer 12). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[172]Document 0120: 15 — R08-BATCH-01 QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

claim ID	source URL	PASS/ FAIL	note
R08-T01	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.122b + https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תיקוני_הזהר_בכב_ב	**PASS**	R07-T09 string «דסליק האי נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה» ["that this soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"] (and variants סליק / ואתפרש ["ascends / and separates"]) **absent** on Sefaria TZ 122b API and Wikisource קכב ב [122b]. Page content **is** (ואתה תחזה / נימא (=עָלְמָא סְתִימָאָה / עלמא סתימאה ["And you shall discern" / "hair" (="hidden world")]. Do not upgrade R07-T09 to [E] on this locus.
R08-T06	https://www.sefaria.org/Tanya,_Part_IV;_Iggeret_HaKodesh.20 (local dump `igk20_plain.txt`)	**PASS**	Exact: «אך אינן אלקות ממש לברוא יש מאין, מאחר שכבר יצאו ונפרדו מהכלים די' ספירות, שבהן מלובש ה"קו"...» ["But they are not actual Divinity to create yesh from ayin, since they have already emerged and separated from the vessels of the ten sefirot, in which the 'kav' is vested..."]. Yatzeu ve-nifredu is the stated reason they are **not** Elokut mamash to create yesh me-ayin.
R08-T09	https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Shir_HaShirim.17	**PASS**	LT Shir 17: «כמו נשמת רשב"י שהיה לו נשמה דאצילות מלובשת ממש בהגוף» ["such as the soul of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai, who had a soul of Atzilut actually vested in the body"] amid «הצדיקים הראשונים / נשמות דאצילות» ["the early righteous ones" / "souls of Atzilut"]. Rashbi = **example**, not Iggeret-body ID of the group.

R08-BATCH-01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — QC table

claim ID	source URL	PASS/ FAIL	note
R07-T09 / R08-T01	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.122b	**FAIL (as cited locus)**	Claimed Aramaic «דסליק האי נשמתא דאצילותא… / ואתפרש מניה» [“that this soul of Atzilut ascends… / and separates from him”] **ABSENT** on live Sefaria TZ 122b (nikud-stripped). Also ABSENT 122a/ 123a/123b this pass. Page **does** contain ואתה תחזה / נימא / עלמא סתימאה [“And you shall discern” / “hair” / “hidden world”]. Do **not** upgrade R07-T09 to [E].
R08-T01 content claim	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.122b	**PASS**	122b opens with four tikkunim on ואתה תחזה [“And you shall discern”]; nima = alma setimaah present.
LT aid/ 5899043 ≈ LT Shir 17	https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Shir_HaShirim.17	**PASS (proxy)**	Chabad HTML not opened (Cloudflare). Sefaria LT Shir HaShirim 17: רשב״י / צדיקים הראשונים / נשמות דאצילות / פרסא / מסך [“Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai” / “early righteous ones” / “souls of Atzilut” / “parsa” / “screen”] present. Same-maamar proxy only until aid HTML opens.
R08-T03 malchut→ atik Beriah	https://www.sefaria.org/Tanya,_Part_IV;_Iggeret_HaKodesh.20	**PASS**	Exact in `igk20_plain.txt`: «ממלכות דאצילות שנעשה עתיק דבריאה» [“from Malchut of Atzilut, which becomes Atik of Beriah”].
R08-T06 yatzeu ve-nifredu	Iggeret 20 (local dump)	**PASS**	Exact: «יצאו ונפרדו מהכלים» [“emerged and separated from the vessels”].

claim ID	source URL	PASS/FAIL	note
kav clothed in NR”N	Iggeret 20 (local dump)	**PASS**	Exact: «ה״קו״ המלובש בנפש־רוח־נשמה שלהם» [“the ‘kav’ vested in their nefesh–ruach–neshamah”] (not shorter invented form).
koach/oz create yesh	Iggeret 20 (local dump)	**PASS**	Exact: «נותן בהם כח ועוז לברוא יש מאין» [“gives them strength and force to create yesh from ayin”].

claim ID	source URL	PASS/FAIL	note
pre-descent «אינן בכלל "יש"» [“are not in the category of ‘yesh’ ”]	Iggeret 20 (local dump)	**PASS**	Exact with gershayim: «אינן בכלל "יש" ודבר נפרד בפני עצמן» [“are not in the category of ‘yesh’ and a separate thing in their own right”]. (First pass missed quote marks — corrected.)
R07 locked archive edit	Drive doc 10 `1t4YWtjAIzoEDvMJlr9JEg3nf17cuUWCIpInDFJAYJTE`	**PASS (no post-create edit; freeze captured)**	Drive metadata: created≈modified (~1.5s). Export md5 `da626a52e8e4fcd3a8dc8a3c01134b54`. R07-T09 still `[E-reported; direct verification pending]` — **not** silently upgraded to [E] after R08 FAIL. No prior freeze existed → cannot prove older history; baseline now in `/workspace/ya-igk20/qc/freeze/`.

R08-BATCH-01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — Film

CUT assembly remains **HOLD** — no ffmpeg/video.

R08-BATCH-01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — R07 freeze integrity (CoS LOCK — read only)

claim ID	source URL	PASS/FAIL	note
R07 Doc 10 freeze	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1t4YWtjAIzoEDvMJlr9JEg3nf17cuUWCIpInDFJAYJTE/edit	**PASS**	Drive `modifiedTime` unchanged (`2026-09-20T04:05:07.519Z`). Canonical **plaintext** md5 `f072db82f3c51f86b81c72ff7b224e1c` identical baseline↔re-export. Docx packaging bytes may churn (ignore). Archive still has R07-T09 as `[E-reported; direct verification pending]`.

File 0170 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[47]

1. Factual Corrections / Mandatory Gates (E1-QC-10+) — E1-QC-22 — Reading the Epistle's Structure as Directed toward Its Conclusion

- **Location:** opening chapter, status note
- **Claim:** presenting the argument as directed toward the mitzvot conclusion = [I], not [E]
- **Evidence status:** [E] in the draft — correctly marked **[I]**
- **Type:** factual (tagging)
- **Proposed correction:** none

File 0174 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[175]

R08-BATCH-02 — YA-IGK20 / Tanya Iggeret HaKodesh §20 — 0. Sources actually opened this batch

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
1	Tikkunei Zohar **124a** (Sefaria vocalized)	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124a — API → `/workspace/ya-igk20/r08b02/tz_124a.json`	Seg. 7: full R07-T09 string with variant **ההיא [that]** (not האי [this])

[47] Document 0170: ZZ - SUPERSEDED — 197 E1 Editorial QC (pre-Grok critique; see 199). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[175] Document 0174: 18 — R08-BATCH-02 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
2	Tikkunei Zohar 124b (Sefaria + Wikisource)	https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124b ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תיקוני_זהר_דכק_ב	Continuation after quote; Wikisource marks parenthetical «(דף קכד ע"ב)» [folio 124b] = pagination variant vs Sefaria 124a
3	Tikkunei Zohar 70a / 70b (by tikkun #)	https://www.sefaria.org/api/texts/Tikkunei_Zohar.70a / `.70b`	Opened; **אתפרש [separates]** on 70b = רוחא [spirit] from לבא [heart] — **not** nishmata de-Atzilut string
4	Wikisource search «נשמתא דאצילותא» [soul of Atzilut]	https://he.wikisource.org/w/index.php?search=תמשנ אתוליצאד+א	Hit list → TZ קכד [124] + Reshit Chochmah
5	Reshit Chochmah, Shaar HaYirah 9 (raw)	Wikisource raw → `reshit_yirah_9.wiki`	Cites same Aramaic (secondary witness)

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
6	Ohr HaTorah Shemot vol. 1 (Tzemach Tzedek), printed **קצט / p.199**	HB PDF req=31630; printed p.199 = https://hebrewbooks.org/pdfpager.aspx?req=31630&pgnum=204 (PDF page 204) — local `oht_shemot1.pdf`	Full open: almin in Idra = otiyot elyonim, not mamash; cites Iggeret «איהו וחיוהי» [He and His Life-Giving Lights]
7	Likkutei Torah, Bamidbar 9 («וארשתיך» [And I Will Betroth You])	https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Bamidbar.9	Admur: almin ≈ אותיות שכשיומשכו… ["letters which, when they are drawn down…"] + «אותיות הדבור בעודן בכח חכמתו» ["the letters of speech while still potential in His Chochmah"]; cites same Iggeret parenthetical
8	Lessons in Tanya / INN Epistle 20 Class 4 (secondary)	https://www.israelnationalnews.com/news/417767	Shows superscript **33** on «as stated in the Kabbalah» at gulgalta/almin line; **note body itself not opened**

#	Source	URL / locus	What was read
9	Prior R08-B01 locks (not re-opened as new E)	TZ 122b absent; Iggeret 20; LT Shir 17	Context only

Not opened successfully this pass: printed Kehot Tanya note-33 glyph/text body; any Admur maamar that grades post-exit kav degree in NR"N beyond Iggeret's own two sentences; Chabad.org Lessons-in-Tanya HTML (Cloudflare 403).

1) Priority A — Alternate locus for R07-T09 → R08-T11 SEALED — Short answer

Found. The claimed string is on **Tikkunei Zohar 124a:7** (Sefaria vocalized / Mantua span; Tikkun 70 pagination neighborhood). R07 locus **122b is RETIRED**. Variant: R07 reported **«האי» [this]**; opened text has **«ההיא» [that]**.

1) Priority A — Alternate locus for R07-T09 → R08-T11 SEALED — Quote [E]

Sefaria, Tikkunei Zohar 124a, segment 7 (nikud stripped for ledger):

> כי אם עונותיכם היו מבדילים ביניכם לבין אלהיכ"ם, מאי מבדילים... ["Rather, your iniquities have separated between you and your G-d; what is 'separated'?"], **אלא דסליק ההיא נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]**.

(Vocalized API dump: `tz_124a_quote_seg.txt`.)

File 0206 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[287]

R08-BATCH-02 — R08-T11 (B02-A) — [E] SEALED

- Research Director **PASS ×2**: (1) segment **124a.7** quote match · (2) **122b absence** confirmed
- Locus: Tikkunei Zohar **124a §7** vocalized — https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124a.7?vhe=Tikkunei_Zohar_-_Vocalized
- Quote: אלא דסליק ההיא נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]
- R07-T09 locus **122b RETIRED → 124a**; variant **ההיא [that]**
- Iggeret kelim-exit application: **[I]/[U]** (unchanged — different sugya)
- **Dropped:** any «provisional / await QC» language

File 0284 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Report or witness from the history of the research[292]

R08-BATCH-02 — R08-T11 (B02-A) — SEALED

- **Tag: [E]** (Research Director sealed)
- **Locus:** Tikkunei Zohar **124a §7** (vocalized)
- **URL:** https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124a.7?vhe=Tikkunei_Zohar_-_Vocalized

[287] Document 0206: ZZ — SUPERSEDED R08 ledger pre-T12-seal (see newer 12). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[292] Document 0284: ZZ — SUPERSEDED R08 ledger pre-PASS×2 note (see newer 12). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- **Quote:** אלא דסליק ההיא נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]
- **Delta:** R07-T09 locus **122b RETIRED → 124a**; variant **ההיא [that]** (not האי [this])
- **Iggeret kelim-exit mapping:** still **[I]/[U]** (different sugya)

File 0343 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 8

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[193]

R08 QC — Corrections Before Freeze — 1. The Division of Tikkunei Zohar 124b — Still Undetermined

The wording of 124b itself was verified in direct transcription:

«דסליק ההיא נשמתא דאצילותא מניה ואתפרש מניה» ["that that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"].

This corrects the reference 122b. The assignment of the folio to a particular tikkun, however, is not settled:

- The Tikkunei Zohar index on Wikisource places folios 119b through 138 within Tikkun 70.
- A Sefaria result displays the heading "Tikkunei Zohar #124 | Tikkun 19," but this is a sheet/collection result and not sufficient proof of the division of the book's actual text.
- Other division sites present a different division.

The precise verdict is therefore:

- 122b — the reference is incorrect.
- 124b — a direct source for the wording, [E-subresearch].

[193] Document 0343: 17 — R08 QC — Corrections Before Freeze. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- Assignment of 124 to Tikkun 19/69/70 — [U] pending examination of a printed edition or a reliable photograph of a title page/table of contents.

Do not write at this stage “under no circumstances Tikkun 70.”

Sources: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_דכק_רהז_ינוקית

https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רהז_ינוקית

https://www.sefaria.org.il/sheets/413221

File 0048 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 9

Report or witness from the history of the research[196]

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane)

Opened: 2026-09-20 ~08:20–08:21 EDT

Caches: `/workspace/ya-igk20/r09b01_tz/`

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane) — 1) Wikisource קכד ב [124b] — Aramaic ascent lemma

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_דכק_רהז_ינוקית

Cache: `r09b01_tz/ws_124b_api.json`, `ws_124b.wiki.txt`, `ws_124b_bare.txt`

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane) — 2) Wikisource קכב ב [122b] — ascent lemma ABSENT (support reject 122b)

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_בכק_רהז_ינוקית

[196] Document 0048: 52 — R09-B01 TZ124 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Cache: `r09b01_tz/ws_122b_api.json`, `ws_122b.wiki.txt`, `ws_122b_bare.txt`

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane) — 3) Tikunei Zohar index — pages 119–138 / תיקון 70 [Tikkun 70]

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רהז_ינוקית

Cache: `r09b01_tz/ws_tz_index_api.json`, `ws_tz_index.wiki.txt`

3) Tikunei Zohar index — pages 119–138 / תיקון 70 [Tikkun 70] — What the index claims under ## תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy]

Lists daffim: - קיט ב [119b] (119b) … through … קלח א•ב [138a/b] (138a/b) - Explicitly includes **קכד א•ב [124a/b]** (124a/b) - Span in TOC: **119b–138b** under heading **תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy]**

3) Tikunei Zohar index — pages 119–138 / תיקון 70 [Tikkun 70] — בדוק לא [unchecked]?

String בדוק לא [unchecked] count on index wikitext = 0.

→ Do **not** mark the index claim with `[E-subresearch]` for that reason.

(The index does carry a separate magiah note under ## עשר עוד תיקונים [Ten Further Tikkunim] about material from דף קלט [folio 139] onward found in another book — that note is **not** attached to תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy] / 119–138.)

3) Tikunei Zohar index — pages 119–138 / תיקון 70 [Tikkun 70] — Status of index→tikkun map

Editorial TOC assignment only. Not a print folio header on קכד ב [124b] itself.

4) Second witness — headers per witness — A. Sefaria (opened; ToratEmet vocalized dump behind API)

Unit	API ref / heRef	On-unit HEADER	Ascent primary lemma?
Daf 124b	`Tikkunei Zohar 124b` / הזהר תקוני ב קכ"ד [Tikkunei Zohar 124b]	**Daf header only** — no תיקון ע' [Tikkun 70] / שבעים [seventy]	Primary נשמתא ההיא דסליק דאצילותא… ["that that soul of Atzilut ascends…"] **ABSENT** on 124b; page starts אסתלק… דמלה ורזא נשמתיה… ["And the secret of the matter… his soul departed…"]

Unit	API ref / heRef	On-unit HEADER	Ascent primary lemma?
Daf 124a	`Tikkunei Zohar 124a` / הזהר תקוני א קכ"ד [Tikkunei Zohar 124a]	Daf header only	Primary lemma **PRESENT** at last seg (Sefaria 124a:7): נשמתא ההיא דסליק אלא מניה ואתפרש מניה דאצילותא ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]
Daf 122b	`Tikkunei Zohar 122b` / הזהר תקוני ב קכ"ב [Tikkunei Zohar 122b]	Daf header only	Primary lemma **ABSENT** (confirm reject)
Alt-struct **Tikkunim.70**	`Tikkunei Zohar 119b:2-139a:1` / תקוני הזהר קי"ט ב׳:ב קל"ט–א׳:א [Tikkunei Zohar 119b:2–139a:1]	Structural title via `alt_structs.Tikkunim` node 70 — **not** a print header printed on 124b	Range **includes** 124a/b (map only)

Version title (Sefaria): `Tikkunei Zohar - Vocalized`

versionSource noted: `https://www.toratemetfreeware.com/online/f_01153_all.html` (live HTML was Cloudflare interstitial this pass — not used as independent readable dump).

Caches: `sefaria_124b.json`, `sefaria_124a.json`, `sefaria_122b.json`, `sefaria_tikkunim70.json`, `sefaria_raw_index.json`, `*_plain.txt`

Pagination apparatus (witnesses agree on string; disagree on daf label): - WS page קכד ב [124b] hosts primary lemma **before** (קכד דף ב"ע) [folio 124b] mark

- Sefaria places same primary lemma on **124a:7**; Sefaria **124b** = continuation (נשמתיה אסתלק… [“his soul departed…”])

4) Second witness — headers per witness — C. Header summary table

Witness	Unit opened	HEADER reported
Wikisource	קכד ב [124b]	Page/daf title תיקוני זהר קכד ב [Tikkunei Zohar 124b] + daf-nav template; **no** tikkun-number print header

Witness	Unit opened	HEADER reported
Wikisource	Index	Section heading תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy] → קיט ב–קלח ב [119b–138b] (incl. קכד [124])
Sefaria	124b	`Tikkunei Zohar 124b` / ב קכ"ד הזהר תקוני [Tikkunei Zohar 124b]
Sefaria	124a	`Tikkunei Zohar 124a` / א קכ"ד הזהר תקוני [Tikkunei Zohar 124a] (+ primary lemma)
Sefaria	Tikkunim.70	Range header `119b:2–139a:1` / א׳:א קל"ט–ב׳:ב קי"ט [119b:2–139a:1]
HebrewBooks	—	**נפתח לא [not opened]**

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane) — 5) Verdict (CoS)

Claim	Tag	Basis
Text of the ascent lemma complex as carried on/around WS 124b (primary string + histalkut continuation), cross-checked Sefaria	**[E-subresearch]**	Both WS and Sefaria opened; string extracted; 122b absence confirmed. Pagination label WS-page vs Sefaria-daf is apparatus, not denial of text.
Tikkun number assignment of 124a/b as "תיקון 70 [Tikkun 70] / תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy]"	**[U]**	Index TOC + Sefaria `alt_structs` map only. **No print folio header** תיקון ע' [Tikkun 70] / תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy] on opened 124a/124b pages. Per lane rule: remains **[U]** unless a print header proves it.
Index בדוק לא [unchecked] flag	**N/A**	Index does **not** say בדוק לא [unchecked] (count 0).
Locus **122b** for this ascent lemma	**REJECT** (supported)	Lemma absent on WS + Sefaria 122b.

Do not invent Mantua/Kushta print headers not opened. ToratEmet HTML and HebrewBooks not readable this pass.

YA-IGK20 R09-B01 — Tikunei Zohar 124 only (CoS parallel lane) — Cache inventory (`r09b01_tz/`)

- `ws_124b_api.json`, `ws_124b.wiki.txt`, `ws_124b_bare.txt`
- `ws_122b_api.json`, `ws_122b.wiki.txt`, `ws_122b_bare.txt`
- `ws_tz_index_api.json`, `ws_tz_index.wiki.txt`
- `sefaria_124a.json`, `sefaria_124b.json`, `sefaria_122b.json`, `sefaria_119b.json`
- `sefaria_124a_plain.txt`, `sefaria_124b_plain.txt`, `sefaria_122b_plain.txt`
- `sefaria_tikkunim70.json` (= alt Tikkun 70 range), `sefaria_tikkun70.json` (= **daf** 70 only; not tikkun-70)
- `sefaria_tz_index.json`, `sefaria_raw_index.json`
- `hb_search.html` (empty), `toratemet_tz.html` (CF interstitial)

File 0144 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 9

Report or witness from the history of the research[198]

R09-BATCH-01 — YA-IGK20 consolidated (A/B/C/D) — A) Tikunei Zohar 124 — ascent lemma + tikkun header

(Folded from TZ124 lane — full apparatus in *R09-B01-TZ124.md*.)

A) Tikunei Zohar 124 — ascent lemma + tikkun header — A1 — Aramaic lemma [E-subresearch]

Wikisource https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_דכק_רהז_ינוקית

> אֶלָּא דְּסָלִיק הַהִיא נִשְׁמָתָא דַּאֲצִילוּתָא מִנֵּיהּ וְאִתְפָּרַשׁ מִנֵּיהּ ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]

Bare: מניה ואתפרש מניה דאצילותא נשמתא ההיא דסליק אלא ["Rather, that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"]
Pagination apparatus: WS page titled ב קכד [124b] places primary lemma **before** marker (ב"ע קכד דף) [folio 124b]. Continuation: יבשא גופא ואשתאר מניה נשמתיה אסתלק ["his soul departed from him and the body remained dry"] / אצילות בארח נשמתא מניה דאסתלקת ["the soul departed from him by way of Atzilut"] / איהי נשמתא דהאי עילאה לנשמתא גופא ["this soul is a body for the higher soul"].

Sefaria second witness: primary lemma on **124a:7**; Sefaria **124b** = continuation only. Same string; daf-label disagreement = apparatus, not denial of text.

A) Tikunei Zohar 124 — ascent lemma + tikkun header — A2 — Headers per edition (assignment [U] if conflict / no print)

[198]Document 0144: 54 — R09-BATCH-01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Witness	Unit	Header reported	Tikkun#?
Wikisource	קכד ב [124b]	Page/daf title + nav template	**No** on-folio תיקון ע' [Tikkun 70] / שבעים [seventy]
Wikisource index	TOC	## תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy] → קיט ב–קלח ב [119b–138b] (incl. קכד [124])	Editorial TOC only
Sefaria	124a / 124b	Daf titles only	No print tikkun header
Sefaria `alt_structs.Tikkunim` slot **70**	Range `119b:2–139a:1`	Structural map includes 124	Map ≠ print
Sefaria slot **19**	`38a:2–42a:6`	—	**Does not** cover 124
Sefaria slot **69**	`99a:1–119b:1`	—	Ends **before** 124
HebrewBooks / ToratEmet HTML	—	**נפתח לא [not opened]** (empty / CF)	—

Index note: string בדוק לא [unchecked] count on WS index = **0** (do not invent that flag for תיקון שבעים [Tikkun Seventy]).

A) Tikunei Zohar 124 — ascent lemma + tikkun header — A3 — 122b REJECT (already sealed; re-confirmed)

Lemma **ABSENT** on WS + Sefaria 122b (content = ואתה תחזה [And You Shall Discern] / נימא [hair] / עלמא סתימאה [hidden world]).

A) Tikunei Zohar 124 — ascent lemma + tikkun header — A4 — Verdict A

Claim	Tag
Ascent lemma text (WS/Sefaria complex on/ around 124)	**[E-subresearch]**
Tikkun 19 / 69 / 70 assignment of folio 124	**[U]** until print header / scan
Locus 122b for ascent	**REJECT**

File 0165 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 9

Report or witness from the history of the research[199]

§A — TZ124 (Drive 51/52 → R09-T01 / T02 / T03) — T01 — 122b REJECT

Independent check on `r09b01_tz/ws_122b_bare.txt` + `sefaria_122b_plain.txt` (+ root `Tikkunei_Zohar_122b.txt`):

ascent strings דסליק [that ascends] / נשמתא דאצילות [soul of Atzilut] / מניה ואתפרש [and separates from him] / נשמת אסתלק [the soul departed] **ABSENT**.

Content = תחזה ואתה [And You Shall Discern] / נימא [hair] / עלמא סתימאה [hidden world] block — matches pack.

Claim	PASS/FAIL
122b ≠ ascent locus	**PASS**

File 0269 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 9

Report or witness from the history of the research[201]

R09-TZ124 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director)

Pack: Drive **51** `1JK62iN3kMwDCEt-etECeMvBGdLD2MFY1` (SUMMARY) · Drive **52** `17EfMM4fMJZjMI50rp6I-0wBvbXWik4Qt` (FULL)

[199]Document 0165: 56 — R09-B01 QC LOG (partial).md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[201]Document 0269: 55 — R09-TZ124 QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Local: `/workspace/ya-igk20/R09-B01-TZ124.md`, `R09-B01-TZ124-SUMMARY.md` **Caches:** `r09b01/`, `r09b01_tz/`, prior `Tikkunei_Zohar_122b.txt` / `124a.txt`

Film CUT: HOLD

Drive 51/52 content matches local packs (read via Drive MCP this pass).

File 0037 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[58]

T06 — exact lemma לידת הנשמות [birth of the souls] → לא נמצא [not found] [לא נמצא] [not found][U] — Open-log (editions / pages / queries searched)

#	Probe	Result
1	Sefaria ES הנשמות לידת [birth of the souls] (sefaria.org.il search-wrapper)	**13** hits; **0** in Pri Etz Chaim / Sefer Etz Chaim / Sha'ar HaKavanot / Sha'ar HaPesukim. Hits = LT Tzav/Bamidbar, DMC Discourses 4:3, Chanah Ariel, Ohr HaChammah, Ma'avar Yabbok only.
2	Sefaria ES נשמות לידת [birth of souls] (no ה [hei, the definite article])	**5** hits; **0** Ari. Ben Yehoyada Sotah; Shem MiShmuel; Ohr Penimi on TES; Sulam on Zohar.
3	Sefaria ES נשמות של לידתן [the birth of souls]	**0**
4	Sefaria ES הנשמות לידת [birth of the souls] + filter Kabbalah / Arizal	**0** Ari body (Kabbalah filter returns Ohr Penimi/ Sulam only)
5	Full-text scan **PEC Gate of Passover** (all ch. 1–8, Sefaria)	lemma **0**; related: לידת הז״א [birth of ZA] / סוד נשמות [the mystery of souls] / יום…לידתה יום ז' של פסח [the day of her birth…the seventh day of Passover] (≠ exact milah; T17 sealed)

[58]Document 0037: 71 — R10-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Probe	Result
6	Full-text **PEC Gate of the Omer Count**	lemma **0**; Atika **0**

#	Probe	Result
7	Full-text **SHK** Sermons on Passover / Sukkot / Shavuot / Isru Chag	lemma **0**
8	Full-text **Sefer Etz Chaim 28** (ibbur)	lemma **0**; has נשמות / ז"ת דעתיק [the seven lower sefirot of Atik / souls] mapping (T21 sealed)
9	Full-text **Sefer Etz Chaim 6** (Ohr Penimi cites שער ו' [Gate 6] for לידת-נשמות [birth of souls] fitness)	lemma **0**; only חדשות נשמות [new souls] language
10	Full-text **Sha'ar HaPesukim, Book of Job** (Shem MiShmuel "LT Ari on Job" lead)	lemma **0**; בעתיקא [in Atika] **0**
11	Wikisource exact "הנשמות לידת" [birth of the souls]	**3** pages — all **אריאל חנה [Chanah Ariel]**; **0** עץ חיים / פרי עץ חיים / שער הכוונות [Etz Chaim / Pri Etz Chaim / Shaar HaKavanot]
12	Wikisource EC tree הנשמות לידת [birth of the souls] prefix עץ חיים [Etz Chaim]	noisy partials (לידת המוחין / הנשמות [birth of the mochin / the souls]) — **no** exact milah
13	HebrewBooks search UI	unreachable / redirect (`error.html` / tiny shell HTML) — **not text-mined**
14	archive.org advancedsearch phrase+ PEC	**0** docs

Caches: `r10gb03/es_leidat_neshamot.json`, `es_leidat_neshamot_nh.json`, `es_leidatan.json`, `t06_open_log.json`, full `txt_Pri_Etz_Chaim__Gate_of_Passover.json`, etc.

Status proposal: keep **T06 HOLD / לא נמצא [not found]**. Residual for future non-Sefaria print OCR (HebrewBooks PDF / Otzar page images) only.

File 0039 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[8]

R10 C+D — Grok Bot independent land — D — DMC שרש מצות התפלה [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer] (R10-T01)

Fresh opens: א§ (1) · ב§ (2) · ג§ (3) · מו§ (46)

Local: `/workspace/ya_igk20/r10/dmc_smt_{1,2,3,46}.json` · full JSON `/workspace/ya_igk20/r10/R10_D_DMC_TEFILLAH.json`

File 0104 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[9]

Result — Misses

Target	Status
DMC SMT §§א–ג, מו [1–3, 46] (GB02 stub)	**נמצא לא [not found]** exact verse (theme-adj §ח Ribash / §מד אלהא [§8 Ribash / §44 “G-d”])
TO Beshalach סא [61]	אלהא דאלהיא + עשר ספירות [G-d of gods + ten sefirot] — **no verse**
LT / Tanya / DMC mitzvot (quick)	exact verse **נמצא לא [not found]** this pass

[8]Document 0039: 60b — R10-C-D.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[9]Document 0104: 59b — R10-E GADOL NOTE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0152 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[65]

GOAL 1 — Iggeret HaKodesh 20 body (ibbur / leidah / 7 months / KYS / Atika / 9 or 7) — Quote A — leidah = KYS דבעתיקא תליא [which depends on Atika]; 7 months Shmini Atzeret → Shvi'i shel Pesach; 9 or 7 months [E]

Sefaria segment **20:15** (0-index para 14; Vilna overlay context near preceding [מ: ד תשרי] [40: 4 Tishrei] block):

> All the more so, since the creation of the souls — from it, to be a yesh and a separate thing in its own right in the world of Beriah — is called "birth," like the splitting of the Sea of Reeds, which "depends on Atika." And also, the entire growth of the souls throughout the seven months, from the union of Shemini Atzeret until the seventh day of Passover, is like the growth
>
> of Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva in the womb of "Imma Ila'ah," which is through higher lights from "Imma Ila'ah" and from above to above as far as Ein Sof, vested in her throughout the nine or seven months of gestation. So it is in creating souls and angels for the world of Beriah.

Proves [E]: (1) creation of neshamos from Malchut → called **leidah**; (2) compared to **kriyat yam-suf** with lemma **דבעתיקא תליא [which depends on Atika]**; (3) **7 months** growth from **zivug of Shmini Atzeret** until **Shvi'i shel Pesach**; (4) analogy to ZA/Nukva in Imma Ila'ah; (5)

[65]Document 0152: 60 — R10-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

lights from Imma Ila'ah upward to Ein Sof clothed in her **כל ט' או ז' ירחי לידה [throughout the nine or seven months of gestation]**.

Does not prove: why 7 vs 9; whether calendar is literal solar months vs kabbalistic overlay; identity of Atika beyond the lemma; full mechanism of KYS (that is LT/Zohar territory).

GOAL 3 — Ari primary: בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika] on kriyat yam suf — 3a. Zohar — FOUND [E-primary]

Opened: `https://www.sefaria.org/api/texts/Zohar,_Beshalach.13.180`

cache: `zohar_beshalach_13_180.json`, `zohar_beatiqa_para20.txt`, `zohar_beatiqa_para21.txt`.

(Kehot Sources on LT/Torah Ohr point to זח"ב מח,א [Zohar II 48a] — Sulam/vocalized map as Beshalach 13:180.)

> And it was taught in Sifra di-Tzeniuta: "to Me," precisely; **everything depends on Atika**. At that time Atika Kadisha was revealed…
>
> …What is the reason? Because **the splitting of the Sea of Reeds depends on Atika**.

Proves [E-primary]: lemma בעתיקא תליא(א) [depends on Atika] applied to **kriyat yam suf** / "מה תצעק אלי [Why do you cry to Me]"; revelation of Atika Kadisha.

Does not prove: LT's application that this koach = **leidat haneshamos** (that is Admur's bridge in LT Tzav 11).

YA-IGK20 R10 — Grok Bot independent BATCH-01 (R10-GB01) — GOAL 4 — Derekh Mitzvotekha / Tzemach Tzedek «שרש מצות התפלה» [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer] §§2 & 46

Opened:

https://www.sefaria.org/Derekh_Mitzvotekha,_Shoresh_Mitzvat_HaTefillah.2 https://www.sefaria.org/Derekh_Mitzvotekha,_Shoresh_Mitzvat_HaTefillah.46

caches: `dmc_smt_2.json`, `dmc_smt_46.json`.

Provenance: Tzemach Tzedek — **not** Admur. Tag **[E-primary]** for TZ"Tz body; do **not** attribute to Admur.

File 0156 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[66]

R10-FULL QC LOG — CoS GB01 + Kuksik A/B/C/D/E + renumber — Packs under QC

Drive #	id	Title	Local
59	`1rC1SblxwRHWGg9fzxnm72P41xTOGJLp_`	R10-GB01 SUMMARY	`R10-GB01-SUMMARY.md` (local twin; sizes match Drive)
60	`1QXb3TJUKvjEyxq-rokT8UetMf5eX8dEU`	R10-GB01 FULL	`R10-GB01.md`
62	`1RuGVtEj83R6LbHg4qUb1zaoOFolB5pke`	R10-A ATIKA KYS.json	`r10gb01/R10_A_ATIKA_KYS.json` / `ya_igk20/r10/`
62b	`1y9FW6lbTRCsGDNG1_gQbDC2ua2smOnSw`	R10-A-B.md	`R10-A-B.md`
63	`1NtoYjmbqZUA-n5fsGtF_WXzYB6XmvkjV`	R10-B MONTHS OMER.json	`R10_B_MONTHS_OMER.json`
59E	`1ic4aqW1kg2UPyi1t1lr48mN-Kz7I5DAs`	R10-E GADOL.json	`R10_E_GADOL.json`
60D	`1KqABa8VR7PaqsSiAAdyRZPMGaFu5iEqs`	R10-D DMC TEFILLAH.json	`R10_D_DMC_TEFILLAH.json`
61C	`1BLa69Hf_oCf4_5n32Kw4cZylIEKnlAI_`	R10-C ADAM CHAVA.json	`R10_C_ADAM_CHAVA.json`

[66]Document 0156: 65 — R10-FULL QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Drive #	id	Title	Local
58	`1USFakX90N3YvYhMGUT3-JJ0YEssXhX16`	R10 PAPER LEDGER	`58_R10_PAPER_LEDGER_BATCH_OPEN_Q.md`

Sefaria opens checked (FULL + local dumps + live re-open where needed): Tanya IH 20 §§15–16; LT Tzav 11; LT Bamidbar 20; Zohar Beshalach 13:180; Shaar HaPesukim Beshalach 5; PEC Gate of Passover / Omer / Festival; DMC SMT §§2,46; Torah Ohr Miketz 14; Etz Chaim 19:1–2; SHK Sermons on Passover (Sefaria tree).

File 0025 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[74]

R12-L1 — SHK / PEC PRINT WITNESS (provisional R12-T01+) — Proposed tickets

ID	Target seal	Edition	Printed page	Match [E]
R12-T01	R10-T12 SHK Pesach **12:4** Atika	HB **22601** יפה שעה [Yafeh Shaah] · ירושלים [Jerusalem] **1902/תרס"ב [5662/1902]**	**פו–פז [86–87]** (PDF 174–176)	**MATCH** (OCR noise on תליא→פציא ["depends" → OCR-corrupted form]; מעתיקא קדישא [from Atika Kadisha] + רחם האילה [the hind's womb] clear)
R12-T02	R10-T11 PEC Pesach **8**	HB **14173** · ירושלים [Jerusalem] **תשכ"א/1961 [5721/1961]**	**תקיז–תקיח [517–518]** (517–518; PDF 148–149)	**MATCH** all sealed bits (רחם / בעתיקא / סוד נשמות / ביבשה [womb / in Atika / mystery of souls / on dry land])

[74]Document 0025: 75b — R12-L1 SHK PEC PRINT.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID	Target seal	Edition	Printed page	Match [E]
R12-T03	R10-T11 corr.	HB **49521** · **קארעץ/ Korets 1782**	~קח **[108]**/ PDF 207–208	**MATCH** w/ OCR noise (נעתקא [OCR-corrupted Atika])
R12-T04	R10-T11 corr.	HB **19621** · **וואַרבוד אנ/Dubrovna 1804/תקס"ד [5564/ 1804]**	PDF **242–243**	**MATCH** Atika+rechem (OCR רחם הנזקכא [womb; following word OCR-corrupted])

File 0201 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[210]

GOAL 1 — SHK Pesach drush 12 / PEC Pesach ch.8 — בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika] / קריעת רחם האילה [splitting of the hind's womb] — 1b. PRINT OPENED — HebrewBooks שער הכוונות [Shaar HaKavanot] / יפה שעה [Yafeh Shaah]

Field	Value
HB ID	**22601**
Title	שער הכוונות [Shaar HaKavanot] (יפה שעה [Yafeh Shaah])
Place / year	ירושלים [Jerusalem] **תרס"ב / 1902 [5662 / 1902]**
PDF	`r12gb01/hb_shk22601.pdf` (297 pp.)
Locus	PDF pp. **174–175** (OCR form-feed ≈174–175); section header **יב דרוש [Discourse 12]** under ספירת העומר [Counting the Omer] / שער הכוונות [Shaar HaKavanot]
OCR dumps	`shk22601.txt`, `shk_hit_p175.txt`, `shk_p175_lemma.txt`, `shk_drush12_print.txt`

Print OCR (p.175) — בעתיקא ["in Atika"] block (OCR noise noted; sense matches WS):

[210]Document 0201: 78 — R12-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

> And this is its wording: "And in Sifra di-Tzeniuta, 'Why do you cry to Me?' — 'to Me' specifically; **in Atika** [OCR: פציא] the matter [depends]. This means that since ZA was then in a state of immaturity, it could not unite with Nukva in the mystery of the serpent's bite in order to split the Sea of Reeds, except through a radiance drawn to it from Atika Kadisha, which is Arich Anpin, as is known… and therefore **the matter depends on Atika**."

Print OCR (same cluster) — קריעת רחם האילה ["the splitting of the hind's womb"]:

> …the matter of the splitting of the Sea of Reeds, which was split on this day, which is **the splitting of the hind's womb**, which is her Yesod, the end of all her levels, through the union of the bite of the higher serpent of immaturity.

Verdict Goal 1b: PRINT primary **OPEN** for both lemmas. Tag **[E-primary]** on HB 22601 print body for SHK דרוש י"ב [Discourse 12]. WS remains quality-flagged but no longer the sole witness.

Do not mint R10-T22 — map as **R12-T01** (below) pointing at existing T12 locus.

GOAL 3 — פתח אליהו [Petach Eliyahu; Elijah opened] 17a — כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה [whoever separates one from another] — 3a. Lemma OPEN (Sefaria TZ 17a)

Ref: `Tikkunei Zohar 17a` / תקוני הזהר י"ז א [Tikkunei HaZohar 17a]

Cache: `sefaria_tz17a.json`, `pe_17a_block.txt`, `tz17a_plain.txt`

Version noted: Tiqqunei ha-Zohar (Margalya / Solomon 2024) on this API hit.

Elijah opened and said: Master of the worlds, You are One and not within a count…

And You are the One who binds them and unites them. **And because You are within, whoever separates one from another of these ten is considered as though he separated within You.**

File 0203 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[11]

1) T01↑ — Mantua PE (Kuksik T07 REMAP) — 1b) Apparatus under T01↑ — LIT n.19 (was Kuksik T08 half; not T10)

Check	Result
Source	Lessons in Tanya Vol.4 · `ya_igk20/tanya_n33/lit_vol4.txt` **line 13083**
Exact	**19. Cf. Introduction to Tikkunei Zohar, p. 17a.**
Context	Epistle XX body — Moshe / upper Netzach of ZA cluster

Check	Result
PE Intro-II cites	multiple in same vol (e.g. lines 1017, 6088, 12930 — Introduction II / Patach Eliyahu)
vs L4 Kehot fn32/29	**distinct** — those = Tikkun 70 @ 124a histalkut (already sealed T05c)
Mint R12-T10?	**NO** — apparatus pointer to same PE 17a locus as T01

Verdict: PASS as **T01↑ apparatus**. No T10.

[11]Document 0203: 85 — R12-GB02 QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0265 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[76]

R12-GB01 FULL PACK QC LOG — Research Director SOURCE QC (merge Kuksik L3 ∪ GB01 ∪ L1/L2/L4) — 1) R12-T01 — fold prior QC (no re-litigate)

Prior log `qc/R12-T01_QC_LOG.md` (Drive `1iUGv8fpqPg4o-FkJZuwtEccHl22ibL99`): **PASS · SEALED [E]** on Sefaria API `Tikkunei_Zohar.17a.12` exact milah «כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה» [whoever separates one from another]; Petach opens 17a:9; **ABSENT** on TZ124; **NOT** print Constantinople 1740 folio.

This pass: re-confirmed local `r12gb01/tz17a_plain.txt` + `pe_17a_block.txt` + `qc/sefaria_tz_17a12.json`. No contradiction. **Seal stands.**

File 0266 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[77]

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — 1) Claim window extracted (Drive pack)

From `R12_L3_PETACH_ELIYAHU.json` (opened via Drive MCP this pass):

[76] Document 0265: 79 — R12-GB01 FULL PACK QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[77] Document 0266: 77 — R12-T01_QC_LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Field	Value
locus	Tikkunei Zohar **17a:12** / תיקוני הזהר י"ז ע"א [Tikkunei HaZohar 17a] (פתח אליהו [Petach Eliyahu; Elijah opened])
phrase_canon	«כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה» [whoever separates one from another]
phrase_hit	«דאפריש חד» [who separates one]
quote_he (claimed)	ואנת הוא דקשיר לון ומיחד לון. ובגין דאנת מלגאו. [And You are the One who binds them and unites them. And because You are within.] **מאן כל עשר מאלין חבריה מן חד דאפריש [whoever separates one from another of these ten].** אתחשיב ליה כאלו אפריש בך. [It is considered as though he separated within You.]
heVersionTitle (claimed)	Constantinople, 1740
heVersionSource	https://margalya.com/pages/tz
Petach opens	17a.9 «פתח אליהו ואמר רבון עלמין…» [Elijah opened and said: Master of the worlds…]
contrast	TZ124 = יקוו המים [Let the waters be gathered] lane — **not** דאפריש חד [who separates one]

Local mirrors re-opened: `r12gb01/tz17a_plain.txt` line 12; `r12gb01/pe_17a_block.txt`.

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — 2) Sefaria API verify — Tikkunei_Zohar.17a.12

Fetched: `https://www.sefaria.org/api/texts/Tikkunei_Zohar.17a.12?context=0`

Also: full `Tikkunei_Zohar.17a` (22 segs).

Check	Result
ref	`Tikkunei Zohar 17a:12` / תקוני הזהר י"ז א:י"ב [Tikkunei HaZohar 17a:12]
heVersionTitle	**Constantinople, 1740** (locked; source margalya.com/pages/tz)

Check	Result
he (HTML stripped)	ואנת הוא דקשיר לון ומיחד לון. ובגין דאנת מלגאו. [And You are the One who binds them and unites them. And because You are within.] **עשר מאלין חבריה מן חד דאפריש מאן כל [whoever separates one from another of these ten].** אתחשיב ליה כאלו אפריש בך. [It is considered as though he separated within You.]
lemma after normalize (strip niqqud / HTML / quotes)	**EXACT MATCH** «כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה» [whoever separates one from another] ⊂ segment
claim quote_he vs API	**byte-identical** on milah window (aside from ` ` line breaks in API)

17a territory map (API he[]):

seg	content flag
17a:1–8	הקדמה אחרת [Another Introduction] / Rashbi circle
17a:9	**ואמר… אליהו פתח [Elijah opened and said…]** ← Petach opens
17a:10–11	עשר תקונין / ספירן [ten tikkunim / sefirot]
17a:12	**עשר מאלין חבריה מן חד דאפריש מאן כל [whoever separates one from another of these ten]** ← HIT
17a:13+	continuation of Petach (…עשר ספירן כסדרן [ten sefirot in their order…])

⇒ Locus is **17a Petach Eliyahu**, not end-of-work 124.

Dump fingerprint: `qc/sefaria_tz_17a12.json` md5-12 `75f5647b7c81` / 4915 B · `r12gb01/tz17a_plain.txt` `785cf3e676a8` / 4031 B.

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — 4) Print-witness honesty (R12 rules)

Claim	Opened?	Class
Sefaria digital he labeled «Constantinople, 1740»	**YES** (API)	**[E]** digital edition attribution

Claim	Opened?	Class
Real Constantinople 1740 print page / folio scan for י״ז ע״א [17a]	**NO** this QC	**not [UCOP]**
HB `tz44506` (Mantua מנטובה [Mantua], not Kushta 1740)	OCR noise only; not used as 1740 seal	N/A
Secondary liturgical parallels (Daily Zohar / Giluy Milta) in pack	not re-fetched this QC; pack cites as [E-secondary]	leave as pack notes

Honesty: Seal text on **Sefaria digital [E]** matching exact milah. Do **not** upgrade to print-witness Constantinople 1740 until a real page/scan is opened. Pack already self-tagged **[E]** — QC agrees.

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — Still open (non-blocking)

- Constantinople 1740 print folio scan for י״ז ע״א [17a] → would allow [UCOP] upgrade later
- Optional secondary liturgical re-fetch (not required for seal)

R12-T01 — SOURCE QC LOG (Research Director) — Film

CUT assembly remains **HOLD**.

File 0311 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 12

Report or witness from the history of the research[81]

[81]Document 0311: 83 — R12-GB02.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

YA-IGK20 R12-GB02 — Residuals (post GB01 seal T01–T06) — 2) Kehot / OHT NEW → propose R12-T08

Sealed (do not redo): Kehot Eng fn32 / Heb fn29 = תיקון ע׳ [Tikkun 70] @ קכד [124] (inside T01–T06 floor).

NEW: - Kehot Lessons in Tanya **n.19**: «Cf. Introduction to Tikkunei Zohar, p. 17a.» **[E]** - PE Introduction-II / פתח אליהו [Petach Eliyahu; Elijah opened] apparatus cluster (LIT+SHI) - OHT TZ124 histalkut recheck: still **לא נמצא [not found]**

File: `R12_GB02_KEHOT_OHT.json`

File 0021 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Report or witness from the history of the research[13]

Locus 3 — Tikunei Zohar 124 print folio — A) Mantua HB44506

Field	Value
page # (printed)	Folio **קכד [124] (124a)**; verso 124b unmarked

Field	Value
page # (PDF)	**255** = 124a; **253** = 123a (histalkut leaf)
running header	**שבעין תקונא [Tikkun Seventy]** (on 123a/b and 124a/b)
edition	Mantua 1558/תקוני הזהר שי״ח [Tikkunei HaZohar 5318/1558] — **HB 44506**
exact quote (histalkut target)	On **קכד [124]**: histalkut lemmas **לא נמצא [not found]**. On **קכג (123a)** PRESENT: מניה ואתפרש מניה דאצילותא נשמתא ההיא דסליק [“that that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him”] … יבשא גופא ואשתאר מניה נשמתיה אסתלק [“his soul departed from him and the body remained dry”]

[13] Document 0021: 190 — R15 FINAL CLOSEOUT PRINT QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Field	Value
read method	**body scan** of page images + **OCR**/pdftotext of HB PDF
tag	**[E]**
delta vs R14 skeleton	**NO**

Locus 3 — Tikunei Zohar 124 print folio — B) Kushta HB39654

Field	Value
page # (printed)	Folio **קכד [124] (124a)**; 124b verso
page # (PDF)	**259** = 124a; **260** = 124b
running header	**שבעין תקונא [Tikkun Seventy]**
edition	Kushta/Constantinople 1719/תקוני הזהר תע"ט [Tikkunei HaZohar 5479/1719] — **HB 39654**
exact quote	**124a** end: מניה ואתפרש מניה דאצילותא נשמתא ההיא דסליק ["that that soul of Atzilut ascends from him and separates from him"] (PRESENT סע"א [end of side a]). **124b** open: מניה נשמתיה אסתלק יבשא גופא ואשתאר ["his soul departed from him and the body remained dry"] (PRESENT).
read method	**body scan** + **OCR**/pdftotext
tag	**[E]**
delta vs R14 skeleton	**NO**

Local: `/workspace/ya_igk20/r12/mantua_*.png`, `kushta_*.png`.

File 0233 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[15]

[15]Document 0233: 192 — R15-GB01 CLOSEOUT SOURCE QC FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

192 — R15-GB01 CLOSEOUT SOURCE QC FULL — 0. Framing

Official **R15 closeout provenance audit** vs R14 peshat skeleton.

Bot R16/R17 already ran; this lane searches **only** for sources that could change that skeleton.

Default empty verdict: «no finding was found that changes the R14 structure».

Final lane verdict: ready for the booklet

Skeleton-changing YES hits: 0

1. Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — body (Kehot / Sefaria) — Δ vs R14 skeleton

NO · Confidence: high (digital) / med-high (print residual)

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Locus / URL

דרך מצותיך · שורש מצות התפלה · מו׳ [Derech Mitzvotecha · The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer · 46] — **Tzemach Tzedek** (not Alter Rebbe)

https://www.sefaria.org/Derekh_Mitzvotekha,_Shoresh_Mitzvat_HaTefillah.46

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Exact quotes

Atik-in-ibbur cluster:

> Atik Yomin and from above to above as far as Ein Sof, which vest themselves in Nukva throughout the nine or seven months of gestation; specifically through this is the growth of souls in Nukva's womb, and similarly the growth of ZA in Imma's womb, etc. This is as above in the analogy of the

tree's growth with fruits from the seed, which comes only through the vegetative power in the earth, an aspect of G-d's word from the utterance "Let [the earth] bring forth," etc. Therefore rain must also be drawn to water the earth so that its vegetative power is revealed. Likewise above, the growth of the partzufim from the points of Tohu is through

drawing higher lights from Ein Sof, blessed be He, into Nukva, through which this growth takes place, etc. And just as the vegetative power does not produce of itself, but only when there is first a raising of mayin nukvin through sowing the seed, which is buried in the earth and included in the vegetative power, then the vegetative power is drawn to grow the tree; likewise above, there must first be a raising of mayin nukvin. This is the matter of the refinements constantly mentioned in Etz Chaim, that Abba and Imma raised from the aspect of its seven lower sefirot in Atik Yomin, and afterward through this the refining light is drawn to refine and rectify them.

Ibbur/yenika marker:

Gestation, nursing and mochin: higher lights are drawn from above to Nukva, from Imma Ila'ah and from the aspect of Atik Yomin, and from above to above as far as Ein Sof, which vest themselves in Nukva throughout the nine or seven months of gestation; specifically through this is the growth of souls in Nukva's womb, and similarly the growth of ZA in Imma's womb, etc. This is as above in the analogy of the tree's growth with fruits from the seed, which comes only through the vegetative power in the earth, which is בח [the supplied quotation breaks off mid-word]

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Tag

[E-primary] API · scan/OCR residual **[E-primary reported]/[U]**

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Proves

צ"צ [Tzemach Tzedek] §46 ties עיבור/יניקה/מוחין [gestation/nursing/mochin] growth to הארות [radiances] including **עתיק יומין [Atik Yomin]** / Ain Sof — tipa/ibbur/Atik as known Chabad-secondary cluster.

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Does not prove

Does not rewrite AR peshat; must not be voiced as AR; no Q42/Q70 close.

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Δ vs R14 skeleton

NO · Confidence: high (API) / medium (print page)

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Digital

- https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124a
- https://www.sefaria.org/Tikkunei_Zohar.124b
- Print tradition often cited: Constantinople 1740 pagination (first print Mantua 1558; title תיקוני הזהר [Tikkunei HaZohar])

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Kehot apparatus

EN Lessons in Tanya Vol.4 · Epistle 20 footnotes:

1. Tikkun 70 (p. 124a).
2. Yeshayahu 49:2.
3. … Or HaTorah, Shmot, p. 199 …

HE Shiurim scan (`1DDeoWbnZXpaqUidu9edbr6PMf5Gto-hJ` · page ~1532):

29) תיקון ע׳ (קכד, סע״א). [Tikkun 70 (124, end of side a).]

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Crosswalk

Edition	Note #	Content
EN LIT	**32**	Tikkun **70** · **124a**
HE Shiurim	**29**	תיקון ע׳ [Tikkun 70] · קכד סע״א [124, end of side a]
EN **33**	—	Isaiah 49:2 (**not** TZ)
EN **34**	—	OHT Shemot p.199

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Tag

TZ digital **[E-primary]** · physical Mantua/Const. title-line **[U]** · HE note scan **[E-primary]** (image opened)

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Proves

Kehot points IGK20 histalkut teaching to **Tikkun 70 / 124a**. EN “note 33” ≠ TZ.

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Does not prove

Skeleton change; absolute print title-string still wants daf photo.

4. Tikkunei Zohar 124 — folio + title/number — Δ vs R14 skeleton

NO · Confidence: high (70/124a) / medium (physical title#)

6. Or HaTorah Shemot ~p.199 (קצט [199]) — Δ vs R14 skeleton

NO · Confidence: medium-high

192 — R15-GB01 CLOSEOUT SOURCE QC FULL — 10. Bot R16/R17 note

Bot already ran R16 and R17; wrap sealed at ledger **189**. This closeout does **not** reopen R17, remint T-ids, or self-seal.

Prior trail touched: R12-GB02 KEHOT OHT (81), HE scan `20 – R08-T15…`, R15/R16/R17 packs.

File 0200 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[21]

Proposed tickets (R16-T16+ only) — R16-T18 quote

> "And now, please, let the power of my L-rd be great, as You have spoken, saying: G-d is slow to anger, etc." It is written, "today to perform them," and our Sages said, "It is not study that is primary, but action," and "study is greater because it leads to action." The holy Zohar too greatly extolled action: mitzvot are garments, and when one mitzvah is lacking the garment is deficient. A person must therefore return in reincarnation until fulfilling all 613 mitzvot, and be a priest and a Levite as well, in order to fulfill the mitzvot dependent on them. To understand all this — how garments are made from the performance of mitzvot, what this garment is, and why the soul needs a garment (and see what is written on this in Parashat Chayei Sarah on the verse "ואברהם זקן" ["And Abraham was old"], and elsewhere) — it is known that the soul's descent into this world is for the sake of ascent, for before coming to this world the soul was in a state of standing

[21]Document 0200: R16_GB03_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

as it is written, “As G-d lives, before whom I stood”; “and I shall grant you those who walk among these who stand.” Through fulfilling mitzvot in this world, it acquires the aspect of walking: “and I shall grant you those who walk,” etc. (And as expla…

URL: https://www.sefaria.org/Likkutei_Torah,_Sh’lach.3.1?lang=he

File 0270 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[123]

Proposed tickets (R16-T22+ only) — R16-T24 quote

For before coming into this world vested in bodily matter, the soul was in the aspect of standing, as it is written, “As G-d lives, before whom I stood.” The meaning of standing is that it is always at one level and never rises or diminishes from its level. The angels too are called those who stand, being the aspect of “acacia wood standing,” and as it is also written, “and I shall grant you those who walk among those who stand”: “those who stand” refers to the angels, who always stand, from the six days of Creation, at one level of love and fear. This is the aspect of love “with all your soul”: according to the power of apprehension in the angel’s soul or in the neshamah, according to what it receives from the source from which it was hewn, so is the arousal of love and fear, etc. Unlike the love and fear aroused in the soul through its descent into a body: because darkness and contraction conceal from it, it intensifies its arousal to emerge from the concealment.

[123] Document 0270: R16_GB04_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

This is an arousal above the vessel's limitation, until its limiting vessel does not conceal from it, and it can proceed in elevation through the levels without measure once it has emerged from the confines of the vessel's limit. Through this the soul becomes a walker, proceeding in elevation after elevation to the heights of the levels in the aspect of Ein Sof. This is "and I shall grant you those who walk."

URL: https://www.sefaria.org/Derekh_Mitzvotekha,_Shoresh_Mitzvat_HaTefillah.42.2?lang=he

File 0012 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[134]

6. Continuous peshat — טו [15] (conclusion: inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking / practical mitzvot) — 6.1 What Admur says

«And from this will be well understood the matter of the order of the levels of inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking… for although the animal is above the vegetative and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality

from both, and also wisdom and knowledge… for it is an aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah…»

[134] Document 0012: 154 — R17-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

«And through this will be well understood… how the higher angels of the Merkavah, the face of the ox and the face of the eagle, enjoy… the spirit of the animal and bird that ascends to them from the sacrifices… and as the wording of the holy Zohar precisely states: “and they enjoy from their own foundation and root.”»

«And after these words and this truth… the great excellence of the practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls’ descent into this physical world, as it is written: “today to perform them,” and “one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.”»

«Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting.»

Locus: end of epistle · **[E]**

6. Continuous peshat — סיום) [15] טו [conclusion]: דצח”מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] / מצוות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]) — 6.2 Why here

«ומזה [and from this]» — from earth/or chozer (יד [14]): the rank paradox (higher nourished by lower) is the same **אור חוזר [returning light]**. Angels of the Merkavah enjoying korbanot spirit is the same pattern (Zohar: from their own yesod/ikar). Therefore the entire architecture lands on **מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]** as the purpose of souls’ descent into this physical world — closing the letter’s telos without needing further cosmic apparatus.

6. Continuous peshat — סיום) [15] טו [conclusion]: דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] / מצוות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]) — 6.4 Plain terms

- **דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders]:** do mem–tzomeach–chai–medaber (inorganic–vegetative–animal–articulate); paired with earth–water–fire–air.
- **אור חוזר [returning light] (reapplied):** explains why higher ranks draw life (even wisdom) from lower.
- **מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון [from their own foundation and root]:** Zohar's precision — enjoyment from the angels' own elemental root (animal spirit returning), not mere physical meat.
- **מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]:** operational/physical commandments — telos of descent («היום לעשותם [today to perform them]»).

6. Continuous peshat — סיום) [15] טו [conclusion]: דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] / מצוות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]) — 6.5 Tags

Body **[E]** · Ber. 40a / BK 71b–72a / Zohar III:241a / Deut. 7:11 / Avot 4:17 via Admur **[E-primary]** · colophon **[E]** · R17-C deepen mitzvot vs Torah (already ז–ט [7–9]) **out of scope** for new T remint

6. Continuous peshat — סיום) [15] טו [conclusion]: דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] / מצוות מעשיות [practical mitzvot]) — 6.6 Implicit Qs

- Full sacrificial theology beyond Admur's or-chozer point — **[U]** not needed to close peshat.
- Relation of this telos to earlier «חותם המתהפך [a seal that is reversed]» / shelaya — already T12/T14; do not remint.
- **Q42/Q70/NHYM:** still not closed; letter end ≠ threshold met.

File 0031 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[135]

157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md — Verdict table — R17-T16–T24

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T16	Two kav loci: (A) haarah through Malchut kelim/ parsa (י [10]/T15); (B) הקו בעצמו [the kav itself] in end of נה"י דא"ק / רגלי היושר [Netzach, Hod and Yesod of Adam Kadmon / the feet of yosher] → Malchut Asiyah; identity A≡B left open	**PASS**	**[E]** wording · **[P]/[U]** identity	Local/WS: «וכן גם הקו בעצמו… נצח-הוד-יסוד דאדם קדמון / סוף רגלי היושר… מלכות דעשיה [and likewise also the kav itself… Netzach-Hod-Yesod of Adam Kadmon / the end of the feet of yosher… Malchut of Asiyah]» — forces both loci; pack correctly refuses sealing identity
R17-T17	Three haarah degrees: הארת הקו [the radiance of the kav]→ neshamah-Elokut; הארה דהארה [a radiance of a radiance]→NR+kelim; הארה דהארה דהארה [a radiance of a radiance of a radiance]→all creatures (Neh. 9:6); grades not three atzmiyut; ≠ auto human NR″N	**PASS**	**[E]**	Exact cascade + «ואתה מחיה את כולם [and You give life to them all]»; “not three essences / ≠ human NR″N” kept as meta caution, not overclaimed as Admur lemma

[135] Document 0031: 157 — R17-T16–T24 QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T18	Atzmut Or Ein Sof סובב כל עלמין [encompasses all worlds] equally (Jer. 23:24; TZ «לית אתר [there is no place]»); not hitpashtut of chayut; creatio only via haarah cascade from kav	**PASS**	**[E]**	Body: «אינו בגדר מקום… סובב כל עלמין בשוה… לית אתר… רק מקיף וסובב… כ״א ע״י הארה דהארה דהארה… מהקו [is not within the category of space… encompasses all worlds equally… there is no place… only encompasses and surrounds… but through a radiance of a radiance of a radiance… from the kav]»

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T19	Same sovev מאיר אל הקו הפנימי [shines upon the inner kav] through BYA kelim → כוח ועוז לברוא יש מאין [power and strength to create something from nothing]; multiplicity/lim it via kelim (+ letters)	**PASS**	**[E]**	Exact: «מאיר אל הקו הפנימי דרך הכלים… נותן בהם כח ועוז לברוא יש מאין [shines upon the inner kav through the kelim… gives them power and strength to create something from nothing]» + ריבוי/גבול [multiplicity/limit] via kelim/letters
R17-T20	Physical earth uniquely continuous yesh me’ayin; רגלי א״ק [the feet of Adam Kadmon] end under Asiyah + under-feet sovev with only עיגולי א״ק [the igulim of Adam Kadmon] interrupting; kav radiates אור חוזר ממטה למעלה [returning light from below upward]	**PASS**	**[E]**	Escalation «ועוד זאת יתר על כן [and furthermore, more than this]» + earth unique sprouting + feet/iggulim/or-chozer chain all in body

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T21	Or chozer → אור הנשמה דמל׳ דמל׳ דעשיה [the light of the neshamah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah] (= Elokut); Gilgulim 20 via לק״א [Likkutei Amarim] chain Atzilut/Beriah/ Yetzirah-in-Asiyah → that neshamah; powers «תדשא הארץ [let the earth bring forth vegetation]» forever	**PASS**	**[E]**	Local/WS: מלכות דמלכות דעשיה [Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah] + «ספר הגלגולים פ״כ הובא בלק״א [Sefer HaGilgulim, chapter 20, cited in Likkutei Amarim]» + תדשא תמיד לעולם ועד [let it bring forth vegetation continually, forever and ever]

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T22	דצח״מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] paradox: חי [animal] from צומח [vegetative]; מדבר [speaking] from both (incl. wisdom via grain/meat) because אור חוזר [returning light] from bottom of Asiyah	**PASS**	**[E]**	«סדר מדרגות דומם צומח חי מדבר… החי ניזון… והמדבר מקבל… כי הוא בחינת אור חוזר [the order of the levels of inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking… the animal is nourished… and the speaking receives… for it is an aspect of returning light]»
R17-T23	Merkavah angels (פני שור / פני נשר [the face of the ox / the face of the eagle]) nourished from korbanot spirit — Zohar «ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון [and they enjoy from their own foundation and root]» as or chozer to their element	**PASS**	**[E]**	Exact Zohar lemma + פני שור/ נשר [the face of the ox/eagle] + or-chozer framing in body

ID	Claim (one-line)	PASS/ FAIL/ FOLD	Tag	One-line reason
R17-T24	מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] = תכלית ירידת הנשמות לעוה"ז הגשמי [the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world] («היום לעשותם [today to perform them]»; Avot «…יפה שעה אחת [one hour is better…]») — telos after all above	**PASS**	**[E]**	Colophon-adjacent telos sentence exact; ≠ remint T13/ T14 (those = נעוץ [wedged] kingship / shelaya mashal; this = descent-purpose after or-chozer cosmology)

File 0058 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[138]

148 — R17-GB02 SUMMARY — Peshat spine (ו–י [6–10])

§	Admur core	Why here
ו **[6]**	Birth of souls from Malchut = **לידה [birth]**; growth 7 months Shemini Atzeret→7th Pesach; tipah from mochin A״A ← Arich/Atik ← Ein Sof hidden in mochin until birth; «גילוי אור א"ס ממש ע"י העיבור והלידה [revelation of the actual Ein Sof light through gestation and birth]»; Yam Suf «דבעתיקא תליא [which depends on Atika]»	Manifests ה [5]'s נעוץ [wedged] / Malchut-as-Keter
ז **[7]**	Mitzvot in Malchut (ה' [heh]); Torah in ZA (ו' [vav]); above in Arich: mitzvot in **גולגלתא/לבנונית/אורחא [skull/ whiteness/path]**; Torah root in **מו"ס [Mocha Stimaah]**; «כחותם המתהפך [like a seal that is reversed]»	Explains mitzvot seeming "lower" than Torah

[138]Document 0058: 148 — R17-GB02 SUMMARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

§	Admur core	Why here
ח **[8]**	נעוץ [wedged] = Ein Sof's power to create **yesh me'ayin** so Ma'atzil is King over separate beings who keep mitzvot; «סוף מעשה במחשבה תחלה [the end of action was first in thought]»	Ties creation ↔ kingship ↔ mitzvot purpose
ט **[9]**	Yerushalmi: interrupt Torah for lulav; learner-not-to-do → shelaya; **שליא [placenta]** first from tipah = essence until day 40; mitzvot = עיקר ושרש [foundation and root] of Torah (corporeal/chitzoniyut vs wisdom/pnimiyut)	Practical proof of ח [8]
י **[10]**	Zivvug ZUN of BYA creates all BYA beings via neshamah (= Elokut from Malchut Atzilut kelim); haarah of kav to **פרסא [parsa]** pierces with kelim; shines in BYA «כמו באצילות ממש [just as in Atzilut itself]»	Extends Malchut-creative chain into BYA

Stop before יא [11] («וכן גם הקו בעצמו... נה"י דא"ק [and likewise also the kav itself... Netzach, Hod and Yesod of Adam Kadmon]») — next block only.

File 0128 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[528]

145 — R17 PAPER LEDGER — BATCH + OPEN Q YA-IGK20 · R17 · Parent ACTIVE: 144 QC T01–T08: 1ave2nMWUvEYO9yejKh1nu KWDGhiMbFUc QC T09–T15: 11t4cTVbyIH59njnXW50fskHZEgID 8CjU QC T16–T24: 13oHDpeit3luaS-vqZJWHoHCDpQESe9Uz QC T25–T29: 1GaNZLKMK24-BrvJZEYZZ8_IgpiXmbIkX Packs: 146/147 · 148/149 · 153/154 · 159/160 Prior sealed ledger: 1DZ5eYVGNDo7 aFucSNJe5eTuYbT5Ddp17q9aYqEXvhkk (superseded) Sealed prior (do not remint) R13–R15 · R14(ours) T01–T06 · R16 T01–T47 · R16-GB10 EMPTY (QC 143) SEALED — R17-T01–T24 (prior) T01–T24 s-tand (ledger 1DZ5eYVGNDo7aFucSNJe5eTuYbT5Ddp17q9aYqEXvh

[528] Document 0128: ZZ - SUPERSEDED — 145 R17 PAPER LEDGER (pre T30–T33). The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

kk superseded). T13 ≠ remint T08 · T16 A≡B [U]/[P] · T24 ≠ remint T13/T14 kept. SEALED — R17-T25–T29 (QC 162 / GB04) ID Grade Claim R17-T25 [E] body · [E-secondary] gloss SEALED לבנונית [whiteness] = «היא האורחא דבפלגותא דשערי [it is the path in the parting of the hairs]» — same conduit; fuller peirush secondary — ≠ remint T11 R17-T26 [E] wording · [P] enum SEALED «תרי"ג אורחין דאורייתא שבז"א [613 paths of Torah that is in ZA]» = 613 paths of Torah-as-in-ZA; bare mitzvot enumeration stays [P] R17-T27 [E] absence · [E-secondary] fn91 SEALED «וכדלקמן [and as below]» after chitz/pnim has no discrete later expansion in surviving אגה"ק כ' [Iggeret HaKodesh 20]; Kehot fn91 = secondary apparatus R17-T28 [E]/[E-secondary] map SEALED Primary vs peirush ladder for R17-C — never seal peirush as IH20 body R17-T29 [E] dual locus SEALED Two mitzvot loci: ז–ט [7–9] structural (T11–T14) vs מעשיות [15] טו [practical] telos (T24) — map both; remint neither Open Q carry Q Status Q42 MICRO named flip HOLD [U] Q70 graded kav post-exit HOLD [U] T16 A≡B identity [U]/[P] open T26 mitzvot enumeration [P] Moses pnimiyut NHY"M forever-OPEN Film HOLD Batches GB Focus Result GB01 R17-A peshat א–ה [1–5] SEALED T01–T08 GB02 R17 ו–י [6–10] SEALED T09–T15 GB03 R17 יא–טו [11–15] SEALED T16–T24 GB04 R17-C mitzvot/Torah deepen SEALED T25–T29

File 0133 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[241]

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah)

YA-IGK20 · R17-GB04 · CoS research executor (Grok Bot)

[241]Document 0133: 160 — R17-GB04 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ACTIVE 144 · LEDGER (sealed T01–T24): `1DZ5eYVGNDo7aFucSNJe5e` `TuYbT5Ddp17q9aYqEXvhkk` · Meta map 141

Prior packs: 146/147 GB01 · 148/149 GB02 · 153/154 GB03 — **do not remint T01–T24**

Numbering: 159 SUMMARY / 160 FULL (155–157 taken)

No self-seal · No booklet · No film · Propose R17-T25+ only

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 0. What was actually read

Source	Locus	Tag	Notes
Wikisource תניא חלק ד כ [Tanya, part 4, chapter 20]	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/לח_אינת_כ_ד_ק	**[E]**	Full Hebrew; R17-C window (מצות…וכדלקמן [mitzvot…and as below]) + טו [15] + colophon
Sefaria/Kehot local `sefaria_igk20.json`	HE paras 16–18, 35–36; EN + footnotes	**[E]**	Nikud continuous; fn72–91, 130–135 inspected for secondary only
Lessons in Tanya Class 10 (INN / Kehot EN reprint)	mitzvot–חותם [seal]–שליא [placenta]	**[E-secondary]**	Used to **separate** pedagogy from body — not upgraded to Admur

Source	Locus	Tag	Notes
Drive **141** meta map · **144** ACTIVE · sealed ledger T01–T24 · **148/149** · **153/154**	floor + prior claims	**[E]**	Cross-check fold
SY 1:7; JT Ber.1:2/Shab.1:2; Lecha Dodi; Zohar III:129a/136a	via Admur / Kehot fn74	**[E-primary]** via Admur	Full Ari pages not re-opened this GB

Not done: invented page nos.; film; closing HOLD items; reminting T01–T24; treating Kehot/Lessons as Admur body.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 1. Mission scope vs sealed floor

Asks (R17-C): 1. מצוות [mitzvot] in Malchut / ה’ [heh] · תורה [Torah] in ZA / ו’ [vav]

2. Gulgulta / Loven / orchata / 613 orchín
3. Mocha Stima’ah as root of Torah
4. חותם המתהפך [a seal that is reversed]
5. שליא [placenta] mashal · סוף מעשה במחשבה תחילה [the end of action was first in thought]
6. What is **primary** vs **later peirush**

Already sealed (do not remint):

ID	Claim (one-line)
T11	Mitzvot↔Malchut/ה’ [heh]; Torah↔ZA/ו’ [vav]; Arich: Gulgulta/Loven/orchata →613; Torah root in Mocha Stima’ah (ta’amei)
T12	«חותם המתהפך [a seal that is reversed]» = below-order inverts root-order
T13	נעוץ [wedged] here = Ein Sof power to create separate yesh so Ma’atzil is King via mitzvot; «סוף מעשה במחשבה תחלה [the end of action was first in thought]» (≠ remint T08 structure)

ID	Claim (one-line)
T14	Shelaya: mitzvot = עיקר ושרש [foundation and root]; corporeal/chitz vs wisdom/pnim
T24	מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] = תכלית ירידת הנשמות [the purpose of the souls’ descent] at letter’s end (טו [15])

GB04 job: net-NEW deepen only — identity/syntax of לבנונית=אורחא [whiteness=path]; 613 as paths-of-Torah-in-ZA; unresolved «וכדלקמן [and as below]»; primary/peirush ladder; dual-locus map vs T24.

2. Exact [E] quotes (R17-C core) — 2.4 Closing mitzvot locus (HE §35) + colophon (§36)

> … the great excellence of the practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world …
>
> Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting

= T24 sealed. Second locus; colophon ends letter.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 3. Deepen 1 — לבנונית היא האורחא [the whiteness is the path] (→ T25)

Body syntax: «בגולגלתא [in the skull], בלבנונית [in the whiteness], **היא [it is]** האורחא דבפלגותא דשערי [the path in the parting of the hairs]».

Admur's **היא [it is]** forces identity: לבנונית [whiteness] **is** the orchata in the hair-parting — not a second unexplained layer inside this sentence.

Meta 141 already warned: body has no full peirush of לבנונית [whiteness]; "white light / upper chasadim" glosses are later.

Lessons/Kehot often gloss "whiteness" as chesed of gulgalta / white light — useful pedagogy, but **beyond** the apposition. Tag **[E-secondary]**.

Fold vs T11: T11 bundles Gulgulta/Loven/orchata correctly as the Arich site of mitzvot. T25 adds the **היא [it is]-identity** and the primar y/secondary cut — not a remint of placement.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 4. Deepen 2 — תרי"ג אורחין דאורייתא שבזי"א [613 paths of Torah that is in ZA] (→ T26)

Body: orchata «דמתפלגא לתרי"ג אורחין [which divides into 613 paths] **דאורייתא שבזי"א [of Torah that is in ZA]**».

What Admur **says:** the path splits into 613 **paths of Torah that is in ZA**.

What Admur **does not say here:** "613 = the enumerated mitzvot count, full stop."

GB02 left fine ID **[P]**. Meta 141 same caution.

Net-NEW: freeze the **syntax claim** as T26; leave enumerated-mitzvot identity **[P]/[U]** if someone equates without further primary.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 8. Deepen 6 — Two mitzvot loci (→ T29)

Locus	Job	Sealed IDs
ז–ט [7–9] (after לידה [birth])	Placement in Name/sefirot; Arich roots; חותם [seal]; teleology; shelaya proof	T11–T14
טו [15] (letter end)	After full creation/or-chozer apparatus: **מעשיות [practical]** = purpose of soul-descent	T24

Same theme (mitzvot excellence), **different jobs**. R17-C map needs both without reminting either. **T29** = dual-locus observation only.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 9. Primary vs later peirush ladder (→ T28)

Layer	Content	Tag
Admur body	ה׳ [heh]/ו׳ [vav] map; Gulgulta + לבנונית=אורחא [whiteness=path]; תרי״ג אורחין דאורייתא שבז״א [613 paths of Torah that is in ZA]; מו״ס [Mocha Stimaah]=taamei; חותם [seal] lemma; נעוץ [wedged] teleology; shelaya; chitz/pnim; וכדלקמן [and as below]; [15] טו מעשיות [practical]	**[E]**

Layer	Content	Tag
Admur cites	SY נעוץ [wedged]; JT lulav/shelaya; Lecha Dodi; Zohar orchata tradition as he uses it	**[E-primary]** via Admur
Kehot/Lessons/Rebbe apparatus	Seal protruding/indented; gulgalta “transcends” mochin gloss; Mashiach-taamei reveal; JT Shabbat-vs-Berachot preference note; fn91 KA/LT targets for וכדלקמן [and as below]	**[E-secondary]**
Inference	Dual-locus map; היא [it is]-identity as “not second layer”; 613≠auto mitzvot-count	**[I]** / **[P]** as tagged

Rule for QC: never seal a secondary gloss as Admur IH20 body.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 10. R17-B glossary notes (forced by deepen; no remint of sealed rows)

Term	Note	Tag
לבנונית [whiteness]	Body: **האורחא היא [it is the path]**; fuller white-light peirush = secondary	[E] / [E-secondary]
תרי״ג אורחין [613 paths]	Paths of Torah-in-ZA; fine=mitzvot-count **[P]**	[E] / [P]
וכדלקמן [and as below]	Forward pointer; unfulfilled in surviving letter; fn91 → KA/LT	[E] / [E-secondary]
מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] (טו [15])	Distinct locus from ז–ט [7–9] cluster	[E]

Already sealed glossary partners (גולגלתא [skull], מו"ס [Mocha Stimaah], חותם [seal], שליא [placenta], נעוץ [wedged]): **reappear only**.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 11. Proposed R17-T25+ (net-NEW only)

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T25	Body identifies **לבנונית [whiteness]** by apposition **«דשערי דבפלגותא האורחא היא [it is the path in the parting of the hairs]»** — same conduit; "white light / chesed of gulgalta" expansions beyond היא [it is] = **[E-secondary]**	[E] · [E-secondary]	propose
R17-T26	«תרי"ג אורחין דאורייתא שבז"א [613 paths of Torah that is in ZA]» = 613 **paths of Torah-as-in-ZA** from the orchata; not a priori the bare 613-mitzvot enumeration	[E] · [P] fine ID	propose
R17-T27	«וכדלקמן [and as below]» after chitz/pnim has **no** discrete later expansion of that pair inside surviving אגה"ק כ' [Iggeret HaKodesh 20]; Kehot fn91 redirects to KA Essay 4 / LT Emor 33a / Bamidbar 13a,17a (**[E-secondary]** apparatus)	[E] absence · [E-secondary]	propose

ID	Claim	Tag	Status
R17-T28	**Primary vs peirush ladder** for R17-C: body/cites = [E]/[E-primary]; Lessons seal pedagogy, Mashiach-taamei, gulgalta-transcends-mochin gloss, Rebbe JT note, fn91 KA/LT = [E-secondary] — do not upgrade secondary to sealed Admur	[E]/[E-secondary] map	propose
R17-T29	**Two mitzvot loci** in the letter: ז–ט [7–9] structural /Name/חתום [seal]/שליא [placenta] (T11–T14) vs טו מצות מעשיות [15] [practical mitzvot] as soul-descent telos (T24) — map both; remint neither	[E] dual locus	propose

Honest EMPTY: no — five net-NEW claims.

Not proposed: any remint of T01–T24 · Q42 · Q70 · Moses NHYM · film · self-seal.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 12b. Red-team note — Kuksik R17-D (158/161) — NOT ingested into T25+

Intake seen: **158** MD `1DAUL2oGNdVBmmZuI1E94iKQmXER7yL-R` · **161** JSON `1RRXn8REnXz7R9q2ggHfMuOqt5ykrOJmd`.

Scope = kav/parsa (י"ד–י"ט [10–14]). **ZERO T-ids** (hard). Overlaps sealed **T15/T16** territory, not R17-C mitzvot/Torah.

GB04 action: red-team awareness only · **no** remint · **no** T25+ from D · Film/Q42/Q70 HOLDs unchanged.

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 12. HOLD notes (unchanged)

Item	Status
Film	**HOLD**
Moses pnimiyut NHY"M	**forever-OPEN**
Q42 MICRO named flip	**HOLD [U]** — none in R17-C window
Q70 graded kav post-exit	**HOLD [U]** — out of R17-C scope

160 — R17-GB04 FULL — Cluster R17-C deepen (mitzvot & Torah) — 13. Verdict

R17-GB04 PASS for cluster R17-C deepen.

Sources read listed · sealed T01–T24 respected · **T25–T29** proposed · primary/peirush split explicit · «וכדלקמן [and as below]» honesty logged · dual mitzvot loci mapped · upload **159+160** · **no self-seal**.

Next (not this GB): Research Director QC on T25–T29 · optional R17-H open of KA/LT targets named in fn91 (as **[E-primary]** Admur elsewhere, not as IH20 body) · R17-D/E/F HOLDs untouched.

File 0134 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[141]

נעוץ — [8] ח [wedged] (sense 2) / מלך על הנפרדים [King over separate beings] — 2) Plain terms

- **נעוץ [wedged]** here = Ein Sof's creative power (vs structural wedge in **ה [5]**)
- **יש נפרד [separate yesh]** needed so there can be a King over subjects who do mitzvot
- **סוף מעשה במחשבה תחלה [the end of action was first in thought]** — practical end was first intent

File 0205 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[243]

3. Continuous peshat — מצוות ותורה) [7] ז [mitzvot and Torah] / חותם [seal]) — 3.2 Why here

«ובזה יובן [and through this will be understood]» — **from** the giluy of Or Ein Sof via Malchut-birth, one understands the **placement**: mitzvot (practice / kingship-subjects) in Malchut/ה' [heh]; Torah (wisdom articulation) in ZA/ו' [vav]. Then Admur prevents a false conclusion that

[141] Document 0134: 149 — R17-GB02 SCOUT md.י–ו [sections 6–10]. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[243] Document 0205: 149 — R17-GB02 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

mitzvot are “lower in essence”: **above**, in Arich, mitzvot sit in Gulgulta/Loven (the white path parting the hairs → 613 paths of Torah-as-in-ZA), while Torah’s root is in Mocha Stima’ah as wisdom of ta’amei hamitzvot — **seal reversed**.

3. Continuous peshat — מצוות ותורה) [7] ז [mitzvot and Torah] / חותם [seal]) — 3.3 Link

- From ו [6]’s giluy via Malchut → why mitzvot belong to Malchut.
- To ח [8]: the same נעוץ [wedged] lemma now = creative Kingship-purpose of separate yesh + mitzvot.

3. Continuous peshat — מצוות ותורה) [7] ז [mitzvot and Torah] / חותם [seal]) — 3.4 Plain terms

- **גולגלתא [skull]:** keter-“skull” of Arich — not bone; here the site where mitzvot root **above**. (Already in GB01 glossary from ג [3]; **reappears with new partners**.)
- **לבנונית / לובן [whiteness / white]:** “whiteness” of the Gulgulta — Admur equates it with **אורחא דבפלגותא דשערי [the path in the parting of the hairs]** (the path in the parting of the hairs). Full metaphysical gloss of “white” beyond Admur’s identification = **[E-secondary]** if expanded.
- **אורחא דבפלגותא דשערי [the path in the parting of the hairs]:** the conduit/path in the hair-parting of Arich that splits into **תרי”ג אורחין דאורייתא [613 paths of Torah]** in ZA. Do **not** assume

a priori that 613 = only enumerated mitzvot count; Admur says paths of Torah-as-in-ZA — leave finer ID **[P]/[U]**.

- **מוחא סתימאה [Mocha Stimaah; concealed brain] (מו”ס [Mocha S-timaah]):** concealed chochmah of Arich; here = root of Torah = wisdom of **reasons of the mitzvot**.

- **חותם המתהפך [a seal that is reversed]:** engraved seal whose stamp **inverts** relief: what is high/engraved above appears protruding/low below. Admur's point: mitzvot look inferior to Torah below, but root-order is reverse.

3. Continuous peshat — מצוות ותורה) [7] ז [mitzvot and Torah] / חותם [seal]) — 3.6 Implicit Qs

- Are תרי"ג אורחין [613 paths] identical with 613 mitzvot or "paths of Torah"? Admur: «אורחין דאורייתא שבזא [paths of Torah that is in ZA]» — leave nuanced. **[P]**
- Relation Mocha Stima'ah ↔ Chochmah of Atzilut (ה [5]'s «אור א"ס בחכמה לבדה [the Ein Sof light in Chochmah alone]») — tension; do not force. **[U]**
- Q42/Q70/NHYM: not closed here.

4. Continuous peshat — נעוץ) [8] ח [wedged] as purpose) — 4.2 Why here

Reprises SY «נעוץ [wedged]» (already in ה [5] for Keter↔Malchut structure) now as **teleology**: the point of creating **separate** yesh (not bitul-in-ilah) is so the Emanator can be **King** over separate subjects who **fulfill mitzvot**. «סוף מעשה במחשבה תחלה [the end of action was first in thought]» seals that the practical end was first in intent.

4. Continuous peshat — נעוץ) [8] ח [wedged] as purpose) — 4.3 Link

- From ז [7]'s mitzvot-in-Malchut / inverted seal → **why** that arrangement exists.
- To ט [9]: Yerushalmi + shelaya as **proof-text mashal** that practice precedes / roots Torah.

4. Continuous peshat — נעוץ) [8] ח [wedged] as purpose) — 4.4 Plain terms

- **נעוץ [wedged] (this use):** not only structural wedging of beginning-in-end, but the **power** of Ein Sof to create yesh me'ayin **as separate**, for kingship-via-mitzvot.
- **מלך על הנפרדים [King over separate beings]:** kingship requires separate subjects (echo ד [4]'s «אין מלך בלא עם [there is no king without a people]»).
- **סוף מעשה במחשבה תחלה [the end of action was first in thought]:** liturgical lemma — the final deed (mitzvot in this world) was the initial intent.

File 0215 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[146]

2. אריך אנפין [Arich Anpin] — Plain peshat (this letter)

Partzuf of Keter-level above Abba/Imma. In this letter: (a) source from which mochin flow is drawn into Abba/Imma each zivug (with Atik Yomin) up to Ein Sof; (b) locus 'above' where mitzvot sit in Gulgu lta/labnunite and where Torah's root sits in Mochin Stima — contrasted with the lower map (mitzvot in Malchut/Hei; Torah in ZA/Vav).

4. לבנונית / לובן [whiteness / white] — Plain peshat (this letter)

Admur himself equates לבנונית [whiteness] with «האורחא דבפלגותא דשערי [the path in the parting of the hairs]» — the path in the parting of the hairs (of Gulgulta). In this letter it is the upper 'white'/ labnunite channel where mitzvot sit in Arich before splitting into the

[146]Document 0215: 151 — R17-B GLOSSARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

613 Torah-paths in ZA. Do not expand ‘white light’ metaphysics beyond that equation from this quote alone.

6. תרי”ג אורחין דאורייתא [613 paths of Torah] — Plain peshat (this letter)

613 paths of Torah that are in ZA — the lower branching of the upper hair-parting path. In context they sit on the Torah/ZA side of the map, while mitzvot are mapped to Malchut/Hei below (and to Gulgulta above).

6. תרי”ג אורחין דאורייתא [613 paths of Torah] — Not proven from quote alone [U]/[I]

- Whether numerically identical to 613 mitzvot as commandments, or Torah-paths/taamim in ZA — not sealed by quote alone [U]
- One-to-one mapping path↔mitzvah not stated [U]

17. נעוץ תחילתן בסופן [their beginning is wedged in their end] (creative sense in IHK20) — Plain peshat (this letter)

TWO applications of one Sefer Yetzirah lemma in one letter — do not collapse. Sense 1 (ה§ [5]): structural — Keter mediates; last of Ein Sof; Malchut of Atzilut is called Keter from below. Sense 2 (ח§ [8], glossary focus): creative/telos — נעוץ [wedged] = Ein Sof’s power to create yesh me’ayin without ilah/alul, so that yesh is separate from Elokut, in order that the Ma’atzil be King over the nifradim through their mitzvot; ‘end of deed in thought first.’

File 0226 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[149]

172 — R17 MISSING PRIMARIES INTAKE — M1–M14 — M2 — Zohar II:52b «בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika]» independent [E]

Field	Value
Status	**OPEN [E]** independent of Admur apparatus
Locus	זוהר ח"ב נב ע"ב [Zohar II 52b] (בשלח [Beshalach]) — Wikisource זהר חלק ב נב ב [Zohar II 52b]

Field	Value
Terms	בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika] · מה תצעק אלי [Why do you cry to Me] · ספרא דצניעותא [Sifra di-Tzeniuta] · קריעת ים סוף [splitting of the Sea of Reeds]

Quote [E]:

> And G-d said to Moses, "Why do you cry to Me?" And it was taught in Sifra di-Tzeniuta: "to Me," precisely; **everything depends on Atika**. At that time Atika Kadisha was revealed… because the splitting of the Sea of Reeds **depends on Atika**.

Search log: Wikisource Zohar II 52b HTML; Daily Zohar / Mikdash Melekh apparatus corroborate 2:52b; Sefaria complex-Zohar API refused bare `Zohar.2.52b` (complex book).

HOLD: Analogy ≠ Q42 MICRO. Do not convert.

[149] Document 0226: 178 — R17 MISSING PRIMARIES M1–M14.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

172 — R17 MISSING PRIMARIES INTAKE — M1–M14 — M6 — Zohar «ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון [and they enjoy from their own foundation and root]» exact daf

Field	Value
Status	**OPEN [E]** (near-exact lemma)
Locus	זוהר ח"ג רמא ע"א [Zohar III 241a] (פנחס [Pinchas]) — Wikisource זהר חלק ג רמא א [Zohar III 241a]
Terms	ואתהניין [and they enjoy] · מיסודא [from the foundation] · עקרא דלהון [their root] · רוחין קדישין [holy spirits] · קרבנא [sacrifice]

Quote [E]:

> And those holy spirits descend and draw near, **and enjoy from their own foundation and root**.

Variant note: Print has **עקרא דלהון [their root]**; Admur/IHK20 cites **ועיקרא דילהון [and their root]**. Same unit; lexical micro-variant.

Search log: Wikisource full-text search hit III 241a; Tanya Part IV (IHK20) pages echo the phrase.

File 0234 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[25]

2. Continuous peshat — א [1] — 2.2 Why here

Opens the whole epistle with Tikunei Zohar unity of lights and vessels **in Atzilut**, then immediately raises the problem that drives the letter: how can **limited kelim** be **one** with Ein Sof? **[E]** + **[I]** on "drives the letter."

[25] Document 0234: 147 — R17-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

5. Continuous peshat — ד [4] — 5.5 Tags

Body **[E]** · «אין מלך בלא עם [there is no king without a people]» midrashic/Zoharic background **[E-primary]** via Admur · Atik identity **[E]** · meta reading of עלמא דאתגליא [the revealed world] confirmed by body **[E]** not **[I]**

File 0238 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[150]

159 — R17-GB04 SUMMARY — What was actually read

- **[E]** Wikisource תניא חלק ד כ [Tanya, part 4, chapter 20] — https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת — full Hebrew; טו + [9–7] ז–ט [15] window re-read
- **[E]** Sefaria/Kehot `sefaria_igk20.json` (local) — HE paras 16–18, 35–36 + EN footnotes 72–91, 130–135
- **[E]** Lessons in Tanya / Israel National News Class 10 reprint of Kehot EN (mitzvot–חותם [seal]–שליא [placenta]) — used only to **separate** secondary gloss from body
- **[E]** Drive 141 meta · 144 ACTIVE · 145 LEDGER · 148/149 GB02 (T11–T14) · 153/154 GB03 (T16–T24)
- **[E-primary] via Admur cites:** SY 1:7 נעוץ [wedged]; Yerushalmi Ber. 1:2 / Shab. 1:2; Lecha Dodi «סוף מעשה [the end of action]»; Zohar III:129a/136a (via Kehot fn74 / Admur wording)
- **Not used as Admur body:** invented pages; film; closing Q42/Q70/NHYM; upgrading Kehot/Lessons mashiach-taamei or seal-pedagogy to [E]

[150] Document 0238: 159 — R17-GB04 SUMMARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

159 — R17-GB04 SUMMARY — Cross-check (fold duplicates)

Prior	Claim (compressed)	GB04 action
T11 SEALED	Mitzvot↔Malchut/ה' [heh]; Torah↔ZA/ו' [vav]; Arich: Gulgulta/Loven/orchata→613; Torah root מו"ס [Mocha Stimaah]	**do not remint** — deepen identity/syntax only
T12 SEALED	חותם המתהפך [a seal that is reversed] = below-order inverts root-order	**do not remint** — pedagogy detail = secondary
T13 SEALED	נעוץ [wedged] here = yesh-me'ayin for kingship via mitzvot + סוף מעשה [the end of action]	**do not remint**
T14 SEALED	Shelaya → mitzvot עיקר ושרש [foundation and root]; chitz/pnim	**do not remint** — וכדלקמן [and as below] deepen
T24 SEALED	מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] = telos of descent at **טו [15]**	**do not remint** — map as **second locus** vs ז [7]

File 0245 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[151]

170 — R17-I CRITIQUE CHECKLIST — continuous peshat map Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — 3) Secondary-as-Admur — TT/Mitteler /Ramash/Kehot phrased as Admur body

#	Locus	Flag
S1	R17-H overall	**CLEAN** — biur hits tagged **[E-secondary]** / "not Admur"; empties honest for Mitteler/Ramash.

[151] Document 0245: 170 — R17-I CRITIQUE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

#	Locus	Flag
S2	H HIT 3.1 header «TT citing Admur [E]»	**ATTRIBUTION AMBIGUITY** — speaker is TT reporting «רבינו ז"ל [our master, of blessed memory]». Tag **[E]** can be misread as Admur-body primary. Prefer: **TT [E] report of Admur dictum** (exact Admur page still **[U]** per HIT's own "Does NOT prove").
S3	H HIT 6.1 LT Shir 30	**CAUTION OK** — marked **[E-secondary]/[U print-class]** pending print-header check. Do not upgrade to Admur.
S4	Glossary optional parallels (Zohar II:52b via apparatus; EC prasa "often")	**CLEAN** — apparatus left **[U]**; not phrased as Admur wording.
S5	Scout rule "No Tanya LaAm as Admur wording"	**CLEAN** — stated and followed in these packs.
S6	Kehot fn91 / וכדלקמן [and as below] apparatus	Not treated as Admur body in Grok intake (scout leaves target **[U]**). Aligns sealed absence claim — do not phrase fn91 destinations as IHK20 body.

Verdict §3: No hard secondary-as-Admur slip in Grok packs. Fix S2 tag clarity only.

6) Collisions / folds — Grok intake vs sealed T01–T29 (+ pending T30–T33) — 6a Sealed floor — CORROBORATE vs remint risk

Grok content (terms/loci)	Sealed	Collision type
א–ה [1–5] spine (scout CORROBORATE-ONLY)	T01–T08	**CORROBORATE** — no remint
לידה / עיבור / טיפה / בעתיקא [birth / gestation / drop / in Atika]	T09–T10	**CORROBORATE** — glossary/ scout restate
Mitzvot↔Malchut / Torah↔ZA / Gulgulta / Mocha Stima / chotam	T11–T12	**CORROBORATE**
לבנונית היא האורחא [the whiteness is the path]…	T25	**CORROBORATE** (glossary §4 equation) — remint-temptation if minted

Grok content (terms/loci)	Sealed	Collision type
תרי"ג אורחין דאורייתא שבזא"א [613 paths of Torah that is in ZA]	T26	**CORROBORATE** — keep enum **[P]**
נעוץ [wedged] sense-2 creative/telos	T13	**CORROBORATE** — ≠ T08
שליא [placenta] / עיקר התורה [the foundation of Torah]	T14	**CORROBORATE**
Parsa בקע [pierced] / כמו באצילות ממש [just as in Atzilut itself]	T15	**CORROBORATE** — scope deepen ≠ remint
Two Kav presentations (Malchut/parsa · NHY d'AK)	T16	**CORROBORATE** — A≡B stays open
הארה [radiance] ×3	T17	**CORROBORATE**
Sovev equally ≠ hitpashtut creatio	T18	**CORROBORATE**
Sovev → הקו הפנימי / כוח ועוז [the inner kav / power and strength]	T19	**CORROBORATE**
Yesod afar / AK feet / or chozer	T20–T21	**CORROBORATE**
דצח"מ [inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders] · Merkavah · מצות מעשיות [practical mitzvot] telos	T22–T24	**CORROBORATE** (scout טו [15])

Grok content (terms/loci)	Sealed	Collision type
וכדלקמן [and as below] unresolved in-letter	T27	**CORROBORATE** (scout ט [9] open Q)
Dual mitzvot loci ז–ט [7–9] vs טו [15]	T29	Soft map awareness — **CORROBORATE**, don't remint either
Primary vs peirush discipline	T28	Method match (esp. R17-H) — **CORROBORATE**
עלמא דאתגליא [the revealed world] / עילה [cause] vs יש [yesh] (H Themes 2–3)	T01–T06 family	Parallel CORROBORATE — not IHK20 remint

Highest remint-temptation zones (still ZERO T-ids here): T16 dual Kav · T15/T25/T26 mitzvot–Torah fine points · T17 he'arah · T20–T21 or chozer.

File 0251 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[26]

Theme 3 — Malchut as alma d'itgalya / yesh m'ayin power — HIT 3.1 — TT citing Admur [E] (TT voice; Admur as «רבינו ז"ל [our master, of blessed memory]»)

> «And on this basis will be understood what our master, of blessed memory, wrote: that this is why Malchut is called the revealed world, for in it is revealed the power of the Ein Sof light to create something from nothing, not through the chainlike descent of cause and effect, etc.» - **Work+locus:** Derech Mitzvotecha, שרש מצות התפלה [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer] §25 - **Speaker:** Tzemach Tzedek (reporting Admur dictum) - **Parallels:** Malchut = עלמא דאתגליא [the revealed world] precisely as locus of revealed yesh-me'ayin power (not עו"ע [cause and effect]) - **Does NOT prove:** Exact Admur page/wording beyond TT's report; does not prove IHK20 «אין מלך בלא עם [there is no king without a people]» equation from this sentence alone

Theme 4 — Ibbur / leidah / בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika] — HIT 4.3 — apparatus only [U]

- IHK20 body cites «בעתיקא תליא [depends on Atika]» without page; glossary notes Zohar II:52b via apparatus — **not re-opened as proof beyond Admur's cite**
- **Does NOT prove:** Parallel locus as independent [E]

[26]Document 0251: 165 — R17_H_PARALLEL_CHASSIDIC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0330 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[156]

153 — R17-GB03 SUMMARY — What was actually read

- **[E]** Wikisource תניא חלק ד כ [Tanya, part 4, chapter 20] (https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/תניא_חלק_ד_כ) — full Hebrew body; יא–טו [11–15] locus re-read end-to-end
- **[E]** Sefaria/Kehot Hebrew אגה"ק כ' [Iggeret HaKodesh 20] (API locked Kehot; paragraph-segmented) + EN Kehot for locus cross-check
- **[E]** local `ya-igk20/igk20_plain.txt` (Kehot-nikud continuous) cross-check
- **[E]** Drive 141 / 144 / 145 / 146–149 (floor + GB01/GB02 format + T01–T15)
- **[E-primary] via Admur cites:** Sefer HaGilgulim ch.20 (via לק"א [Likkutei Amarim]); Neh. 9:6; Jer. 23:24; Tikkunei Zohar 57/70 «לית אתר [there is no place]»; Gen. 1:11/1:20/1:24; BR 10:6 mazal; Berachot 40a; Bava Kama 71b–72a; Zohar III:241a; Deut. 7:11; Avot 4:17
- **Not used:** invented page numbers; film; closing Q42/Q70/NHYM; reminting T01–T15

File 0538 · Focused Studies · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[28]

---

[156]Document 0330: 153 — R17-GB03 SUMMARY.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[28]Document 0538: E1.6-HY1-Booklet.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

From Unity in Atzilut to the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — Working Version E1.6-HY1 — Addition of HaYom Yom for 11 Tishrei

Local update dated 22.9.2026, based on file E1.6. The supplementary study after Station 3 and references in the introduction and Station 15 have been added. Further production of the booklet and investigation of questions F1 are suspended; the underlying corrections that remain undecided, including the numbering sequence, are not approved in this round.

Text status: an edited manuscript for further work.

Quotations from the body of the Epistle were checked against digital witnesses marked «not checked» — **[E-subresearch]**. The Kehot print itself has not been read at the glyph level — **[U]**.

Notes marked **[I]** are editorial explanation, and are not the Alter Rebbe's wording.

Station 2 — The Kelim of Atzilut and Finitude — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies that finitude does not disappear. Precisely because the kelim have limit and finitude, one must clarify in what sense they are Divinity.

Station 2 — The Kelim of Atzilut and Finitude — What Question Does the Station Leave Open?

This sense has not yet been stated. The answer will appear in the distinction between cause and effect and something from nothing.

Station 3 — Cause and Effect versus Something from Nothing — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies:

- Cause and effect is an order of chainlike descent.
- Something from nothing is a different kind of coming into being.
- The kelim of Atzilut are called Divinity in relation to their power to create something from nothing.

The formulation that the unity is «with regard to the action», rather than simple identity, is an editorial interpretation **[I]** or a later explanation, and is not another quotation from the Alter Rebbe.

The Peshat Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Supplementary Study — «To Him and Not to His Attributes»: HaYom Yom for 11 Tishrei

After clarifying the unity of the lights and kelim, one can ask a question close to the life of the person praying: when we address G-d through names and attributes of Divine governance, to whom is the address directed? HaYom Yom for 11 Tishrei presents a teaching that the Alter Rebbe delivered publicly in Liozna, on the night following Yom Kippur 5556. The teaching interprets «to Him and not to His attributes» in three formulations. This source is brought here as a supplementary study to the Epistle; the connection between them is an editor's reading **[I]**.

The Peshat Booklet — Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20 — Part ב [2] — Stations 6–11

A direct continuation of E1.1: the opening chapter and Stations 1–5.

Status of the evidence: quotations from the body of the Epistle were checked in a digital transcription marked «not checked» — **[E-**

subresearch]. The Kehot print itself — **[U]**. Editorial explanation is marked **[I]**; an external source receives a separate tag according to the way it was read.

Station 8 — The Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies that practical mitzvot are not a side topic introduced at the end of the Epistle. They are part of the structure itself: Malchut is the place where things are actually done.

Station 8 — The Mitzvot in Malchut and Torah in Ze'ir Anpin — What Question Does the Station Leave Open?

It is still unclear why specifically the practical mitzvah is called the foundation and root of Torah, even though Torah is wisdom. The answer will come through the description of Arich Anpin and the reversed seal.

Station 14 — Three Degrees of Radiance — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies that vitality does not pass from Ein Sof to the physical body in a single transition. There is an order of garments and radiances.

Station 19 — The Sacrifices and the Vitality That Ascends through Human Service — The Epistle's Wording

«And through this will be well understood, with good reason and knowledge, how the higher angels of the Merkavah, the face of the ox and the face of the eagle, greatly enjoy, and are nourished and sustained by, the spirit of the animal and bird that ascends upon them from the sacrifices on the altar, and as the wording of the holy Zohar precisely states: and they enjoy from their own foundation and root.»

Quotation from the body of the Epistle: **[E-subresearch]**. The Zoharic source to which the Epistle alludes has not been opened here at the glyph level — **[U]**.

Station 19 — The Sacrifices and the Vitality That Ascends through Human Service — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies that the practical conclusion is not an external addition to the Kabbalistic explanation. The body and matter become part of the ascent when they act within the framework of a command and the service of G-d.

Station 19 — The Sacrifices and the Vitality That Ascends through Human Service — What Question Does the Station Leave Open?

Extending the example from sacrifices to human service as a whole requires additional sources. It must not be written as though all its details were stated here.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — The Conclusion's Wording

«And after these things that we have explained, the great excellence of the practical mitzvot will be well understood, for they are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world, as it is written, today to perform them; and one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.»

At the end of the textual witnesses a colophon line appears:

«(Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting.)»

Quotation from the body of the Epistle: **[E-subresearch]**. The source in the Mishnah to which «one hour is better» corresponds will be

recorded separately; here the Epistle is the direct witness for the quotation.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — Plain Explanation

After the entire Kabbalistic argument, the conclusion is the purpose of the souls' descent into the physical world: fulfilling practical mitzvot. The Epistle adds «as it is written, today to perform them», and immediately brings the first half of the Mishnah's wording: «one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come».

Action is not an adjunct to study or apprehension. It is the place where a command is fulfilled in the body and in matter, and therefore it is the purpose of the descent into this world.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — The Station's Role

This is the destination of the sequence: the Epistle returns from the higher concepts to the act of the mitzvah in the world.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — What Question Does the Station Resolve?

It clarifies that practical mitzvot are the purpose of the souls' descent, as the Epistle explicitly says. The connection between this conclusion and the entire map of stations is an editorial reading of the structure **[I]**, but the wording of the conclusion itself is in the body of the Epistle.

Station 20 — The Purpose of the Souls' Descent and the Excellence of the Practical Mitzvot — What Question Does the Station Leave Open?

The technical questions left unresolved in the course of the Epistle do not negate this explicit conclusion. The line «עד כאן מצאנו מכתב ידו הקדושה» / «ע"כ מצאנו מכיה"ק» [both: "Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting"] is an editorial colophon by a copyist or printer, and is not part of the Alter Rebbe's words.

File 0555 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 3

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[419]

א [1]. Digital Sources Opened — D1 — Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, Discourse Beginning צו את בני ישראל [Command the Children of Israel], End of Section ג' [3]

- Text in ChabadText
- Text on the Ashoova site, Pinchas ג' [3]
- Supplied Chabad Library location: עח ב [78b] — did not load in the reading tool.

Read in the text: the paragraph about the mazal, its context concerning physical coming into being, and the following reference to Iggeret HaKodesh, discourse beginning איהו וחיוהי [He and His life-giving lights]. This is not merely a search excerpt. The discourse links growth from the earth's power with the action of the mazal, and distinguishes from them the coming into being attributed to sovev. The heading and beginning of the discourse were checked on Ashoo-

[419] Document 0555: IGK20-Earth-R3_01_Source_Update.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

va. The number עח ב [78b] was not seen in a facsimile in this round. The two pieces of information must be preserved separately.

File 0425 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[391]

“Good Reason and Knowledge,” the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — “And through This Will Be Well Understood, with Good Reason and Knowledge”

This is not simply a rhetorical flourish.

“Good reason and knowledge” is a biblical expression from Psalms 119:66:

“Teach me good reason and knowledge…”

And there is an almost perfect correspondence here with what happened in the preceding sentence.

A moment before, we read:

“that he should taste the **taste** [טעם] of grain”

“and also wisdom and **knowledge** [דעת]”

And now:

“good **reason and knowledge** [טעם ודעת].”

It is difficult to ignore the wordplay: the “taam” [טעם] that meant the taste of food becomes “taam” in the sense of explanation and understanding, and the “daat” [דעת] that food adds becomes the “knowledge” through which the mystery of the sacrifices is understood.

[391] Document 0425: Initial-Deep-Research.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

And there is another particularly beautiful echo here: the continuation of the verse in Psalms is **"for I have believed in Your mitzvot."** And the Alter Rebbe, two lines later, arrives at "the great excellence of the practical mitzvot." I do not think this should be turned into "proof" that everything is constructed as a deliberate allusion, but as a literary-Chassidic structure it is a very strong correspondence: **reason → knowledge → mitzvot.**

"Good Reason and Knowledge," the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — What Is the Merkavah Here?

The basis is Ezekiel's vision: each of the living creatures of the Merkavah has four faces — a human, a lion, an ox and an eagle. The lion's face is on the right, the ox's face on the left, and the eagle's face in the other direction; the Kabbalistic sources interpret the faces as different spiritual aspects. We must therefore immediately correct a possible mistaken picture: "the face of the ox" is not necessarily an angel that looks only like an ox, and "the face of the eagle" is not a separate angel that is simply a giant bird. The vision of the Merkavah itself is **mutual inclusion** — each living creature has several faces.

And the Kabbalistic sources deepen this still further. In Or HaChamah on the Zohar, it is stated that "the main aspect is the human face" and that the other aspects are included in it; that is, ox, lion and eagle are modes of revelation within an integrated structure, not four worlds sealed off from one another. This answers your question about mutual inclusion: yes, the fact that each aspect includes other aspects does not contradict the designation "the face of the ox." The name indicates **which aspect predominates and serves as a root for a particular branch**, not that there is nothing else in it.

“Good Reason and Knowledge,” the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — Why Is the Face of the Ox the Root of All Domestic Animals, and Not Only Oxen?

The Zohar in Pinchas, as explained by the author of the Sulam, explicitly says that from “the face of the ox” a spirit extends to the species of domestic animals destined for sacrifice — bulls, sheep, he-goats and goats. That is, the “ox” in the Merkavah is **the spiritual archetype of the category of sacrificial domestic animals**, and not only an ox in the narrow sense of the biological species. And this resolves a strong question: sheep and goats also come upon the altar, so why “the face of the ox”? Because the face of the ox is the higher root of that spiritual family.

In the same way, the Alter Rebbe pairs **the face of the eagle** with birds. This does not mean that eagles are sacrificed — on the contrary, a bird offering comes from turtledoves and young pigeons — but that the “eagle” in the Merkavah serves as a primal root for the aspect of birds. The Alter Rebbe’s very wording, “the face of the ox and the face of the eagle… from the spirit of the animal and bird,” makes the correspondence explicit. ### Why Not the Face of the Lion?

Because the example here is **the sacrifices upon the altar**, from domestic animals and birds.

The face of the ox — the root of the sacrificial domestic animals.

The face of the eagle — the root of birds.

The face of the lion belongs to another aspect of the Merkavah, but there is no corresponding branch here of wild animals offered as sacrifices of the type of which the Alter Rebbe speaks. It is therefore not needed in this particular argument. ### And Why Is There a “Human Face” at All, Since the Human Being Himself Is above the Animal?

Because we must be careful about projecting the earthly inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders too simply onto the higher Merkavah.

The "human face" in the Merkavah is not "a physical human being located beside a physical ox." It is a higher aspect of the human form, and in certain sources it is even described as the comprehensive and primary aspect within which the other faces are included. There is therefore no contradiction between:

"The physical human is the level of the speaking, above the animal"

and:

"In the higher Merkavah there is the face of the human, the face of the ox, the face of the lion and the face of the eagle."

These are two parallel, but not identical, systems.

"Good Reason and Knowledge," the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — What Does It Mean That the Angels Are "Nourished" by the Spirit of the Sacrifice?

It certainly does not mean that an angel needs smoke or meat as calories.

The Alter Rebbe is precise:

"from the spirit of the animal and bird **that ascends to them** from the sacrifices."

That is, this concerns **the spiritual vitality** of the animal and bird, which through the sacrificial service ascends from its lower root to its higher root. The Zohar itself describes the face of the ox as a source from which spirit extends to the sacrificial domestic animals; therefore, when that vitality is refined and ascends, it returns to a high

source associated with the angels of the Merkavah. And this is in fact the same structure as human eating:

Lower food → is refined within the human being → adds to the human being;

A lower animal → is refined in the sacrifice → ascends to its root → adds to the angel.

"Good Reason and Knowledge," the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — "Greatly Enjoy, and Are Nourished and Sustained" — Three Expressions

I have not found a good basis for turning these three verbs into three sefirot or three distinct technical levels, and therefore I would not impose such an interpretation on them.

In a more precise Chassidic plain reading, this is cumulative:

"Enjoy" — they have pleasure from the radiance;

"Are nourished" — it becomes an influx and vitality for them;

"Are sustained" — it supplies them with the influx they need.

That is, the Alter Rebbe wants to take this beyond "the angels are happy when they see a sacrifice" and establish it as a much more essential relationship: the lower is actually a source of **influx** for the higher. ### Why Do They "Greatly Enjoy"?

Because it is not an influx foreign to them. And this brings us to the great precision of the Zohar.

“Good Reason and Knowledge,” the Merkavah, the Face of the Ox and the Face of the Eagle, and the Nourishment of the Angels — “ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון” [And They Enjoy from Their Own Foundation and Root] — This Is the Whole Point

A simple translation:

“And they enjoy from their own foundation and root.”

This adds something decisive.

Without these words we would say: the higher angel receives some addition from the lower animal.

The Zohar says something far bolder: when the spirit of the animal ascends, the angel receives **from “יסודא ועיקרא דילהון” — from its own foundation and root.**

That is, the animal below conceals within it something that reaches a deep root of the angel above.

This is precisely what the Alter Rebbe has demonstrated throughout the Epistle:

What is lower as a branch can reach a place higher than the branch above it, because its root is not measured by its place in the revealed order.

Therefore he says **“as the wording of the holy Zohar precisely states.”** The mere fact that the angels “enjoy” is not enough for him. The decisive point is that the enjoyment comes **from their own root**. Incidentally, the source research reveals a small inconsistency in the reference here: the online note in Lessons in Tanya displays “III, 341a”, whereas another Chabad source quoting the passage explicitly specifies **241a — Zohar, part ג’ [3], רמ”א ע”א [241a]**. For locating the passage, the reference to רמ”א ע”א [241a] is the more useful reference.

The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — In-Depth Research in Peshat, Kabbalah and Chassidut — The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot

The Alter Rebbe concludes:

“And after these words and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know, to comprehend… the great excellence of the practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls’ descent into this physical world…”

Here almost every word is carefully constructed.

The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot — “After These Words and This Truth”

This sounds like a closing flourish, but the content matters: in effect he is saying — **now there is no longer any need for a new proof.**

If you have understood:

that the lower earth bears extraordinary power;

that the vegetative gives life to the animal;

that the vegetative and animal add knowledge to the speaking;

that the spirit of the animal and bird nourishes the angels of the Merkavah;

and that the reason is the revelation of the light at the bottom and returning light —

then the great excellence of the physical object through which a mitzvah is performed already follows from the entire argument. The expression “after these words and this truth” also echoes biblical language in II Chronicles 32:1. There is no necessity to see a homiletical

interpretation of the verse here; it mainly gives the sentence a solemn, concluding biblical sound.

The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot — "דעת לנבון נקל" [It Is Easy for One with Understanding to Know]

This too is actual biblical language:

"ודעת לנבון נקל" [And it is easy for one with understanding to know] — Proverbs 14:6. Its meaning in our context is precise: someone who is already "understanding" — who has understood one thing from another in the course of the Epistle — does not now need a new lengthy explanation; the "knowing" of the conclusion becomes "easy."

Nor is this a one-time expression for the Alter Rebbe. He also uses "ודעת לנבון נקל" [And it is easy for one with understanding to know] at the end of chapter 12 of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. For him, therefore, it is a kind of transition formula from the long explanation to a conclusion that should be clear to someone with understanding.

The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot — Why Are "Practical Mitzvot" the "Purpose of the Souls' Descent"?

Here we must distinguish between several kinds of "purpose," rather than set them in competition.

Within this same Epistle, a short time earlier, the Alter Rebbe spoke of **"drawing down higher lights in ABYA — which is the purpose of the creation of man."** Now he says that practical mitzvot are **"the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world."** These are not two contradictory goals. They describe the same process from different angles:

"A dwelling in the lower realms" — the general Divine purpose: that Divinity be revealed specifically in the lower.

"Drawing down higher lights" — what the human being accomplishes in the order of the worlds.

"Practical mitzvot" — the unique practical means for which the soul must descend into a body and a material world.

Refining the body, the animal soul and the physical object — the way the goal is carried out.

Lessons in Tanya emphasizes precisely this complementarity: chapters 35 onward of Likkutei Amarim explained action from the perspective of a dwelling in the lower realms and the refinement of the vital soul; Epistle 20 adds the depth of the excellence of physicality itself and its root. Therefore the words **"into this physical world"** are not an incidental addition. They are the entire point.

A soul does not need to descend into a physical world in order to be spiritual. Before its descent it is far more spiritual.

What is unique about the descent is that it becomes capable of taking **physical wool for tzitzit, leather for tefillin, a coin for charity, an etrog, matzah, the body of a Jew performing an action**, and connecting the lower itself with G-d's will.

This is precisely what the whole Epistle has demonstrated is not "merely a descent"; within the lower lies a root that the higher does not have as it stands at its revealed level. ### Then What about "Torah Study Is Equivalent to Them All"?

There is no contradiction here, because "which is greater?" is a meaningless question until one says **in what respect**.

Torah has an excellence that a practical mitzvah does not have: the person apprehends the wisdom and will of the Holy One, blessed be He, with his intellect, and Torah becomes inward knowledge for him.

In Tanya itself, Torah is described as a unique mode of union of the human intellect with Divine wisdom.

On the other hand, the practical mitzvah has a different excellence: it enters **into matter itself**, and therefore specifically it realizes the purpose of descent into the lower.

Our Sages say:

“Study is greater, because it leads to action.”

The reason itself is instructive. The excellence of study is not that it nullifies action, but that it **brings the person to action**. In the order of Divine service, Torah is the light, the guidance, the understanding and the union; action is the place where the Divine intention actually takes hold in the lower.

Therefore “Torah study is equivalent to them all” and “practical mitzvot are the purpose of the souls’ descent” can both be true:

Torah — higher in terms of revelation, apprehension and inward union;

A practical mitzvah — decisive in terms of fulfilling the purpose of the descent and turning physicality into a dwelling for Him, blessed be He.

Epistle 20 deals mainly with the second axis, and therefore it ends with **“practical mitzvot”**, not with a general ranking of Torah against mitzvot. The introduction to Lessons in Tanya formulates the purpose of the Epistle in precisely this way — to explain the special significance of action and matter. ### And What about Torah in the Future?

Here it is especially advisable not to confuse three different questions:

which is greater in this world — study or action;

what will be the principal apprehension in the days of Mashiach;

and what "the World to Come" means in the Mishnah quoted by the Alter Rebbe.

These are not necessarily the same period or the same criterion.

Even if in the future there will be apprehension of Torah at a depth that we do not have today, this raises no difficulty at all for the words of Epistle 20. The Alter Rebbe does not say: "Torah study is lower than mitzvot at every time and in every respect." He says: **the special reason the soul descends into a physical world is the ability to act upon physicality.**

Higher Torah can be an exceedingly sublime revelation; but the very fact that there is a higher revelation does not negate the question: why did the soul have to enter a material body? The answer here is — for **"practical mitzvot."**

On the contrary, "study is greater, because it leads to action" shows that the complete order is not Torah **or** mitzvot, but Torah **that brings the Divine truth into action**.

The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot — "Today to Perform Them"

The verse is Deuteronomy 7:11, and our Sages expound it as a division between the time of action and the time of reward; the reference also appears in the notes on the passage. Why does the Alter Rebbe need this verse?

Because he wants to demonstrate that it is not enough to say, "in the World to Come the light is greater." The entire account of the Epistle is that **the greatness of the revealed light is not the only criterion**.

A world in which more Divinity is seen can be very lofty in terms of revelation. But this world is the place where there is something that does not exist there in the same form: **action, refinement and renewal of the lower.**

And this is precisely why he concludes with the Mishnah from Avot.

The Concluding Expressions — And Why the Conclusion Is Specifically Practical Mitzvot — "One Hour of Repentance and Good Deeds in This World Is Better than All the Life of the World to Come"

This is not a statement that the World to Come is bad.

The Mishnah itself continues in the opposite direction: one hour of gratification in the World to Come is higher than all the life of this world. That is, the Mishnah itself gives us two criteria:

In terms of **revelation, pleasure and apprehension** — the World to Come is high.

In terms of **the ability to act, repent and perform mitzvot** — an hour in this world is more precious than all the life of the World to Come.

The Alter Rebbe quotes specifically the first half because that is the half relevant to Epistle 20. And this is a fundamental answer to the question of Torah versus mitzvot:

There is no single scale on which everything is ranked "one to ten."

There is an excellence of revelation.

There is an excellence of root.

There is an excellence of apprehension.

There is an excellence of action.

There is an excellence of pleasure.

And there is an excellence of fulfilling the purpose.

Epistle 20 deals with the last question — **where does one reach the goal for which the soul descended?**

And the answer is: in this world, in physicality, through practical mitzvot.

The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — In-Depth Research in Peshat, Kabbalah and Chassidut — The Overall Picture — And What Now Becomes Clear about the Entire Epistle

After examining all the details, I think we can reread the conclusion almost word by word and see how tightly constructed it is.

The Alter Rebbe begins with:

“And from this will be well understood…”

That is: do not see the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders as a new topic. **“From this”** — from the structure of the bottom of Asiyah and returning light explained above — the tangible world will now be understood. He presents the direct order:

Inanimate < vegetative < animal < speaking.

Then he immediately dismantles the possibility of thinking that “higher” means “does not need the lower”:

The animal is nourished by the vegetative;

The human being by both;

And not only his body — his knowledge too.

Grain shows that the vegetative gives knowledge to the speaking.

Ox meat shows that the animal adds wisdom to the speaking.

The reason is not that the vegetative and animal are manifestly higher than the human being, but that **the returning light from the bottom of Asiyah** reveals in them something whose source is deeper than the revealed hierarchy. He then raises the entire structure one level:

What is true between plant, animal and human in this world is also true between a physical animal and an **angel**.

You would expect the higher angel to be the one giving vitality to the animal. The Alter Rebbe says: in a sacrifice, the spirit of the animal

ascends, and the higher "face of the ox" **is nourished by it**. And not merely nourished by it.

The Zohar is precise:

"מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון" [from their own foundation and root] —

from their own root. That is, we have now demonstrated the principle on two levels:

Within the world: the lower nourishes the higher.

Between worlds: the physical lower nourishes the spiritual higher.

Then comes the conclusion that needs almost no further explanation:

If so — it is clear why a Divine soul, which is higher than matter, descends into it.

Not because matter is higher than it as it appears.

But because **within matter there is hidden something the soul cannot reach when it remains above.**

Therefore it descends.

Therefore it vests itself in a body.

Therefore it encounters wool, leather, money, wheat, wine, oil, an etrog, a sukkah, and an entire world of matter.

And therefore **a practical mitzvah** is not a compromise for a soul that cannot remain in spirituality.

It is the very reason for the descent. And I would add one more precise point, perhaps among the most important for your entire booklet: Epistle 20 is not merely saying **"action is more important than understanding."** Such a formulation is too crude and even misleading. It says something far deeper:

The lowest thing in the order of revelation may be the vessel for the highest thing at the root; therefore, a thing's worth must not be measured by the degree of its revealed spirituality.

From this comes the power of the earth.

From this comes the power of food.

From this comes the power of the sacrifice.

And from this comes the power of the practical mitzvah.

This is also why, in my view, the three words at the end — **"לעולם הזה הגשמי" [into this physical world]** — are not merely a description of place. They are a summation of the entire Epistle 20.

The soul did not descend despite the world being physical.

It descended because it is physical.

And this is the depth of the connection between the two sentences that at first seem almost opposite:

"One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come"

and —

"The purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world."

The World to Come reveals.

This world acts.

The higher illuminates.

The lower fulfills the intention.

And "returning light" is the concept that connects them. Finally, the printers' note also has significance: **"Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting."** This is the end of the manuscript that was found, not the Alter Rebbe's usual stylistic closing; the tradition attached to Lessons in Tanya connects the Epistle with the period near his passing. For this reason it is not correct to seek another concluding sentence supposedly missing. The sentence about practical mitzvot is in fact the peak at which the manuscript ends — and it does indeed close precisely the circle opened throughout Epistle 20: **how specifical-**

ly the physical yesh, the lowest in the order of hishtalshelut, becomes the place in which the highest Divine intention takes hold.

File 0530 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[529]

ID, Question, Status, Determination, Sources

S01

Question: What does "ומזה" [and from this] refer back to, and what does "יובן היטב" [will be well understood] add?

Status: Preferred reading

Determination: The advantage of the bottom in the earth unit is applied to nourishment and knowledge. Sowing and raising mayin nukvin are part of the context, not necessarily the sole object of "from this."

Sources: Epistle, near the conclusion

S02

Question: What is the inner connection of each of the four pairs of inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders/elements, even though water itself is inanimate?

Status: Supported; one detail open

Determination: All four pairs are explicit in Pinchas ג§ [3]; water, fire and air are explained. Earth is given without a separate reason. Aspects are not an identity of material with a created species.

Sources: L6 ג§ [3]; L4 א§ [1]

S03

[529]Document 0530: closure_status.csv. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Question: Why earth–water–fire–air in this order; how does it differ from other Kabbalistic orders?

Status: Difference supported; proposed reconciliation

Determination: Etz Chaim: animal–air/speaking–fire, versus the Epistle: animal–fire/speaking–air. Components of composition versus characterization of levels is a possible reconciliation; no explicit bridge has been found.

Sources: Etz Chaim נ׳ [50, 10]; L4; L6

S04

Question: Why is the inanimate omitted from the nourishment examples, including water and salt; what exactly does note 61 resolve?

Status: Partial

Determination: Note 61: It=the animal; the omission of earth in parentheses and qualified dependence after creation. L7 includes the inanimate in foods. The chain is not exhaustive; the reason for the omission is undecided.

Sources: Note 61 EN; L7

S05

Question: What does “above” mean, and what does the dependence of the higher on the lower teach?

Status: Supported

Determination: Above in the level of revealed vitality and knowledge; an addition from the lower does not reverse the ranking in every respect.

Sources: Epistle; L1

S06

Question: Why “is nourished and lives” versus “receives its vitality,” and why “from both”?

Status: Preferred syntactic interpretation

Determination: "Is nourished and lives" presents dependence for existence; in the human being, wisdom and knowledge are added. "From both": vegetative and animal, exemplified by grain and meat. No sefirotic division of the verbs is demonstrated.

Sources: Epistle; L1 ב§ [2]

S07

Question: What are the context and exact wording of the grain statement in Berachot?

Status: Supported

Determination: Berachot 40a: Rabbi Yehudah, wheat as the Tree of Knowledge, calling "father and mother" following the taste of grain.

Sources: Berachot 40a

S08

Question: Why specifically grain; what are the differences between wheat, grain, bread, tasting and eating?

Status: Supported within the limits of the parallel passage

Determination: Vaetchanan ה§ [5] specifies the root of wheat in Daat of Tohu. Wheat, grain, bread, matzah and tasting must not be interchanged in every detail.

Sources: Vaetchanan ה§ [5]; L1; מצה זו [This Matzah] ב§ [2]

S09

Question: Why "father and mother" here, versus "father" in the parallels; what is demonstrated concerning Abba and Imma?

Status: Wording supported; homiletical interpretation open

Determination: The Epistle preserves "father and mother"; L1 and מצה זו [This Matzah] use "father." There is no focused witness for interpreting the two names as Abba and Imma in the Epistle's sentence.

Sources: Berachot; Epistle; L1

S10

Question: Why "wisdom and knowledge" without understanding; is there a mapping to the two examples?

Status: Limit of knowledge

Determination: There is no evidence for the division grain= knowledge and meat=wisdom, or for explaining the omission of understanding by means of the two examples.

Sources: The entire set of parallels examined

S11

Question: What do the meat sugya, Rashi and Tosafot say, and what is their relation to the Epistle's wording?

Status: Supported

Determination: The source is 72a, with context from 71b. The wording דלא אכלי [that I did not eat] differs from the Epistle's wording; Rashi: lack of precision; Tosafot: fasting. L1 is explicit concerning an addition to the power of intellect.

Sources: Bava Kamma 72a; L1 ב§ [2]

S12

Question: Why specifically ox meat, and why are both examples needed together?

Status: Partial

Determination: The two examples fulfill "from both," vegetative and animal. No species-specific reason for the ox in particular, beyond the quotation of the sugya, was found.

Sources: Epistle; L1

S13

Question: How are the root of food, refinement, Tohu and Tikkun connected to returning light — is there an explicit bridge?

Status: Parallels supported; identity not demonstrated

Determination: L1: Tohu and refinement; L7: Sag/Mah; L3: sacrifices and lights of Tohu; L2: future returning light. There is no explicit identification with the return of the kav at the end of Adam Kadmon.

Sources: L1–L3; L7; Epistle

S14

Question: What does "כי הוא" [for it is] refer to; what is the returning light at the beginning of the sentence?

Status: Preferred reading

Determination: "For it is" summarizes the phenomenon as a whole; food is a possible subject. Returning light at the beginning of the sentence provides an explanation for nourishment directed upward.

Sources: The Epistle and its context

S15

Question: Analyze "שמתגלית... מאור... ומהקו... בבחינת אור חוזר" [which is revealed... from the light... and from the kav... in the aspect of returning light]; what is attributed to sovev and what to the kav?

Status: Strong preferred reading

Determination: "Which is revealed": the radiance. Sovev and the kav are sources of radiance; the last "returning light" is attached to the kav according to "as above" and the earth unit.

Sources: Epistle

S16

Question: What is included in "הארה דהארה כו'" [a radiance of a radiance, etc.], and why the abbreviation here?

Status: Partial

Determination: “Etc.” refers to the preceding description of the radiance; it is undecided whether it abbreviates only an additional “of a radiance” or a broader sequence. No fourth degree is demonstrated.

Sources: Epistle; Lessons

S17

Question: Why does he again detail the end of yosher and the kav after they have already been explained?

Status: Contextual interpretation

Determination: The repetition applies the preceding explanation to nourishment and knowledge; the detail about the kav and the bottom is a reason, not merely a location.

Sources: Epistle

S18

Question: What is revealed “with greater force” — power, light, vitality, knowledge — and what is the connection to earth?

Status: Supported

Determination: Syntactically, the radiance is revealed with greater force. In the earth context, its power and ability are seen; afterward vitality and knowledge are explained as results of the relationship.

Sources: Epistle

S19

Question: “And through this will be well understood, with good reason and knowledge”: plain meaning, source of the expression, and role in the argument.

Status: Linguistic anchor and interpretation

Determination: “Good reason and knowledge” echoes Psalms 119:66; in the argument this is a reasoned understanding of the nour-

ishment of the Merkavah. There is no evidence that it names another Kabbalistic level.

Sources: Psalms 119:66; Epistle

S20

Question: What is the Merkavah here, and what is the difference between the human face and the man upon the throne?

Status: Supported

Determination: The human face among the four faces is not the figure of the man upon the throne. Ezekiel's distinction must be preserved even when the parallels give Kabbalistic meanings to both.

Sources: Ezekiel 1:6, 10, 26; K5

S21

Question: How does each face include the others while still having a defined name and role?

Status: Supported within limits

Determination: Mutual inclusion does not negate the particular role of each face. A fixed attribute is not proof of the absence of refinement; one must not infer the absence of all mutual inclusion.

Sources: Zohar 533; L3 §ג [3]; L6 §א [1]

S22

Question: Why is the ox the root of domestic animals and the eagle the root of birds, including the other sacrificial species?

Status: Relationship explicit; comprehensive reason partial

Determination: In the Zohar, the ox is a source for domestic animals and the eagle for birds; the ox does not restrict the discussion to cattle alone, and the sequence also includes sheep and goats. There is no complete theory here for every species.

Sources: Zohar 534–537

S23

Question: Why does the Epistle mention only ox and eagle, when the Zohar also includes lion and human?

Status: Strong contextual explanation

Determination: The Epistle deals with the spirit of the animal and bird; in the Zohar, the lion and human also appear in other roles. The choice fits the example, but the Epistle does not explicitly explain the omission.

Sources: Zohar 539–541; Epistle

S24

Question: What ascends from the sacrifice, from whom does the spirit come, to whom does it return, and what does it add?

Status: Supported with marked extensions

Determination: The spirit is from the faces of the Merkavah and ascends from the sacrifice; in the Zohar, a substrate and garment below; in the Epistle, returning light; and in L3, revelation of lights of Tohu after refinement. The three formulations must not be merged.

Sources: Zohar; Epistle; L3

S25

Question: The meaning of "greatly enjoy, and are nourished and sustained," and whether the expressions are distinct.

Status: Plain interpretation; division not demonstrated

Determination: Enjoyment, nourishment and sustenance. "Enjoy/are nourished" are found in the Zohar; "are sustained" was not located in the sequence. There is no witness for three separate levels.

Sources: Zohar 531; Epistle

S26

Question: Locate the Zohar quotation precisely, its subjects and pronouns; distinguish different occurrences from textual variants.

Status: Digitally supported

Determination: 241a, bird passage 537 near line 2; another occurrence and variants in the same line 14/540. The distinction between locations and textual variants is preserved. There is no new Zohar facsimile.

Sources: Zohar.com; Stanford sel385

S27

Question: What does "כדקדוק" [as precisely stated] add, and what does "יסודא ועיקרא דילהון" [their foundation and root] mean in each link?

Status: Supported contextual interpretation

Determination: "As precisely stated" emphasizes the relationship to their foundation. In the Zohar, a source above and a base/garment below; LT adds revelation of the root. The possessive pronoun alone does not determine direction.

Sources: Zohar 531, 534–541; L3

S28

Question: How does the lower add to the angels, which are also from Ban; what does refined/not yet refined resolve?

Status: Combined reconciliation

Determination: K4 distinguishes Ban that has already been refined from that which has not yet been; L3: the lights of the root; L6: a refined world and a fixed role. There is no single source explicitly combining all three layers.

Sources: K4 ז§ [7]; L3; L6 א§ [1]

S29

Question: How does a small sacrifice nourish many higher beings; the meaning of the lamp analogy in the Zohar.

Status: Supported within the limits of the analogy

Determination: A slender lamp and slender piece of wood show that a little can kindle and illuminate for many; an analogy for the force of the imparting, not a division of portions or a calculated quantitative ratio.

Sources: Zohar 538

S30

Question: "And after these words and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know… all the above" — sources and function.

Status: Anchors and preferred reading

Determination: "After these words and this truth": II Chronicles 32:1; "it is easy for one with understanding to know": Proverbs 14:6. The transition is to the conclusion. "All the above" is read against the body of the Epistle, not only the sacrifice.

Sources: Scripture; Epistle

S31

Question: What is the link that infers practical mitzvot from nourishment and sacrifice; what does G-d's command add?

Status: Supported

Determination: The command is already in the body of the Epistle: fulfilling mitzvot in separate yesh. The sacrifice exemplifies service in matter; there is no inference that every act of eating or all physicality is a mitzvah.

Sources: Epistle; L6

S32

Question: The purpose of the souls' descent, the purpose of the creation of man, drawings down in ABYA, and a dwelling in the lower realms.

Status: Supported; reference open

Determination: Drawings down, the purpose of the souls' descent and revelation below combine. L7 explains this through sowing and drawing down; it is not a demonstrated identification of במ"א [elsewhere].

Sources: Epistle; L7; Tanya לו–לז [36–37]

S33

Question: What is the excellence of practical mitzvot here; is there any explicit comparison with Torah?

Status: Supported

Determination: The conclusion emphasizes practical mitzvot versus the life of the World to Come; in the body of the Epistle there is a comparison of the root of Torah and mitzvot, and of outer/inner dimensions. There is no single ranking in every respect.

Sources: Epistle; L4; L7

S34

Question: Torah study is equivalent to them all, union in Torah, study that leads to action, and Tanya לז ,[5–4] ד–ה [37].

Status: Supported by the parallels

Determination: Tanya ד [4] includes Torah and mitzvot; ה [5] explains union in apprehension; לז [37] distinguishes a mitzvah that can or cannot be performed by others. L4 gives different aspects of "greater," and in L7 study too draws down.

Sources: Tanya לז ,[5] ה ,[4] ד [37]; L4 ד§ [4]; L7

S35

Question: Now, the days of Mashiach, Gan Eden and the resurrection of the dead — what is the relationship to Torah and action in each source?

Status: Separated by sources

Determination: Now: service; K3: action is greater in the days of Mashiach; K5: Gan Eden/resurrection in the context of reward. Actual study at the resurrection must not be inferred from בחכמה עשית [You made with wisdom], nor should "the World to Come" be applied in the same sense everywhere.

Sources: K3; K5; Tanya ד [4]; Eruvin

S36

Question: "Today to perform them," and exactly what the Eruvin exposition proves.

Status: Supported

Determination: Deuteronomy 7:11 and the exposition in Eruvin 22a: the time of action versus receiving reward. The exposition does not in itself say that action is greater than Torah.

Sources: Eruvin 22a

S37

Question: "One hour is better," the two halves of the Mishnah, repentance and good deeds, and the meaning of the World to Come in context.

Status: Supported within limits

Determination: The two halves of the Mishnah emphasize service and gratification along different axes. L6 provides a parallel in memale/sovev; there is no proof of a special intention for the word "repentance" in the Epistle.

Sources: Avot 4:17; Tanya ד [4]; L6 ב–א§§ [1–2]

S38

Question: Grain→reason and knowledge, ox meat→the face of the ox: demonstrated structure or proposed echo?

Status: Proposed echo

Determination: "Taste of grain/good reason and knowledge" and "ox meat/the face of the ox" can create a linguistic echo. The sequence of topics is explicit, but the planning of the echo and a separate Kabbalistic meaning have not been demonstrated.

Sources: Epistle; comparison of expressions

S39

Question: "Thus far we have found," print and manuscript testimony, and the Piena tradition — what can be inferred?

Status: Transmission boundary supported; history open

Determination: "Thus far we have found" marks the limit of the material. It is not proof of truncation or deliberate closure. The Piena tradition and the first printing have not been verified afresh in their original sources.

Sources: The Epistle's wording; reported traditions

S40

Question: A continuous explanation of the entire unit, distinguishing a supported conclusion from a proposal.

Status: Completed

Determination: A continuous explanation of the entire unit in the attached report, separated from parallels and proposals. Closure is not a declaration that every detail has been resolved.

Sources: REPORT_HE

File 0532 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[262]

The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — initial deep research in plain meaning, Kabbalah, and Chassidut

Editorial label: this is a translation of the initial research document, preserved as a historical witness. Its assertions are not the final findings. The critical dossiers identify its corrections, including the element mapping, source attributions, Bava Kamma reference, the Zohar, and the transmission note.

The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — initial deep research in plain meaning, Kabbalah, and Chassidut — The passage's structure and the point holding it together

First, a small technical correction: the passage is the conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20, not the conclusion of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. This is how it appears in Tanya's division and in the daily lesson. In my view, the key is that the paragraph does not offer several unrelated examples—the four created orders, food, grain, meat, the chariot, sacrifices, and mitzvot—but one chain of proofs. The Alter Rebbe seeks to establish a paradoxical principle:

In the revealed order, the higher is above the lower; at the root, however, precisely the lowest can bear a loftier power and therefore nourish, elevate, and complete what stands above it.

This continues the preceding paragraphs. At the bottom of Asiyah, particularly in physical earth, the illumination reaching the end of the chain of development shines with special strength. The kav terminates there and shines upward from there as returning light. The

[262]Document 0532: initial_deep_research_en.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Alter Rebbe previously illustrated this through the earth's power of growth and the superior fruits produced after sowing and planting—an awakening from below through human action. The structure is therefore: the bottom of Asiyah, returning light, the lower nourishing the higher, plants sustaining animals, plants and animals adding understanding to humans, animal and bird spirits nourishing higher angels, and hence the advantage of a practical mitzvah performed with physical matter. The conclusion about practical mitzvot is not a new topic. It is the result toward which the entire epistle advances.

This is particularly significant for understanding the epistle as a whole. Lessons in Tanya explains that earlier parts of Tanya already discussed practical mitzvot through making a dwelling below and refining the animal soul. Epistle 20 adds a deeper dimension: physicality itself has a higher root that does not become manifest within the graded spiritual order. From here we can approach each detail.

The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — initial deep research in plain meaning, Kabbalah, and Chassidut — The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion

The Alter Rebbe concludes that after these things and truths, it is easy for the discerning to understand the great advantage of practical mitzvot, the purpose of souls descending to this physical world. Almost every word is carefully placed.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — 'After these things and truths'

This sounds like a closing flourish, but its content matters: no new proof is now required. Once we understand the unusual power carried by lower earth, plants sustaining animals, plant and animal adding understanding to humans, animal and bird spirits nourishing chariot angels, and the explanation through illumination at the bot-

tom and returning light, the advantage of the physical mitzvah object follows from the entire account. The wording also echoes II Chronicles 32:1. No exposition of that verse need be intended; principally it gives a solemn biblical cadence to the conclusion.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — 'Knowledge is easy for the discerning'

This is itself biblical wording, Proverbs 14:6. Its contextual meaning is precise: someone already discerning, who has understood one matter from another throughout the epistle, requires no new lengthy discussion; knowledge of the conclusion becomes easy. It is not a unique expression in the Alter Rebbe's writings: he also uses it at the end of chapter 12 of Iggeret HaTeshuvah. It functions as a transition from extended explanation to a conclusion apparent to the understanding reader.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — Why are practical mitzvot the purpose of souls' descent?

Different kinds of purpose should be distinguished rather than made to compete. Shortly before, the epistle called drawing higher lights into the four worlds the purpose of human creation. Now practical mitzvot are the purpose of souls' descent to this physical world. These are not contradictory goals but perspectives on one process.

A dwelling below is the general Divine purpose: Divinity revealed precisely in the lower realm. Drawing higher lights describes what the person effects within the worlds. Practical mitzvot are the distinctive practical means for which the soul must descend into a body and material world. Refining body, animal soul, and physical object describes how the goal is carried out.

Lessons in Tanya stresses this complementarity: chapters 35 onward explained action through the dwelling below and refinement of the vital soul; Epistle 20 adds physicality's own depth and root. 'To this physical world' is therefore not incidental. It is the whole point. A soul does not need to descend to become spiritual: it is more spiritual before descent.

Descent uniquely enables taking physical wool for tzitzit, hide for tefillin, money for charity, an etrog, matzah, and the body performing an action, and connecting the lower itself to God's will. The epistle has shown that this is not descent alone: the lower contains a root unavailable to the higher as it stands at its manifested level.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — What about Torah study corresponding to them all?

There is no contradiction, because asking what is greater is meaningless until specifying in what respect. Torah has an advantage unavailable to a practical mitzvah: the person grasps Divine wisdom and will intellectually, making Torah inward knowledge. Tanya describes a distinctive union between human intellect and Divine wisdom.

Practical mitzvot have another advantage: they enter matter itself and thereby realize descent's purpose in the lower realm. The Sages say study is great because it leads to action. The reason is instructive: study's advantage is not cancelling action but bringing the person to it. In service, Torah supplies illumination, guidance, understanding, and union; action is where Divine intention is realized below.

Both claims can therefore be true. Torah is higher through revelation, understanding, and inward union; practical mitzvah is decisive through realizing descent's purpose and turning physicality into His

dwelling. The epistle principally addresses the latter axis, so it ends with practical mitzvot rather than a universal ranking of Torah and mitzvot.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — What about Torah in the future?

Three questions should not be confused: whether study or action is greater now; what the principal understanding will be in the messianic era; and what the World to Come means in the cited Mishnah. These do not necessarily denote the same period or measure.

Even if future Torah understanding will be incomparably deep, that does not challenge the epistle. It does not say Torah is below mitzvot at every time and in every respect. It says the particular reason a soul descends into a physical world is to act within physicality. Sublime Torah revelation does not cancel the question why the soul had to enter a material body. Here the answer is practical mitzvot. Study leading to action demonstrates the complete order: Torah bringing Divine truth into action, not Torah or mitzvot as alternatives.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — 'Today to perform them'

The verse is Deuteronomy 7:11. The Sages interpret it as distinguishing the time of action from the time of reward, a reference also supplied in the passage's notes. Why does the Alter Rebbe need it? Because greater revelation in the World to Come is insufficient: the whole epistle shows that revealed light's magnitude is not the only measure.

A world with more evident Divinity may be very high in revelation. This world nevertheless possesses something unavailable there in the

same way: action, refinement, and renewal of the lower. This is why he concludes with the Mishnah in Avot.

The closing expressions—and why practical mitzvot are the conclusion — One hour of repentance and good deeds here surpasses all life in the World to Come

This does not say the World to Come is inferior. The Mishnah itself continues in the opposite direction: one hour of enjoyment there surpasses all life here. It supplies two measures. Through revelation, delight, and understanding the World to Come is higher.

Through the capacity to act, return, and perform mitzvot, an hour here is more precious than all life there.

The Alter Rebbe cites the first half because it applies to Epistle 20. This gives a fundamental answer concerning Torah and mitzvot: there is no single scale ranking everything from one to ten. There are advantages of revelation, root, understanding, action, delight, and fulfillment of purpose. The epistle asks where the purpose of the soul's descent is reached. Its answer is this world, physicality, and practical mitzvot.

The conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — initial deep research in plain meaning, Kabbalah, and Chassidut — The overall picture—and what now becomes clear about the entire epistle

After examining the details, I believe we can reread the conclusion almost word by word and see its coherence. 'From this it will be clearly understood' tells us not to treat the created orders as a new topic. From the previously explained bottom of Asiyah and returning light, we understand the tangible world. The straight hierarchy is inanimate, plant, animal, and speaking human.

He immediately dismantles the assumption that higher means independent of the lower. Animals live from plants, humans from both, and not only bodily: their understanding does too. Grain shows the plant giving knowledge to humans; ox meat shows animal life adding wisdom. The explanation is not that plants and animals are manifestly above humans, but that returning light from the bottom reveals a dimension rooted more deeply than the visible hierarchy.

The structure is then raised another level: what holds between plant, animal, and person also holds between physical animal and angel. We would expect the higher angel to give life to the animal. The Alter Rebbe says that in sacrifice the animal's spirit ascends and nourishes the higher ox face—and does so from their own foundation and root. The Zohar's precision means their root reaches them from below. The principle has now appeared on two levels: within the world, lower nourishes higher; between worlds, lower physical reality nourishes higher spiritual reality.

The conclusion now almost explains itself. A Divine soul descends into matter not because matter is visibly above it, but because matter conceals something the soul cannot reach by remaining above. Hence descent, embodiment, and encounter with wool, hide, money, wheat, wine, oil, etrog, sukkah, and an entire material world. A practical mitzvah is not a compromise for a soul unable to remain spiritual. It is the very reason for descent.

One final precision may be especially important for your booklet. Epistle 20 does not simply say action is more important than understanding; that would be crude and misleading. It says the lowest in revelation can be the vessel for the highest at the root, so value cannot be measured by visible spirituality alone. This accounts for earth's power, food's power, sacrifice's power, and the practical mitzvah's power.

For this reason, ‘to this physical world’ is not merely a location. It summarizes the entire epistle. The soul descended not despite the world’s physicality but because of it. This is the depth joining the apparently opposed statements about one hour here surpassing all future life and the purpose of souls descending into this physical world. The future world reveals; this world acts. The higher shines; the lower fulfills the intention. Returning light is the concept joining them.

Finally, the printers’ note, ‘Thus far we found in his holy handwriting,’ matters. This is the endpoint of the manuscript found, not the Alter Rebbe’s ordinary stylistic signature; the tradition in Lessons in Tanya associates the epistle with the period close to his passing. It is therefore inappropriate to seek a supposedly missing further summary. The sentence on practical mitzvot is the actual summit at which the manuscript ends, closing the circle opened throughout Epistle 20: how physical being, lowest in the graded order, becomes the place where the highest Divine intention is realized.

File 0571 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Unnumbered Round

Report or witness from the history of the research[481]

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S19 — Linguistic anchor and interpretation

Question: “And through this will be well understood, with good reason and knowledge”: plain meaning, source of the expression, and role in the argument.

Determination: “Good reason and knowledge” echoes Psalms 119:66; in the argument this is a reasoned understanding of the nour-

[481]Document 0571: IGK20-Finale-Close_S_STATUS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ishment of the Merkavah. There is no evidence that it names another Kabbalistic level.

Sources: Psalms 119:66; Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S20 — Supported

Question: What is the Merkavah here, and what is the difference between the human face and the man upon the throne?

Determination: The human face among the four faces is not the figure of the man upon the throne. Ezekiel's distinction must be preserved even when the parallels give Kabbalistic meanings to both.

Sources: Ezekiel 1:6, 10, 26; K5.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S21 — Supported within limits

Question: How does each face include the others while still having a defined name and role?

Determination: Mutual inclusion does not negate the particular role of each face. A fixed attribute is not proof of the absence of refinement; one must not infer the absence of all mutual inclusion.

Sources: Zohar 533; L3 §ג [3]; L6 §א [1].

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S22 — Relationship explicit; comprehensive reason partial

Question: Why is the ox the root of domestic animals and the eagle the root of birds, including the other sacrificial species?

Determination: In the Zohar, the ox is a source for domestic animals and the eagle for birds; the ox does not restrict the discussion to cattle

alone, and the sequence also includes sheep and goats. There is no complete theory here for every species.

Sources: Zohar 534–537.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S23 — Strong contextual explanation

Question: Why does the Epistle mention only ox and eagle, when the Zohar also includes lion and human?

Determination: The Epistle deals with the spirit of the animal and bird; in the Zohar, the lion and human also appear in other roles. The choice fits the example, but the Epistle does not explicitly explain the omission.

Sources: Zohar 539–541; Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S24 — Supported with marked extensions

Question: What ascends from the sacrifice, from whom does the spirit come, to whom does it return, and what does it add?

Determination: The spirit is from the faces of the Merkavah and ascends from the sacrifice; in the Zohar, a substrate and garment below; in the Epistle, returning light; and in L3, revelation of lights of Tohu after refinement. The three formulations must not be merged.

Sources: Zohar; Epistle; L3.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S25 — Plain interpretation; division not demonstrated

Question: The meaning of “greatly enjoy, and are nourished and sustained,” and whether the expressions are distinct.

Determination: Enjoyment, nourishment and sustenance. “Enjoy/are nourished” are found in the Zohar; “are sustained” was not located in the sequence. There is no witness for three separate levels.

Sources: Zohar 531; Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S26 — Digitally supported

Question: Locate the Zohar quotation precisely, its subjects and pronouns; distinguish different occurrences from textual variants.

Determination: 241a, bird passage 537 near line 2; another occurrence and variants in the same line 14/540. The distinction between locations and textual variants is preserved. There is no new Zohar facsimile.

Sources: Zohar.com; Stanford sel385.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S27 — Supported contextual interpretation

Question: What does “כדקדוק” [as precisely stated] add, and what does “יסודא ועיקרא דילהון” [their foundation and root] mean in each link?

Determination: “As precisely stated” emphasizes the relationship to their foundation. In the Zohar, a source above and a base/garment below; LT adds revelation of the root. The possessive pronoun alone does not determine direction.

Sources: Zohar 531, 534–541; L3.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S28 — Combined reconciliation

Question: How does the lower add to the angels, which are also from Ban; what does refined/not yet refined resolve?

Determination: K4 distinguishes Ban that has already been refined from that which has not yet been; L3: the lights of the root; L6: a refined world and a fixed role. There is no single source explicitly combining all three layers.

Sources: K4 ז§ [7]; L3; L6 א§ [1].

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S29 — Supported within the limits of the analogy

Question: How does a small sacrifice nourish many higher beings; the meaning of the lamp analogy in the Zohar.

Determination: A slender lamp and slender piece of wood show that a little can kindle and illuminate for many; an analogy for the force of the imparting, not a division of portions or a calculated quantitative ratio.

Sources: Zohar 538.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S30 — Anchors and preferred reading

Question: "And after these words and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know… all the above" — sources and function.

Determination: "After these words and this truth": II Chronicles 32:1; "it is easy for one with understanding to know": Proverbs 14:6. The transition is to the conclusion. "All the above" is read against the body of the Epistle, not only the sacrifice.

Sources: Scripture; Epistle.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S31 — Supported

Question: What is the link that infers practical mitzvot from nourishment and sacrifice; what does G-d's command add?

Determination: The command is already in the body of the Epistle: fulfilling mitzvot in separate yesh. The sacrifice exemplifies service in matter; there is no inference that every act of eating or all physicality is a mitzvah.

Sources: Epistle; L6.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S32 — Supported; reference open

Question: The purpose of the souls' descent, the purpose of the creation of man, drawings down in ABYA, and a dwelling in the lower realms.

Determination: Drawings down, the purpose of the souls' descent and revelation below combine. L7 explains this through sowing and drawing down; it is not a demonstrated identification of במ"א [elsewhere].

Sources: Epistle; L7; Tanya לו–לז [36–37].

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S33 — Supported

Question: What is the excellence of practical mitzvot here; is there any explicit comparison with Torah?

Determination: The conclusion emphasizes practical mitzvot versus the life of the World to Come; in the body of the Epistle there is a comparison of the root of Torah and mitzvot, and of outer/inner dimensions. There is no single ranking in every respect.

Sources: Epistle; L4; L7.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S34 — Supported by the parallels

Question: Torah study is equivalent to them all, union in Torah, study that leads to action, and Tanya לז ,[5–4] ד–ה [37].

Determination: Tanya ד [4] includes Torah and mitzvot; ה [5] explains union in apprehension; לז [37] distinguishes a mitzvah that can or cannot be performed by others. L4 gives different aspects of "greater," and in L7 study too draws down.

Sources: Tanya לז ,[5] ה ,[4] ד [37]; L4 ד§ [4]; L7.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S35 — Separated by sources

Question: Now, the days of Mashiach, Gan Eden and the resurrection of the dead — what is the relationship to Torah and action in each source?

Determination: Now: service; K3: action is greater in the days of Mashiach; K5: Gan Eden/resurrection in the context of reward. Actual study at the resurrection must not be inferred from בחכמה עשית [You made with wisdom], nor should "the World to Come" be applied in the same sense everywhere.

Sources: K3; K5; Tanya ד [4]; Eruvin.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S36 — Supported

Question: "Today to perform them," and exactly what the Eruvin exposition proves.

Determination: Deuteronomy 7:11 and the exposition in Eruvin 22a: the time of action versus receiving reward. The exposition does not in itself say that action is greater than Torah.

Sources: Eruvin 22a.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S37 — Supported within limits

Question: "One hour is better," the two halves of the Mishnah, repentance and good deeds, and the meaning of the World to Come in context.

Determination: The two halves of the Mishnah emphasize service and gratification along different axes. L6 provides a parallel in memale/sovev; there is no proof of a special intention for the word "repentance" in the Epistle.

Sources: Avot 4:17; Tanya ד [4]; L6 ב–א§§ [1–2].

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S38 — Proposed echo

Question: Grain→reason and knowledge, ox meat→the face of the ox: demonstrated structure or proposed echo?

Determination: "Taste of grain/good reason and knowledge" and "ox meat/the face of the ox" can create a linguistic echo. The sequence of topics is explicit, but the planning of the echo and a separate Kabbalistic meaning have not been demonstrated.

Sources: Epistle; comparison of expressions.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S39 — Transmission boundary supported; history open

Question: “Thus far we have found,” print and manuscript testimony, and the Piena tradition — what can be inferred?

Determination: “Thus far we have found” marks the limit of the material. It is not proof of truncation or deliberate closure. The Piena tradition and the first printing have not been verified afresh in their original sources.

Sources: The Epistle’s wording; reported traditions.

IGK20-Finale-Close — Map of the Forty Questions — S40 — Completed

Question: A continuous explanation of the entire unit, distinguishing a supported conclusion from a proposal.

Determination: A continuous explanation of the entire unit in the attached report, separated from parallels and proposals. Closure is not a declaration that every detail has been resolved.

Sources: REPORT_HE.

File 0371 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[530]

IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — Principal Corrections

1. Bava Kamma 71a → 72a (end of 71b / beginning of 72a)
2. Zohar III רמא א → [341] שמא [241a]; after מיסודא [from the foundation] — lion+human
3. Note 61 EN = later explanation; HE was not opened

[530]Document 0371: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. P6 was not located in this round outside Iggeret HaKodesh 20
5. K3/K4 Cloudflare — were not read

File 0372 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[263]

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 1. Execution Summary P1–P7

Package	Status	Key note
P1 Body of the unit	**Read**	abc770 + Wikisource + EN chabad.org
P2 Notes 61–67	**Partial**	62–67 verified from sources; 61 HE not opened; LIT Vol.4 not in HB
P3 Berachot / Bava Kamma	**Read**	Berachot 40a; Bava Kamma 71b–72a + Rashi/Tosafot
P4 Zohar 240–241	**Read**	240a/b + 241a; lion+human documented
P5 K3/K4	**Failed/partial**	Cloudflare + empty Wayback
P6 Loci	**Not located in this round**	Linguistic search without a verified quotation outside Iggeret HaKodesh 20
P7 Verses / “Thus far”	**Read**	Eruvin 22a; Avot 4:17; “Thus far” note

3. Lessons / Shiurim Notes 61–67 (P2) — Note 64 — Numbers 28:2

In the Zohar (240a), the discussion of sacrifices opens with «Command the children of Israel… My offering, My bread».

Reasoned interpretation: the juxtaposition in Lessons derives from the Zohar’s framework of sacrifices/angels, not from a verse in the body of Iggeret HaKodesh.

[263] Document 0372: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The body of the Epistle itself quotes «today to perform them» and the Mishnah in Avot — not Numbers 28:2 explicitly in this unit.

3. Lessons / Shiurim Notes 61–67 (P2) — Note 65 — Zohar III

Correction: not שמא א [341a]. The target is **רמא א (241a)**.

Wikisource: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז After «ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דלהון» [and they enjoy from their own foundation and root], the Zohar goes on to ask about the four figures, and explicitly introduces **lion** and **human**. See P4.

3. Lessons / Shiurim Notes 61–67 (P2) — Note 66 — Deuteronomy 7:11 + Eruvin 22a

Explicit in Eruvin 22a: «Today to perform them, and not tomorrow to perform them; today to perform them, tomorrow to receive their reward.»

3. Lessons / Shiurim Notes 61–67 (P2) — Note 67 — Avot 4:17

Explicit in the standard wording (Rambam/Bartenura): «One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.»

The numbering 4:17 is correct; no «numbering correction» is needed in this round.

5. Zohar (P4) — Critical for A11 — 240b (Background)

The face of the ox → an animal for sacrifice; the face of the eagle → a bird; «they draw near to their foundation and enjoy from that foundation».

5. Zohar (P4) — Critical for A11 — 241a — The Quotation + Its Continuation (Required)

1. «And those holy spirits descend and draw near, and enjoy from their own foundation and root.»
2. **Immediate continuation:** «Thus far, sacrifice from two sides… Now one must ask — four figures are engraved upon the throne — why is there no sacrifice from the others? Rather, certainly there is sacrifice from all of them. **A lion** is engraved upon the throne… **A human** is engraved upon the throne…»
3. Afterward: אריה כליל [lion—kalil; literally "entire"; source shorthand unclear] / human offers his spirit; and a summation that all four figures draw near.

Evidentiary conclusion (not a conceptual ruling):

The Epistle explicitly restricts itself to «the face of the ox and the face of the eagle» + animal and bird. The Zohar **does not** end there — it adds lion and human.

Why the Epistle lists only ox/eagle: **open / requires interpretation** (do not invent a mechanism as though it were the Alter Rebbe's).

Hypothesis A11 («the Zohar also speaks of lion and human») — **confirmed as a textual fact**.

Separation of layers: the Zohar's text (Aramaic) ≠ Wikisource translation/commentary ≠ abbreviated quotation in Iggeret HaKodesh.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 9. A Plain Continuous Reading (S40) — Without a Slogan

The unit explains: from the order of the levels of inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking, corresponding to the elements earth–water–fire–air, a paradox emerges — the animal and speaking are «higher» in level, yet they are nourished by the vegetative (and the

speaking by both), and even wisdom and knowledge depend on tasting grain and eating meat (as in the examples from our Sages). This is described as an aspect of **returning light** ascending from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance from the encompassing Ein Sof light and from the kav at the end of the feet of the yosher of Adam Kadmon is revealed with greater force. From this is understood (according to the Epistle) the reason for the enjoyment of the angels of the Merkavah — the face of the ox and the face of the eagle — from the spirit of the animal and bird in the sacrifices, as the Zohar says, «ואתהניין מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון» [and they enjoy from their own foundation and root]. And after all this, it is easy to understand the great excellence of **the practical mitzvot** as the purpose of the souls' descent into this world, as in the verse «today to perform them» and the Mishnah «one hour is better…». Thus far (according to the printers) was found in his holy handwriting.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 10. New Questions (N-Grok)

- **N-Grok-01:** Does the note «ע"כ מצאנו» [Thus far we have found] appear in the first printing/manuscript of Iggeret HaKodesh 20 in the same form and in parentheses?
- **N-Grok-02:** What is the Hebrew wording of note 61 in «Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya», vol. 4, and is «יש לומר» [it may be said] explicit there?
- **N-Grok-03:** Do Lessons/Shiurim actually print «Bava Kamma 71a» and «Zohar III 341a» in a printed witness — or is this only a digital transmission error?
- **N-Grok-04:** Read the body of K3 §§14–15 and K4 on angels/refined — after bypassing Cloudflare.

- **N-Grok-05:** Why does the Epistle choose only ox+eagle while the Zohar adds lion+human — is there an explicit source in the Alter Rebbe/our Rebbes?

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — 11. What Was Opened Personally versus What Failed

Opened: abc770 Iggeret HaKodesh 20; Wikisource Tanya 4:20; Berachot 40a; Bava Kamma 71b + 72a (+ Rashi/Tosafot); Zohar 240a, 240b, 241a; Eruvin 22a; Avot 4:17; EN Epistle-20 (aid/1029342); HebrewBooks 15840 (=LIT Vol.1 only); various WebSearch searches.

Failed / not verified: chabadlibrary JS; Lessons Vol.4 PDF; note 61 HE; body of K3/K4; facsimile of printed Tanya/Zohar; P6 loci outside Iggeret HaKodesh 20.

File 0373 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[264]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — B. Lessons / Shiurim (Notes 61–67)

#	Witness	Result
B1	Lessons EN online aid/7965	Cloudflare — not read
B2	HebrewBooks 15840	Downloaded; **Volume 1** only (not Vol.4 Iggeret HaKodesh)
B3	Note 61 EN	Known from the command prompt; HE not opened
B4	Table of notes 62–67	Verified against sources in the Sages/Zohar/Mishnah (not against the text of the printed notes)

[264]Document 0373: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — D. Zohar

Folio	URL	Read	Relevant content
III 240a	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מר_ג_קלח_רהז	Yes	Opening «My offering, My bread» (Numbers 28:2)
III 240b	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז	Yes	The faces of the ox / eagle / lion / human; יסודא דלהון [their foundation]

Folio	URL	Read	Relevant content
III 241a	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז	Yes	מיסודא ועקרא [from the foundation and root] + **continuation on lion and human**

Facsimile of printed Zohar: not obtained. Wikisource transcript = digital witness.

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R1-Bot — G. Local Files evidence/

File	Content
abc770_igk20.html	Copy of the abc770 page
tanya_wikisource_igk20.html	Copy of Wikisource
zohar_241a_wikisource.html	Zohar 241a
bk_72a_wikisource.html	Bava Kamma 72a
Lessons_Tanya_Vol1_HB15840_NOT_vol4.pdf	Vol.1 only — indicated in the filename

File 0374 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[482]

[482]Document 0374: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 4. Zohar III 240b — Ox/Eagle Background

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז

Passage (Zohar text):

> The face of the ox — a spirit extended from it to the domestic animals… and because those holy hosts came from them… they draw near to their foundation and enjoy from that foundation…
>
> The face of the eagle — a spirit extended from it to the bird…

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 5. Zohar III 241a — The Quotation + Lion and Human (Critical)

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז

> And those holy spirits descend and draw near, and enjoy from their own foundation and root.
>
> And if you say, how does a little from this pigeon or from this turtledove extend to so many sides…
>
> Thus far, sacrifice from two sides engraved upon the throne. Now one must ask —
>
> Four figures are engraved upon the throne — why is there no sacrifice from the others?
>
> Rather, certainly there is sacrifice from all of them.
>
> A lion is engraved upon the throne. When the sacrifice is complete — a lion descends and enters the fire, and eats and enjoys from there.

A human is engraved upon the throne. The human is the root of all, and offers there his spirit and his soul,

and the higher human enjoys from the lower human…

Distinction: all the above = the Zohar's text. There is no Chabad commentary here.

Iggeret HaKodesh quotes only as far as «מיסודא ועיקרא» [from the foundation and root] and illustrates with the faces of the ox and eagle.

Numbers 28:2 in the Zohar's context (240a):

«Command the children of Israel and say to them, My offering, My bread, etc.»

→ A possible explanation for the placement of note 64 (**reasoned interpretation**, not the body of Iggeret HaKodesh).

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 6. Eruvin 22a — «Today to Perform Them»

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בכ_ויבורע

What is the meaning of that which is written (Deuteronomy 7:11), "which I command you today to perform them"?

Today to perform them, and not tomorrow to perform them; today to perform them, tomorrow to receive their reward.

SOURCE_READER — Source Passages with Context — 7. Avot 4:17

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/זי_ד_תובא_הנשמ

One hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come.

File 0376 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[484]

VARIANTS — Independent Reading of Differences — Zohar versus Iggeret HaKodesh (Not a «Textual Variant» but a Restricted Quotation)

Zohar 241a	Iggeret HaKodesh
מיסודא ועקרא [from the foundation and root] + continuation on lion and human	מיסודא ועיקרא [from the foundation and root] + only ox and eagle

Classification: **explicit** that the Epistle quotes part; **open** why.

File 0405 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[446]

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 4. The Zohar: Two Relationships, Not One Reversal of Direction

In the text of Zohar III 240b, the spirit descends from above to the animal below, and then returns in the sacrifice. In the same sequence, the higher beings receive enjoyment from their foundation and garment in this world.

Relationship	What is explained
From the higher to the animal and bird	The source of the spirit and affiliation with the spiritual species

[484] Document 0376: VARIANTS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[446] Document 0405: IGK20-Finale-R1-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Relationship	What is explained
From the sacrifice to the higher beings	Enjoyment and nourishment from the foundation in this world

Claude's correction should therefore be accepted: "יסודא" [foundation] must not be translated in every occurrence as "a hidden higher root." But this does not justify erasing the explicit direction of descent from above. The term is used in different relationships within the sequence.

Source: Zohar III 240b.

At 241a, lion and human explicitly participate in the sacrifice. Explaining the Epistle's choice of ox and eagle in terms of the spirit of the animal and bird is a supported local interpretation; it does not negate the other faces. In addition, the two word orders "מיסודא ועקרא" [from the foundation and root] and "מעקרא ויסודא" [from the root and foundation] appear in two different places in the same sequence. Their very difference must not be turned into a manuscript variant in the same line. The variant apparatus noted by Claude has not been examined here.

Source: Zohar III 241a.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 6. K3, K4, K5 — Contribution and Limit

K3 — "ציון במשפט תפדה" [Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice], 5735, sections יד–טו [14–15]: indicates the excellence of action that will be revealed in the days of Mashiach, and connects the excellence of practical mitzvot to Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The opposite claim, that in the future Torah is necessarily greater, must therefore not be preserved as a research assumption. The discourse itself also presents more than one aspect of Torah and mitzvot.

Source K3. In note 27, the reference to Sefer HaMitzvot of the Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a], was located; the text of that source was not examined here.

K4 — "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, section ז [7]: directly explains the enjoyment of the angels, and distinguishes between Ban that has already been refined and sparks that have not yet been refined. This is an important correction to a sweeping explanation of Tohu versus Tikkun. This passage contains no explicit identification with the returning light of the kav. Applying the discussion of penitents to the choice of the Mishnah quotation at the end of the Epistle remains a proposal.

Source K4, an unreviewed transcript.

K5 — "ונגלה כבוד הוי" [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722: two points in Claude's report must be corrected. The explanation that the World to Come in the Mishnah means the resurrection of the dead explicitly refers to the Mishnah "All Israel have a portion," not to "One hour is better." In addition, section ז [7] does distinguish between Gan Eden as the reward for Torah and resurrection as the reward for practical mitzvot; one must not record that the discourse does not discuss this relationship at all. The discourse also contributes to distinguishing the human face of the Merkavah from the man upon the throne, and to the discussion of the substance of food.

Source K5, an unreviewed transcript.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 7. The Direct Source Missing from the Torah–Action Discussion: Tanya ד' [4]

Chapter 4 itself quotes "One hour is better" within an explanation of attachment through Torah and its mitzvot, as compared with the pleasure of apprehension of the radiance of the Shechinah. This is

an anchor from the Alter Rebbe himself, without relying only on the introduction to Lessons.

It follows that the Mishnah is not sweeping evidence for excluding Torah study from the excellence of service in this world. In Epistle 20, the emphasis is practical mitzvot and the purpose of descent; one must not infer that all the excellences of Torah are inferior, or that comparing service to reward is identical to comparing study to action.

Source read in its text: Tanya, chapter ד' [4].

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 9. What Is Retained, What Is Corrected, and What Was Not Examined

Retained: the reports' location corrections for Bava Kamma and the Zohar; the participation of all four faces in the Zohar; the contribution of K3 and K4; the distinction between sovev and the kav; the requirement not to identify refinement, Tohu and returning light automatically.

Corrected: the correspondence attributed to Etz Chaim; the exclusive explanation of "יסודא" [foundation]; the claim of textual variants without comparison of the same location; attributing the meat–knowledge connection only to the later explanation; transferring the interpretation of "the World to Come" from one Mishnah to another.

Not examined here: the text of Mishnat Chassidim; Or HaChamah and Mikdash Melech; Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah, Vayigash, in their texts; facsimiles of the Talmud and Zohar; the complete Hebrew source for note 61; Sefer HaMitzvot of the Tzemach Tzedek, קעא [170a]; the first printing of Iggeret HaKodesh. They must not be presented as evidence that was read.

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 10. Reading Ledger and Method of Access

Read in their digital texts in the independent examination: Etz Chaim נ י [50, 10]; Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, in the discourse mentioned; Likkutei Torah, Tzav, מצה זו [This Matzah], ב [2]; Tanya ד [4]; Zohar 240b–241a; the relevant passages in K3, K4 and K5. There is no claim here to have read these books in their entirety or in a print facsimile.

The Grok and Claude reports were read from the user's message. Bot's REPORT_HE and VARIANTS files were opened directly in the source folder. Bot's ZIP was not successfully downloaded; there is no claim that the complete package was checked or that facsimiles were found in it.

Original Bot folder

This document concludes the current R1 review. The open questions are retained for the overall work; there is no need to close them artificially in order to preserve the progress.

File 0406 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[265]

Your Role — Claude: Source Criticism and Focused Explanation

You are the lead independent researcher for the questions of the Merkavah, the Zohar's wording, the sacrifice, and Torah–action–purpose (S19–S39). At the same time you must provide a critical response to all the other questions, and not omit them. You are not

[265] Document 0406: IGK20-Finale-R1_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

being asked merely to attack an earlier report: you must propose a positive explanation where there is a basis.

Preferred order of execution:

א [1]. The body of the Epistle and the unit's context; then Zohar 240–241 before and after the quotation. Check especially the roles of lion and human and the direction of "יסודא ועיקרא" [foundation and root]. Required table: subject → what it receives → from whom → action → source. Do not use the Sulam commentary or Or HaChamah without marking the layer.

ב [2]. The discourse "פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל" [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723 (K4): check whether it actually explains the Epistle's sentence and what it adds concerning Tohu/Tikkun. If it does not resolve a detail, say so.

ג [3]. The discourse ציון במשפט תפדה [Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice], 5735 (K3), and its sources; Tanya לה–לז, [4–5] ד–ה [35–37] and the necessary parallels. Check a table of now/the days of Mashiach/Gan Eden/the resurrection of the dead — do not fill a cell with a source that does not discuss it.

ד [4]. Check the syntax of returning light, the two food proofs and the previous research, so that contradictory assumptions do not remain in the explanation.

Your deliverable:

1. Up to seven new findings that change the understanding, each with a source and status.
2. Three or four in-depth dossiers, according to the finding, containing all the user's relevant points of precision.
3. A review table A01–A18: accepted/corrected/unsupported/open, with a short reason.

4. A table of all S01–S40: conclusion, status, source, and what is missing. You may refer to an in-depth section in the same report, not to a report that is not attached.
5. A readable continuous explanation of the entire conclusion; indicate in the relevant sentences where it is your proposal.
6. A ledger of sources read and limitations; new questions; at most three substantive follow-up targets, if needed.

Title: IGK20-Finale-R1-Claude. There is no need to wait for another model or request approval.

Work Framework — IGK20-Finale-R1 — ג [3]. The Independent Research Supplied — Complete as to Its Claims, Not a Settled Source

A user supplied a long research report, all of whose main proposals are brought here. Its original citation markers were search IDs unavailable outside that conversation; do not use them as evidence. We do not have full references for claims attributed there to Torat Chaim, Or HaTorah and Or HaChamah. Locate and examine them, or mark them as unverified.

A01. The entire unit is a sequence: power in the lower → food adding vitality and intellect to the higher → sacrifice nourishing angels → practical mitzvot. This is a possible key to reading; check whether it is a continuous proof or an analogy/application on several levels.

A02. The inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders/elements are “aspects,” not a material classification:

earth=stability and rest; water=growth and spreading; fire=heat and self-movement; air=speech and awareness. These are proposed explanations that the report did not anchor in an explicit source for all four correspondences. In particular, do not declare that air is the highest of the elements in every ordering system.

A03. Earth was omitted because it is the basis of everything and was already discussed. Note 61 is a partial anchor; the expansion “and therefore there is no need to mention it” is an inference that must be checked.

A04. “And also wisdom and knowledge” moves the proof from bodily existence to the speaking order’s special power. Grain exemplifies vegetative→initial knowledge; meat exemplifies animal→additional intellectual investigation. Correspondence to “from both” is plausible; do not map grain=knowledge and meat=wisdom without a source.

A05. “Father and mother” is the Sages’ wording; an echo of the higher Abba and Imma was proposed but not demonstrated. The connection between the Tree of Knowledge and wheat was mentioned; this is not yet an adequate explanation for grain in particular.

A06. Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah were described as explaining additional intellect after refinement of food. There is no precise location; this is a locating task, not a demonstrated reading. “A high root,” the breaking of the kelim, Tohu and Tikkun, and returning light are not automatically synonyms.

A07. The first returning light was proposed as a general description of nourishment from below; the last as a description of the kav. Sovev shines there without a technical return. This is a preferred syntactic proposal, not proof that there is no other reading.

A08. “A radiance of a radiance, etc.” was proposed as an abbreviation of the third radiance already mentioned. No explicit source has been found for the reason for choosing “etc.” or for extending it to the entire system of concealments. Do not claim a fourth degree without evidence.

A09. “Good reason and knowledge” was compared to Psalms 119:66; an echo of the taste of grain, knowledge and the verse’s conclusion

about mitzvot was proposed. Possible linguistic proximity is not demonstrated authorial intention. The same applies to ox meat→the face of the ox.

A10. The Merkavah was explained as mutual inclusion of aspects, and the name "the face of the ox" as a root aspect of domestic animals, not only the ox species. Or HaChamah was mentioned without a reference as saying that the human face is primary; it must be located and not attributed to the Zohar without examination.

A11. The faces of the ox/eagle were explained as corresponding to the sacrificial animals/birds; the face of the lion was not mentioned because wild animals are not offered. This explanation is incomplete: the preparatory examination found that the Zohar on the same folio also discusses lion and human. The continuation must be read, and the question must not be closed on the basis of the animal list alone.

A12. Enjoy=pleasure; are nourished=vitality; are sustained=receivin g what meets their needs. This is a proposed linguistic interpretation, not a demonstrated mapping to three levels. "Greatly" requires close examination.

A13. "מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון" [from their own foundation and root] was explained as the angels' receiving from their deep root through the lower. It is essential to check the subject of each pronoun in the Zohar, what foundation and root mean in context, and what the Alter Rebbe adds by applying returning light. Do not replace examination with "everything is a high root."

A14. The concluding expressions were identified as biblical phrases (II Chronicles 32:1; Proverbs 14:6). It was proposed that "it is easy for one with understanding to know" moves from proofs to the conclusion; their role here requires verification, not merely identification of a verse.

A15. Dwelling=purpose; drawings down=action; practical mitzvot= a special path in a material world; refinement=the way of realization. This is an explanatory combination, not four definitions by the Alter Rebbe in the same sentence. Also check the difference between "the creation of man"/"the descent of souls."

A16. Torah was presented as higher in revelation and apprehension, and mitzvot in realizing the purpose. This can be true on some axes, but it is not a sufficient investigation of "study is greater" and of the future. The user asked whether specifically Torah is greater in the future; do not adopt this as an assumption. An explicit source in the direction of "action is greater," mentioned below, was found.

A17. "Today to perform them" and "one hour is better" were proposed as action versus reward/pleasure. It is essential to read the entire Mishnah, explain why repentance is included, and define which World to Come is meant in each source. Gan Eden, the days of Mashiach and the resurrection of the dead must not be identified with one another.

A18. "Thus far we have found" was identified as a note by the copyist s/printers; it is forbidden to infer from this that the Epistle is deliberately complete or incomplete, or to establish a date of writing and circumstances without a witness. The tradition concerning Piena and proximity to his passing requires an identified source.

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S29. How Does the Existence of a Small Sacrifice Suffice for Many Angels? The Zohar Itself Raises a Related Question; What Does Its Explanation Add to the Plain Meaning of the Epistle? Distinguish Physical Food from Spiritual Influx without Emptying "Are Nourished" of Content.

Cluster ה [5] — The Conclusion, Torah and Action, the Future

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S33. "Practical Mitzvot" versus Torah: Does the Epistle Explicitly Rank Them against One Another, or Is Their Excellence Established along a Particular Axis? What about Torah Study as a Mitzvah, Speech as Action, Prayer and Intention?

S34. "Torah study is equivalent to them all" and "study is greater, because it leads to action": read the context and explain what is considered greater in each source. Compare Tanya לה–לז [4–5], ד–ה [35–37], and Kuntres Acharon ד [4] if relevant; the division Torah=apprehens ion/action=purpose is insufficient without a source that applies it.

S35. Check especially the future assumption: study is greater now/ action is greater in the future, or another order? Distinguish the days of Mashiach, the resurrection of the dead and Gan Eden, and future apprehension of Torah. Read K3 and its sources; do not present the user's question as a fact.

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S36. "Today to Perform Them": What Do the Verse and the Eruvin Exposition Prove? Action versus Reward, a Time of Opportunity, or Priority of Action over Study? Do Not Infer beyond the Source's Scope.

S37. "One hour of repentance and good deeds is better…": why repentance here, what are good deeds, and what is "all the life of the World to Come"? Also read the half of the Mishnah about gratification. Check Tanya ד [4] and parallels; does will/nature versus radian ce/apprehension explain it, and what does it not explain?

ד [4]. All Research Questions — Fixed Numbering S01–S40 — S39. “Thus Far We Have Found in His Holy Handwriting”: Who Wrote the Note, in Which Printed Witnesses, and What May Be Inferred from It about the Epistle’s Completeness/Truncation/ Date? Do Not Turn a Copying Note into Evidence of an Intention to Conclude.

S40. The overall map of the argument: what was demonstrated, what served as an analogy, and what was learned by inference? At the end, write a continuous explanation of the entire unit, but do not replace the individual questions with the slogan “the lower is higher at its root.” Add newly discovered questions with the ID N-[שם 01-[מודל [N-[model name]-01], etc.

File 0424 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[439]

ב [2]. Continuous Explanation — Returning Light and the Merkavah

“For it is an aspect of returning light” explains the relationship: at the bottom, a radiance that adds upward is revealed with greater force. The Epistle again details sovev and the end of the kav, because it applies to nourishment and knowledge the explanation previously given for growth. Sovev is a source of radiance at the bottom; the return from below upward is attributed here to the kav. “A radiance of a radiance, etc.” refers to the previous description, but the precise scope of the abbreviation is undecided. There is no need to invent an additional degree on its basis.

[439] Document 0424: Final-Closure.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

The expressions Tohu, Sag and Mah in the parallels expand the understanding of the root of food and refinement. They are not an explicit identification of Sag with the returning light of the kav. Nor is the returning light in "ואכלתם אכול" [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], in the future context of Malchut after the refinements, the same statement about the end of the feet of Adam Kadmon. There is a structural relationship: that which is low in revelation can add by virtue of a root or radiance higher than its revealed level. There is no license here to merge all the descriptions into one mechanism.

"And through this will be well understood, with good reason and knowledge" transfers the explanation from the human being to the angels of the Merkavah. In the Zohar, the face of the ox is the source of the spirit of domestic animals, and the face of the eagle of the spirit of birds. In the offering, the spirit ascends, and the higher beings enjoy from the foundation they have below. The Zohar itself connects origin and return through the analogy of the Shechinah's enjoyment from the spirit of the righteous person, which originates in her. The Epistle reads this relationship through the explanation of returning light. Likkutei Torah, Emor, adds that refinement reveals lights of Tohu; the reference to the Epistle is indeed printed there, without it having been determined who wrote it.

Zohar, Pinchas, paragraphs 531–540 · L3, ד§ [4]

"As precisely stated" emphasizes that the enjoyment comes from what belongs to their foundation and root. Two aspects must be distinguished: the higher is the source of the descending spirit; the lower is its base and garment in this world. The reading in terms of the root in Tohu explains, in the Chassidic parallel, what is revealed through the lower, and does not erase its role as a base in this world in the Zohar's wording. The pronoun "דילהון" [their] alone does not decide the entire question.

The Epistle's wording is especially close to the bird paragraph, 537, at 241a; at a later place, 540, there is a different word order and also an actual textual variant in the same line. A textual variant must not be inferred from the mere existence of two different paragraphs. Lion and human are also discussed in that same Zoharic sequence: the lion in the fire, and the human in offering his spirit and soul. The Epistle's choice of ox and eagle fits the examples of the spirit of the animal and bird. This is a strong contextual explanation for the choice, not an explicit statement by the Epistle about the reason for the omission.

An angel that has already been refined can receive an addition. K4 distinguishes refined Ban from Ban not yet refined, whose root is higher; L3 describes the angels' enjoyment from the revelation of the lights of the root. L6 shows that a fixed attribute and role are compatible with a refined state. The combination allows the addition to be understood without setting up an artificial contradiction. One must not infer that a particular attribute excludes all mutual inclusion: L3 itself discusses the peace and nullification that connect different attributes.

"Enjoy, are nourished and are sustained" describes receiving enjoyment, vitality and sustenance. The first two terms are found in the Zohar; no source for the third was located in the sequence examined. A division into three levels has not been demonstrated. The Zohar's analogy of the slender lamp answers the question of quantity: a little can be the beginning of a great imparting; this is not a formula for measuring spiritual food.

ב [2]. Continuous Explanation — From the Sacrifice to Practical Mitzvot

"And after these words and this truth" and "it is easy for one with understanding to know" mark the transition to establishing the con-

clusion. “All the above” is read well against the background of the entire Epistle: it has already said that separate beings were created to fulfill the command, and that mitzvot are the foundation and root of Torah. Nourishment and sacrifice are the final links in the argument. The conclusion, therefore, is not that every contact with matter is a mitzvah. It is physical action in accordance with the command that establishes the purpose of the soul’s descent in the lower reality.

The excellence of mitzvot combines their root and their place in action. In the body of the Epistle, their root is described in Gulgulta and the root of Torah in Mocha Stimaah, while in their manifestation below they differ in outer and inner dimensions. One must not infer from this a single ranking in every respect. Ki Tetze ד§ [4] describes aspects in which study is greater and aspects in which action is greater; within that same section, Torah arouses ratzo, while action also brings about drawing down below. In Kuntres Acharon ד [4], it is explicit that study too draws down light. Elevation and drawing down participate in the service, and its purpose is not merely departure from the world.

L4, ד§ [4] · L7

“Today to perform them” places the time of service against the time of reward. The Mishnah “One hour is better” adds the excellence of service in this world, while its second half establishes the excellence of gratification in the World to Come. A particularly close parallel was found in Likkutei Torah, Pinchas: the two quotations appear in the same discourse, and the difference between measured apprehension and the drawing down through Torah and mitzvot is explained. This is also a comparison of the quality of the connection, not only of time. Nevertheless, the two quotations must not be called “two verses”: the second is a Mishnah.

Tanya ד [4] applies the excellence of attachment to Torah as well. Tanya לז [37] maintains both the excellence of study and the precedence of a mitzvah that cannot be performed by others. K3 adds the future revelation of the excellence of action; K5 distinguishes reward in Gan Eden from reward at the resurrection. These are explanatory additions that must be read in context, without loading every occurrence of "the World to Come" with the same interpretation and without attributing the entire future division to the concluding unit itself.

"Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting" marks the limit of the material transmitted. The formula alone is not proof that the Alter Rebbe intended to conclude here, or that the manuscript was truncated. The Piena tradition is a matter of separate historical testimony; it need not be decided in order to explain the existing conclusion.

IGK20-Finale-Close — The Compiler's Report and Explanation of the Concluding Unit — ה [5]. Source and Reading Ledger

The table documents the current closing review. "Retained" means the result of the previous research and the reports supplied, not a rereading now.

Source	Role	Status in this review
Epistle 20, ABC770	The body of the argument and the conclusion	Opened; the paragraphs on the root, the earth and the conclusion were reread

Source	Role	Status in this review
L1 ימים ששת [Six Days], Tzav ב§ [2]	The two proofs and Tohu; transition to service	The text was reread. The facsimile file retrieved from Drive was truncated and did not serve as visual testimony
L2 אכול ואכלתם [And You Shall Eat Plentifully]	A future parallel of returning light	Retained from the rounds; not reopened

Source	Role	Status in this review
L3 והניף ביאור [Explanation of “And He Shall Wave”], Emor	Tohu, sacrifices and the two references	Retained from the rounds; an Emor facsimile had previously been seen by the compiler, not reopened
L4 תצא כי [When You Go Out] ד§ [4]	The two directions and the result of action	The text of ד§ [4] was reread; א§ [1] retained
L5 בפ׳ נסכים [In the Section of Libations], Shelach א§ [1]	Animal–fire and reference to Ki Tetze	The compiler’s previous digital reading is retained; another researcher’s blockage does not negate it
L6 ישראל בני את צו [Command the Children of Israel], Pinchas א§§–ד [1–4]	Pairs, angels, the time of service, sacrifice and drawing down	Full text read; facsimile PDF180, heading Pinchas/150, independently seen
L7 Kuntres Acharon ד [4]	Sag/Mah, food, drawing down and sowing	Relevant text and its context reread; the site marks “not checked”; no print facsimile
Berachot 40a	Grain and parents	Retained from the rounds
Bava Kamma 72a	Meat; Rashi and Tosafot	The folio and Rashi reopened; the rest of the context retained
Zohar, Pinchas 84	Spirit, base, birds, the four faces	Aramaic passage 535–540 reopened; the broader context retained. The site’s translation is not the Zohar’s text
Stanford, sel385	Variants in the same line	The compiler’s previous reading is retained; no new Zohar facsimile
Etz Chaim נ י [50, 10]	The reverse mapping	Retained from the rounds; no emendation on its basis
Vaetchanan, תוספת ביאור וידעת [Further Explanation of “And You Shall Know”] ה§ [5]; מצה זו [This Matzah] ב§ [2]	The specific role of wheat and “father”	Retained; they do not replace L1
Tanya לז, [5] ה, [4] ד [37]; Eruvin 22a; Avot 4:17	Torah, action, service and reward	Retained from the rounds; no claim of new reading
K3 5735, K4 5723, K5 5722	Future revelation, refinement, body and sovev	Later explanations retained; K4/K5 are unreviewed transcripts

Source	Role	Status in this review
Lessons, note 61	The animal and the earth	English from the rounds; original Hebrew not verified
Psalms 119:66, II Chronicles 32:1, Proverbs 14:6	Transitional expressions	Pages opened in the review; the Psalms anchor found in the text
Bot R5 folder	Closure witnesses	REPORT_HE and LOCATIONS read; EVIDENCE list opened; no claim to have checked the entire package

In the L6 facsimile, section ג' [3] and the four pairs are visible, as are a refined world and the angels' attributes in the adjacent column. The secure citation for the facsimile seen is **Pinchas, Arabic-numbered page 150, PDF180**. Bot's report of עה [75] at the opening does not itself provide a precise column for section ג' [3]; its LOCATIONS table mixes this with the continuation on עו [76]. This mixture must not be adopted as a final citation.

File 0378 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or witness from the history of the research[441]

IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — Reuse from R1

BK 71b→72a; Zohar 241a + lion/adam; note 61 EN late commentary; «ad kan» printer note (digital only).

File 0379 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or witness from the history of the research[266]

[441]Document 0378: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[266]Document 0379: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. P3 — Zohar 240b–241a — Table of Occurrences of יסודא/ עיקרא [Foundation/Root] (in Order)

#	Location (standard digital print)	Short wording	Subject
1	240b	«ואתהנון מההוא **דלהון ליסודא** מתקרבין יסודא» [they draw near **to their foundation** and enjoy from that foundation]	Face of the ox / domestic animal

#	Location (standard digital print)	Short wording	Subject
2	240b	«יסודא דהאי עלמא» / «מסטרא דיסודא דלהון» [foundation of this world / from the side of their foundation]	Garment of the spirit
3	241a	«ואתהניין **דלהון ועקרא מיסודא**» [and they enjoy **from their own foundation and root**]	Holy spirits (the Epistle's quotation)
4	241a	«מיסודא דיליה» [from his foundation]	Higher human from lower human
5	241a	«כד אתהנון **דלהון ויסודא מעקרא**» [when they enjoy **from their own root and foundation**]	Lamps / priests and Levites
6	241a	«מתקרבי **דלהון ויסודא לעקרא**» [they draw near **to their root and foundation**]	Face of the ox (summary of the four figures)

Immediate continuation after #3: «Thus far, sacrifice from two sides… a lion is engraved… a human is engraved…» — lion+human **documented** (retaining the R1 correction: 241a, not 341).

דילהון [their]: appears in the context of enjoyment from sacrifice/a garment of spirit — one **must not** decide from it alone between «higher root» and «lower foundation».

4. P3 — Zohar 240b–241a — Stanford / Pritzker sel=385

- Opened: Hilufim Pinehas 3 239a–241b.
- For the same location, «מיסודא ועקרא דלהון» [from their own foundation and root] (241a, line ~2): spelling/witness variants — מיסודא/ מסטרא [from the foundation/from the side]; ועקרא/ועיקרא [and the root, variant spelling]; דלהון/דילהון [their, variant spelling]; /ואתהניין ואתהנון [and they enjoy, variant spelling], etc. — **the same locus**, different witnesses.
- Do not conflate occurrence #1 with #3 as a «variant».

Mikdash Melech / Or HaChamah: links on Wikisource; the commentator's text in facsimile was **not** opened in this round (site translation ≠ facsimile of a commentator).

5. P4 — Emor לח ג [38c] + K4 — 5.1 Likkutei Torah, Emor לח [38]

- Page heading in OCR: « לח תורה אמור לקוטי» [OCR order: 38 / Torah / Emor / Likkutei].
- Later in the page/discourse (explicit anchor): quotation «In the holy Zohar (Parashat Pinchas, 241a), and they enjoy from their own foundation and root» + elevation of the animal soul to the face of the ox in the Merkavah / the altar's consumption.
- This is the locus close to K4 note 37 (angels/ox) — **read**.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — 6. P5–P6 (Secondary — Honest Limits)

Item	Status
K3 יד–טו [14–15] / K5 ז ,[3] ג [7]	Cloudflare — not read
Tanya ch. 4 / Eruvin / Kiddushin / Avot	**Reuse from R1** (solid)
Mishnah «All Israel» ≠ «One hour is better»	Confirmed as a distinction (R1 + principle)

Item	Status
Note 61 HE	**Not opened** — remains a later explanation; EN «It may likewise be said»
Sefer HaMitzvot, Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a]	Not opened in this round
Early print with Iggeret HaKodesh + «Thus far we have found»	Title-page not verified; digital only (R1)

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — 8. What Was Opened / What Failed

Opened: Etz Chaim 50:10; Mishnat Chassidim HB7122; Iggeret HaKodesh (3 digital); Zohar 240b+241a; Stanford 385; Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan ו׳ [6] + Tzav יג [13] + Emor לח [38] (from `lt_full.txt`); abc770.

Failed/partial: print facsimile of Etz Chaim/Zohar/Tanya; K3/K4/K5 Cloudflare; note 61 HE; Sefer HaMitzvot, Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a].

File 0380 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or witness from the history of the research[489]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — P3 — Zohar

ID: P3-240b

Location: Zohar III 240b

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז

PDF: n/a

printed: n/a

[489]Document 0380: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

folio: רמ ב [240b] (page heading)

scope: יסודא דלהון [their foundation] / ox eagle

type: digital_body

ID: P3-241a

Location: Zohar III 241a

URL: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז

PDF: n/a

printed: n/a

folio: רמא א [241a]

scope: מיסודא ועקרא [from the foundation and root] + lion human

type: digital_body

ID: P3-STAN

Location: Stanford variants sel=385

URL: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385

PDF: n/a

printed: n/a

folio: 239a–241b range

scope: witness variants for the same sequence

type: critical_apparatus

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R2-Bot — P4 — Angels

ID: P4-EMOR

Location: Likkutei Torah, Emor לח [38]

URL/path: lt_full.txt

printed: לח [38] (heading)

column: ג [c] specified in K4's citation; OCR does not clearly separate columns

scope: Zohar quotation + elevation of the animal soul

type: digital_OCR

ID: P4-K4

Location: פקודא מחצית השקל [The Commandment of the Half-Shekel], 5723

URL/path: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192

printed: —

column: —

scope: Cloudflare — not read

type: blocked

File 0381 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or witness from the history of the research[442]

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — E. Zohar 241a

> And they descend and draw near… and enjoy **from their own foundation and root**.
>
> Thus far, sacrifice from two sides… **a lion** is engraved… **a human** is engraved…

SOURCE_READER — Short Anchors — F. Likkutei Torah, Emor לח [38] (Close to K4's Note)

> In the holy Zohar (Parashat Pinchas, 241a), and they enjoy from their own foundation and root

[442]Document 0381: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

- elevation of the spirit of the animal to the face of the ox in the Merkavah.

File 0383 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Report or witness from the history of the research[491]

VARIANTS — The Same Location Only — Table 1: Zohar III 241a — «ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דלהון» [And They Enjoy from Their Own Foundation and Root]

Base source: Wikisource / Margaliot. Apparatus: Stanford sel=385 (Pinehas 239a–241b).

Anchor	Variant	Witnesses (as in Stanford)	Note
ואתהניין [and they enjoy]	ואתהנון / ואיתהנון [and they enjoy, variant spellings]	מ"ח, various manuscripts	Spelling
מיסודא [from the foundation]	מסטרא [from the side] (32נ)	32נ	**Same line**; do not conflate with «ליסודא דלהון» [to their foundation] at 240b
ועקרא [and the root]	ועיקרא [and the root]	...8מ ,5פ ,3ו	Common spelling; Iggeret HaKodesh: ועיקרא [and the root]
דלהון [their]	דילהון [their]	3ו, etc.	Iggeret HaKodesh: דילהון [their]

Do not record as a variant: the occurrence of «ליסודא דלהון» [to their foundation] at 240b versus «מיסודא ועקרא» [from the foundation and root] at 241a — these are **two occurrences**.

[491]Document 0383: VARIANTS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0409 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[531]

Role: in-depth interpretive investigation of the Zohar, returning light and the conclusion on practical mitzvot.

Your emphasis is not a summary of R1, but a move from general directions to answers built upon precise sentences.

Dossier א [1] — S20–S29, foundation and root, Merkavah and refinement: א [1]. Reread Zohar 240b–241a in the Aramaic sequence. Construct a table for every relevant occurrence of foundation/root: subject, pronoun, higher/lower, source of the spirit, what ascends, who enjoys, and from what. A required test: how can the higher be the source of the lower's spirit and the lower be the foundation of the higher's nourishment without turning the two claims into an identity? ב [2]. Do not settle for translating "root." Does the word indicate chainlike descent, a substrate in this world, affiliation with the same species, or a source of addition? Which of these is in the Zohar, and what does returning light in the Epistle add? ג [3]. Open at least one commentary on the passage, preferably Mikdash Melech or Or HaChamah if available. If they do not open, use an accessible commentator and mark its layer; do not present the site's translation as the Zohar's text. ד [4]. Check the claim of textual variants from R1: compare witnesses of the same occurrence only. Two word orders in two occurrences are not evidence for a variant in the same line. ה [5]. Ox and eagle: propose a positive explanation for their selection based on the distinction between the roles of the four faces. Read Ezekiel 1. Explain mutual inclusion without a picture of four disconnected living creatures and without confusing the human face with

[531]Document 0409: IGK20-Finale-R2_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

the man upon the throne. Check whether “enjoy/are nourished/are sustained” is a substantive distinction or a linguistic accumulation. ו [6]. Read Likkutei Torah, Emor לח ג [38c], to which K4 refers. Check whether it is a closer source from the Alter Rebbe for explaining the nourishment. Distinguish refined/unrefined Ban from Tohu/Tikkun; has a connecting sentence to returning light been found, rather than merely a resemblance?

Dossier ב [2] — S14–S19, syntax and a positive explanation of returning light: א [1]. Present proposed punctuation of the entire sentence and a serious alternative reading. Establish separately the subject of “הוא” [it], the subject of “שמתגלית” [which is revealed], and the scope of the two source phrases. ב [2]. Why is returning light mentioned twice? Why is repetition of the end of the feet of yosher required? What has changed from growth to nourishment and knowledge? ג [3]. K5 says that the substance of food is from sovev. Is this a direct parallel to the Epistle, an additional explanation, or a different explanation? Do not substitute the spirit ascending from the sacrifice for the substance of food. Show precisely what remains different. ד [4]. How far can “with greater force” and “a radiance of a radiance, etc.” be explained, and what is undecided? Do not define sovev as returning light merely to simplify the diagram.

Dossier ג [3] — S30–S37, why practical mitzvot: א [1]. Read the text of Tanya ד–ה [4–5] and לז [37], not only the introduction to Lessons; use לו [36] and מא [41] as needed. What is the precise link between the power of the lower and a mitzvah action performed according to a command? ב [2]. Compare “One hour is better” in chapter 4 and at the end of 20: the same quotation serves to explain Torah and mitzvot there, and practical mitzvot here. Does this resolve the difficulty, or only sharpen the axes? ג [3]. K3 §§יד–טו [14–15] and K5 §ז [7]: construct a separate table for service now, reward in Gan Eden, the days of Mashiach and the resurrection of the dead. Do not fill a cell without

a source that addresses it. Distinguish performing mitzvot, studying Torah, revelation of the excellence of action, and receiving reward. ד [4]. "The World to Come" in the Mishnah "All Israel" is not automatically the World to Come in the Mishnah "One hour is better." Indicate which Mishnah is under discussion in every sentence. ה [5]. Read Avot in full, Eruvin 22 and Kiddushin 40 in context. Examine repentance in the conclusion without turning K4's proposal concerning penitents into a demonstrated reason for choosing the Mishnah. ו [6]. "And after these words and this truth," "it is easy for one with understanding to know," and "all the above":

explain their function in the argument, beyond identifying phrases. Do not restrict "all the above" to the last three lines without evidence.

Required deliverable:

1. Up to six findings that actually change R1.
2. The three in-depth dossiers, with tables of relationships and periods.
3. A continuous explanation of 600–1000 words for the entire conclusion: in understandable language, without turning hypotheses into facts.
4. A change table only for the IDs examined; for all others, "not examined in this round," without automatic import of status.
5. A ledger of sources you actually read, link and location, and distinction between a primary source and a later explanation.
6. For each unresolved dossier: what can already be explained, and what sentence or witness might change the determination. Do not end merely with a list of searches.

========== ALL THE CONTEXT, TEXT AND QUESTIONS ========

With G-d's help

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Second Research Round on the Concluding Unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20

Task preparation date: 23.9.2026.

This is a research assignment to carry out now, not a proposed plan. The prompt is self-contained: it includes the working text, all the unit's questions, the R1 findings and the compiler's review, sources, and deliverable requirements. You do not need to receive another model's prompt. Do not write a booklet at this stage.

Binding continuation instruction: the user explicitly asked to continue with another round. Statements in the historical review document below about not opening R2 are not instructions for the current round. Do not cut off the research because it was previously called "the last round": this concerns the last unit in the Epistle. There is no need to request approval to read sources, examine alternatives, or complete the research within the task's scope.

Our aim is to understand the precise plain meaning, every expression and connection, with the aid of Kabbalah and Chassidut. A reasoned positive explanation is required, alongside clear disclosure of what is not demonstrated. Do not settle for agreeing with previous reports or declaring "open" before examining an available source. You may and should correct the compiler as well.

Full working text — the user's wording without vocalization, with slight expansion of abbreviations for readability; not a diplomatic transcription:

> "And from this will be well understood the matter of the order of the levels: inanimate, vegetative, animal, speaking, which are aspects of earth, water, fire, air; for although the animal is above the vegetative, and the speaking above the animal, nevertheless the animal is nourished and lives from the vegetative, and the speaking receives its vitality from both, and

also wisdom and knowledge, for an infant does not know how to call 'father' and 'mother' until it tastes the taste of grain, etc., and I have not yet eaten ox meat, etc., for it is an aspect of returning light from below upward, from the bottom of Asiyah, where a radiance of a radiance, etc., from the Ein Sof light that encompasses all worlds is revealed with greater force, and from the kav of the Ein Sof light at the end of the feet of the yosher of Adam Kadmon in the aspect of returning light, as mentioned above. And through this will be well understood

with good reason and knowledge, how the higher angels of the Merkavah, the face of the ox and the face of the eagle, greatly enjoy, and are nourished and sustained by, the spirit of the animal and bird that ascends to them from the sacrifices upon the altar; and as the wording of the holy Zohar precisely states: and they enjoy from their own foundation and root. And after these words and this truth, it is easy for one with understanding to know, to comprehend, through all the above, the great excellence of the practical mitzvot, which are the purpose of the souls' descent into this physical world, as it is written: today to perform them; and one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world is better than all the life of the World to Come. Thus far we have found in his holy handwriting."

Preceding context, faithfully summarized from the Earth reports (the text must be read if the conclusion depends on it): before "ועוד זאת" [And furthermore, this], three degrees of radiance from the kav are described; sovev too shines upon the kav through the kelim and gives them power to create something from nothing. In the earth unit,

sovev shines beneath the feet of Adam Kadmon without a great interruption, only the igulim of Adam Kadmon; and the kav that ends there also shines from below upward as returning light. The destination of the radiance is the light of the neshamah of Malchut of Malchut of Asiyah. After establishing the destination comes a description of the vesting of ABYA within Asiyah to that same destination, not a double route. No source has been found saying that sovev "pushes" the kav to return. At the end of the growth analogy, drawings down of higher lights in ABYA and the purpose of the creation of man are mentioned. "במ"א" [elsewhere] has not been identified. Tanya לו–לז [36–37] and מא [41] served to explain the relationship between service below, drawings down and union above, and a dwelling in the lower realms. This is an explanatory combination, not an identification of the reference. Arich Anpin and Atik Yomin appear earlier in the Epistle; Atik is absent only from the particular list in the analogy. The reason "avoiding duplication of Keter" was rejected. Do not reopen the union dossier or the discussion of the igulim of Adam Kadmon/Atik unless a source is directly necessary for the concluding questions.

Notes 61–67 supplied at the beginning of the research:

61 is attributed to the Rebbe in Lessons. The English wording supplied:

"[It is superior] also with regard to its creation; 'nevertheless, [it] is nourished…[by the vegetative].' (This enables us to understand why the element of Earth is not mentioned here, for everything comes from the Earth. It may likewise be said that for this reason, even after having been created, [everything] depends on it and is nourished by it.)"

Distinguish the first sentence from the qualified addition; do not attribute both to the Alter Rebbe. The Hebrew wording is still needed.

62 Berachot 40a.

63 was supplied as “Bava Kama 71a”; in R1 it was corrected to 72a, with the context beginning at 71b.

64 Numbers 28:2; the verse is not an explicit quotation in the body of the unit.

65 was supplied as “III, 341a”; in R1 it was corrected to Zohar III 241a, with 240b before it.

66 Deuteronomy 7:11; Eruvin 22a.

67 Avot 4:17; read the second half of the Mishnah as well.

Canonical question map — preserve these IDs; new questions will be marked N-R2-[שם 01-[מודל [N-R2-[model name]-01], etc.:

S40: A Continuous Explanation of the Entire Unit, Distinguishing a Supported Conclusion from a Proposal.

Rules for reading and determination:

1. Begin with the focused sources given in your role. Open the text, not only search results. Bring context before and after when a pronoun or reference depends on it.
2. Mark separately: source text you read; facsimile you saw; transcription you received; search result; later explanation; your inference. The compiler’s report is not your reading.
3. Do not require the user to assemble a package from several places. Continue with available research even if Drive or a particular site does not open. Report a blocker once; seek an alternative witness.
4. For each dossier: a precise difficulty, preferred answer, evidence, step of inference, serious alternative, real difficulty, and what remains missing. Do not invent “counterevidence” to fill a template.
5. Not every difference between sources is a contradiction; not every resemblance is identity of mechanism. Separate the source of the power, the manner of drawing down, the act of refinement, the recipient and the purpose.

6. Do not emend the Epistle on the basis of a conventional order. Do not invent a page number, edition attribution or quotation. In books: book/discourse/section + anchor wording + link; if the page was not verified, say so.
7. “I did not find” requires details of a focused search; “not examined” is not an interpretive result. Do not declare a question closed merely because an elegant formulation appears.
8. Do not construct a booklet or edit previous reports. Write a new R2, and preserve explicitly what was corrected and why.
9. If files can be saved, provide an accessible report and a source file. Do not claim a system was operated or a message sent if you only prepared text. There is no artificial requirement to activate subagents.

Map of available sources and candidates:

- Iggeret HaKodesh 20: https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/1029342/jewish/Epistle-20.htm
- Berachot 40a: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב
- Bava Kamma: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_אע_אמק_אבב ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב
- Zohar: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84
- Variant apparatus noted by Claude, requiring examination at the same location: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385
- Etz Chaim נ י [50, 10]: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רעש/סייח_זץ/נ_קרפ/י
- Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah, chapter ד [4]: a target found only in a secondary reference. Do not attribute to it in advance

wording.

- Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, "להבין בתוספת ביאור ע"פ וידעת היום" [To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse "And You Shall Know Today"] ה§ [5]: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/קל_הרות_יטו_(ומדא%22ר_וקזה)/ונחתאו
- Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" [To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, "This Matzah"] ב§ [2]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898813
- K3 ציון במשפט תפדה [Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice], 5735, §§יד–טו [14–15]: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/3140547/jewish/page.htm
- K4 פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, §§ז–ט [7–9], an unreviewed transcript: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192
- K5 ונגלה כבוד הוי" [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722, §§ג–ז [3–7], an unreviewed transcript: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm
- Likkutei Torah, Emor לח ג [38c]: a reference from note 37 in K4; read the text and do not settle for the reference.
- Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah, Vayigash: targets to locate, not verified quotations. A precise discussion of food and knowledge must be located, not replaced with a general discussion of the inanimate and vegetative.
- Tanya: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_א_קלח_אינת ; chapters ה [5] [41] in the same framework. לו [36], לז [37], מא
- Eruvin 22a; Kiddushin 40b; Peah 1:1; Avot 4:17; Ezekiel 1 (especially verses 6, 10, 26).
- Lessons / Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9%2F23%2F2026 ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431/jewish/Igeret-HaKodesh-Epistle-20-Part-9.htm

- Sefer HaMitzvot of the Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a] (discourse and location require examination of the text): the reference in K3 note 27 for the Piena tradition.
- Bot R1 folder, for assistance only: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc
- ZIP R1: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XWmYouEwVAWpx8S65x5_d2CBwREh0i25/view

Places that did not open for one researcher may open for you. K3/K4/K5 opened for the compiler; do not automatically retain Bot's blocked status.

The complete R1 review is presented below as historical working material. This is the compiler's examination, not your report; its statements about ending the process have been superseded by the R2 instruction above. The findings themselves remain open to criticism:

===== BEGINNING OF R1 REVIEW =====

IGK20-Finale-R1 — Consolidated Review and Additional Sources — 10. Reading Ledger and Method of Access

===== END OF R1 REVIEW ===== ========== BEGINNING THE WORK ==========

Carry out now the role defined at the beginning of the prompt. Do not return only a plan. Provide supported findings and a positive explanation with limits.

File 0412 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 2

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[400]

[400] Document 0412: IGK20-Finale-R2-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3 — What Was Achieved and What Changed in the Current Examination

R2 corrected the attribution of the order of the elements to Etz Chaim, separated the relationships in the Zohar, and strengthened the connection between practical mitzvot and the body of the Epistle. Nevertheless, two major claims of absence result from imprecise location of discourses. Focused digital sources have now been found, so R3 is being opened with new targets.

L1 — Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ששת ימים תאכל מצות" [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot], ב–ג§§ [2–3]: the two food proofs appear together, and the addition of intellect is explained by the root of foods and refinement. This is the missing discourse in the meat discussion. It is distinct from "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" [To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, "This Matzah"]. This does not in itself identify it with the returning light of the kav. Source read in its text: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814

L3 — Likkutei Torah, Emor, "ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם" [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"], ד§ [4]: the enjoyment of the angels, lights of Tohu, the Zohar quotation, and an explicit reference to the end of איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights] appear. This is a direct source for investigation, beyond the general parallel from "וספרתם לכם" [And You Shall Count for Yourselves]. Verification of לח ג [38c] in print is still required. Source read in its text: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840

L2 — Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "ואכלתם אכול" [And You Shall Eat Plentifully]: a discussion was found connecting eating and elevation to the use of returning light in the future context. This is a substantive candidate for comparison; what is shared and what differs from returning light at the end of the feet of Adam Kadmon still needs checking. One

must no longer declare that no shared discussion has been found at all. Source read in its text: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808

These three are digital textual witnesses that were read, not print facsimiles. Each researcher must personally open the source on which they rely.

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3 — Corrections to Location and Transmission

1. The headings "צו ז" [Tzav 7], "ואתחנן ו" [Vaetchanan 6] and "אמור ו" [Emor 6] on the ChabadText site serve as discourse indexing. They must not be turned into folio numbers without a facsimile. In preparing R3, we separated discourse name, section, printed folio, column and PDF index.
2. Bot's list contains OCR products and references without complete page identification. The compiler opened SOURCE_LEDGER and SOURCE_READER; in this round the complete ZIP or its facsimiles were not seen. The presence of a passage in a source reader does not confirm that a facsimile was read.
3. Regarding Mishnat Chassidim, the wording of the work must be distinguished from the commentary printed beside it. The association of the speaking order with fire can assist in comparison with Etz Chaim, but does not verify the Epistle's map in advance.
4. The Zohar variant was verified in the Stanford apparatus: at 241a, line 14, there is indeed a change in the order foundation/root at the same location. Claude was therefore correct in this correction. It must be distinguished from the separate occurrence at line 2. The Epistle's wording matches the bird occurrence in print, but this does not prove which copy or single location the author intended. In Claude's table, "240 line 14" is a location error, to be corrected

to 241a. Source: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3 — What Is Retained from R2

- The Epistle's map: inanimate–earth, vegetative–water, animal–fire, speaking–air. The map in Etz Chaim 50:10: the first two pairs are identical, and the last two are reversed. This is a demonstrated difference in the formulation as transmitted and examined in the rounds; it is not proof of a contradiction before clarifying scope. Do not emend.
- "No witness was found" must be "no external source was found explaining the Epistle's order." The Epistle itself is a clear witness to its own order.
- Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, gives a reason for wheat's particular role, and "מצה זו" [This Matzah] explains "father" in the context of immaturity and faith. The doubling of father and mother in the Epistle still requires investigation beyond the Gemara's wording. Do not map grain=knowledge and meat=wisdom without a source.
- In the Zohar there is a source of spirit above, a garment and foundation below, and enjoyment from what ascends in the sacrifice. The reading need not choose one direction and erase the other. "Affiliation with a species" can

be the connecting relationship, and it need not be crowned as a third lexical meaning of יסודא [foundation].

- Ox and eagle explicitly fit the domain of the spirit of the animal and bird. Lion and human are not absent from the Zohar. One must not infer that they do not enjoy at all or have no role in elevation.
- K4 is a direct later explanation of the angels and of Ban that has been refined versus that which has not yet been refined. K3 speaks of action being greater in the days of Mashiach. They must not be

merged automatically with every use of returning light or every meaning of the World to Come.

Corrections to the Argument, Not Only to the References — K5 and the Substance of Food

K5's references to the Epistle make it a direct later explanation. It may illuminate the same phenomenon along another axis; "changes the subject" is too strong. First compare human eating in the Epistle with human eating in K5. Only then clarify the relationship to the spirit of the sacrifice and the angels. Comparing angels here with the human body there does not alone prove a mismatch.

Corrections to the Argument, Not Only to the References — Purpose, Torah and Action

Tanya ד' [4] does not merely set now against later. According to the text presented in R2, it contains a qualitative reason: attachment through Torah and mitzvot as opposed to enjoyment of radiance and apprehension. Time and the manner of attachment are two parts of the explanation.

The conclusion does not declare an absolute ranking of Torah and action in every respect, but the body of the Epistle contains an explicit comparison: mitzvot are the foundation and root of Torah, with the distinction of outer and inner dimensions. One must not correct one exaggeration by the opposite claim that there is no comparison in the Epistle at all. Tanya לז [37] must be read in its text, including both sides: interrupting study for a mitzvah that cannot be performed by others, and the preference when it can be performed by others.

The connection of "all the above" to the entire Epistle was strengthened, especially through the command addressed to separate beings and the forward reference. The scope of the pronoun must still be

presented as a reasoned contextual conclusion, not a compelling grammatical rule.

In the future table, “tomorrow” in Eruvin must not be assigned specifically to Gan Eden without an additional source. A sentence dealing with reward for study must not be entered in the cell “actual study at the resurrection.” “The World to Come” in the Mishnah “All Israel” and the Mishnah “One hour is better” is not an identical subject merely by virtue of the two words.

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler’s Review and Preparation for R3 — Allocation of R3

Grok: the source common to grain and meat; the reasons for the details of the examples; the four correspondences; examination of the returning-light parallel in “ואכלתם” [And You Shall Eat]. **Claude:** the precise source in Emor compared with the Zohar and K4; syntax independent of assumptions; K5 compared with the same nourishment phenomenon; completion of the Torah-and-mitzvot axis in the text of Tanya ד–ה [4–5] and לז [37]. **Grok Bot:** verification of locations and facsimiles for the five distinct Likkutei Torah discourses, separation of text and commentary in Mishnat Chassidim, note 61 in Hebrew, and checking the Zohar variants. Sources read digitally need not wait for a facsimile in order to serve as research with its status marked.

The aim is added understanding, not another round of identical status tables. Each researcher will provide a positive explanation, a change table only for the IDs handled, and a distinction between a reasoned answer and a detail that remains open. Further questions will be added only if they change the interpretation of the unit.

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3 — Limit of Reading in This Review

The Grok and Claude reports were read from the user's message. Bot's two ledgers were read from the files. The relevant passages in the three new Likkutei Torah discourses, an alternative witness on ChabadText, and the Zohar variant apparatus were read. Facsimiles of Likkutei Torah, Mishnat Chassidim, Mikdash Melech, Or HaChamah, note 61 in Hebrew or an early printing were not examined now. The other claims summarized from R2 are marked as transmission of the reports or criticism of their inference; they are not presented here as a new reading of all the sources.

File 0385 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[532]

GAPS — Gaps Remaining after R3 (Specific Only)

1. **he.chabad.org** — Cloudflare blocks fetch; the texts were read from chabadpedia + a Kehot facsimile. There is no page screenshot from the Chabad site itself.
2. **Note 61 in Hebrew** — no facsimile/page of the note's wording was opened; only a candidate, «Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya» (Weinberg + the Rebbe's notes). Do not translate EN and call it a Hebrew source.
3. **Precise column (א/ב/ג/ד [a/b/c/d])** for ד§ [4] in Emor לח [38] and ה§ [5] in Vaetchanan ו [6] — the page heading was verified; a full column letter requires additional visual measurement on the facsimile (no offset was invented).

[532]Document 0385: GAPS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. **L2 «ואכלתם אכול» [And You Shall Eat Plentifully]** — identified as a separate discourse; **no** declaration of identity with the conclusion of איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]/Iggeret HaKodesh (a candidate only, according to the rule).
5. **P5 transmission** — no printing of «Thus far we have found» with title page+year was opened in this round (secondary; the round was not spent on it).
6. **K3/K4/K5** — "read" status is not inherited from other researchers; citation links only if required later.
7. **Physical Zohar print facsimile** for 240b / 241a — not brought in this round; digital + Stanford evidence only.

File 0386 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[494]

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot

Final round R3 — witness verification and disentangling mixed loci (Likkutei Torah ×5, Mishnat Chassidim, Zohar A/B, status of note 61).

IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot — Files

File	Content
REPORT_HE.md	Findings + R2 corrections
SOURCE_LEDGER.md	Source ledger
SOURCE_READER.md	Passages in context
VARIANTS.md	Zohar Place A vs B
GAPS.md	Remaining gaps
EVIDENCE/	Facsimiles and HTML
IGK20-Finale-R3.zip	Complete archive

[494] Document 0386: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0387 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[267]

Report IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET — What Was Corrected from the R2 Conflations

1. **«צו יג» [Tzav 13] ↔ מצה זו [This Matzah]** — R2 attributed the OCR heading «יג תורה צו» [13 / Torah / Tzav] to the discourse «מצה זו» [This Matzah].
   Correction: in Kehot's TOC: **מצה זו [This Matzah] = יא ג [11c]**; **ששת ימים [Six Days] = יג א [13a]**.
   R2's «צו יג» [Tzav 13] = **the printed folio of ששת ימים [Six Days]**, not of מצה זו [This Matzah].
   The site label **«צו ז» [Tzav 7]** = discourse index no. 7 — **not** printed folio 7.
2. **Merging ששת ימים [Six Days] ↔ מצה זו [This Matzah]** — prohibited and separated: two discourses, two incipits, two printed folios.
3. **L3 Emor** — the correct text: **ביאור והניף הכהן [Explanation of "And the Priest Shall Wave"]** ד§ [4] (angels/Tohu/Zohar + איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]).
   Not «וספרתם לכם» [And You Shall Count for Yourselves] (aid/5898837; print לו [36]).
   The PDF heading **לח [38]** for the text of ד§ [4] is consistent with R2's attribution of «לח ג» [38c] as the text-column location — without inventing a fixed offset.
4. **Zohar** — correction of B's location from «240 line 14» to **241a / רמא א**. Separation of Place A (birds, 240b) from Place B.

---

[267] Document 0387: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Report IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET — P4 — Zohar

- Place A: 240b — birds / ליסודא [to the foundation].
- Place B: **241a**, line ~14 — «וכד אתהנון מעקרא ויסודא דלהון» [and when they enjoy from their own root and foundation] (+ variants /מיסודא מסטרא [from the foundation/from the side], etc.).

See VARIANTS.md.

Report IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot — 2026-09-23 ~13:39 ET — What Is Already Well Explained versus Gaps

Explained: the five discourses are separate, with incipit+section+pr int/PDF; separation of MC text/commentary; Zohar A/B; clarification of «צו יג» [Tzav 13].

Gaps: see GAPS.md (note 61; final column; CF on chabad.org; facsimile of printed Zohar).

No Kabbalistic ruling in place of an interpretation researcher; **no** reopening of union/Earth dossiers beyond minimal context.

File 0388 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[533]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R3-Bot (2026-09-23)

Columns: How read | Verification level | Book/discourse/section | URL | Edition if verified | PDF page | Printed folio | Column | Scope

ID: L1-A

How read: digital+complete facsimile

Verification level: high (printed heading visible)

[533]Document 0388: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, «ששת ימים תאכל מצות» [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot], §§ב–ג [2–3]

URL: chabadpedia Tzav; aid/5898814 blocked by CF

Edition: Kehot LT ©1948/1998/2017 (hb58812)

PDF: 55–57

Print: יג [13] (TOC: יג א [13a]; continuations טו ב [15b]/טו ד [15d])

Column: א [a] (TOC opening); §§ב–ג [2–3] in the facsimile's text

Scope: two food proofs: bread/that which proceeds from G-d's mouth + Daat of Tohu/ox meat/taste of grain **ID:** L1-B

How read: digital+complete facsimile

Verification level: high

Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, «להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו» [To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, "This Matzah"] §ב [2]

URL: chabadpedia; aid/5898813 blocked by CF

Edition: Kehot hb58812

PDF: 51–53

Print: יא [11] (TOC: יא ג [11c])

Column: ג [c] (TOC)

Scope: father/immaturity/faith — separate from L1-A

ID: L2-C

How read: digital+complete facsimile

Verification level: medium–high

Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, «ואכלתם אכול» [And You Shall Eat Plentifully] (opening of Tzav)

URL: chabadpedia; aid/5898808 blocked by CF

Edition: Kehot hb58812

PDF: 44–45

Print: ח→ז [7→8] (Tzav heading on 44; ח [8] heading on 45)

Column: No column letter determined without a clear frame at the opening

Scope: eating/elevation; future discussion of returning light — a candidate only, not identity with the conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh **ID:** L3-D

How read: digital+complete facsimile

Verification level: high

Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Emor, «ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם» [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"] ד§ [4]

URL: chabadpedia Emor; aid/5898840 blocked by CF

Edition: Kehot hb58812

PDF: 103–106

Print: TOC: והניף [And He Shall Wave] לז א [37a]; ביאור [Explanation] לז ג [37c]; text of ד§ [4] under heading לח [38] (PDF 105–106)

Column: ד§ [4] in the text column on לח [38] (R2 «לח ג» [38c] = candidate column; no offset invented)

Scope: angels/lights of Tohu/Zohar quotation + points to איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]/Iggeret HaKodesh

ID: L3-NOT

How read: digital (rejection)

Verification level: verified as different

Book/discourse/section: «וספרתם לכם» [And You Shall Count for Yourselves] — another discourse

URL: aid/5898837

Edition: Kehot: TOC וספרתם [And You Shall Count] יא ב~ [11b] / לו [36]

PDF: ~101

Print: לו [36] (heading)

Column: —

Scope: not the L3 text **ID:** L-E

How read: digital+complete facsimile

Verification level: high

Book/discourse/section: Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, «להבין בתוספת ביאור ע"פ וידעת היום» [To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse "And You Shall Know Today"] ה§ [5]

URL: chabadpedia Vaetchanan

Edition: Kehot hb58812

PDF: 235–238 (+239)

Print: TOC: תוס' ביאור [Further Explanation] א ו [6a]; heading ו [6] on 235; ח [8] on 239

Column: ה§ [5] in the text (PDF 238: Daat of Tohu + wheat/grain)

Scope: Daat of Tohu and wheat

ID: MC-title

How read: title-page facsimile

Verification level: high (HB catalog)

Book/discourse/section: Mishnat Chassidim HB7122

URL: https://hebrewbooks.org/7122

Edition: Krakow 5649; 585 pp.; with the commentary טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]

PDF: 1–3 (title page/introduction)

Print: —

Column: —

Scope: verification of title/year/commentary **ID:** MC-body

How read: facsimile

Verification level: high

Book/discourse/section: Tractate HaHarkavah + טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]

URL: HB7122

Edition: as above

PDF: 210–213

Print: צא–צב [91–92] (heading in facsimile)

Column: text above / Taam Etzo below

Scope: visual boundary: text≠commentary

ID: Z-A

How read: digital Wikisource + Stanford

Verification level: medium

Book/discourse/section: Zohar, Pinchas ~240b — עופי/ליסודא [birds/ to the foundation]

URL: wikisource; Stanford sel=385

Edition: no claim to the Alter Rebbe's copy

PDF: —

Print: 240b (not line 14)

Column: —

Scope: Place A **ID:** Z-B

How read: digital Wikisource + Stanford

Verification level: high for location

Book/discourse/section: Zohar, Pinchas 241a, line ~14 — faces, general

URL: Stanford sel=385

Edition: —

PDF: —

Print: 241a / רמא א

Column: —

Scope: Place B; correction from «240 line 14»

ID: N61

How read: search only

Verification level: Hebrew facsimile not opened

Book/discourse/section: candidate: Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya (Weinberg; the Rebbe's notes)

URL: chabadpedia book entry

Edition: note 61 itself not verified

PDF: —

Print: —

Column: —

Scope: no translation of EN in place of a Hebrew source **ID:** Site-idx

How read: meta

Verification level: verified

Book/discourse/section: site labels «צו ז'» [Tzav 7] «ואתחנן ו'» [Vaetchanan 6]

URL: he.chabad.org / chabadpedia

Edition: —

PDF: —

Print: not print numbers

Column: —

Scope: discourse indices only

Evidence files: see EVIDENCE/ — names correspond to the table.

File 0389 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[443]

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — D / L3 — ביאור והניף [Explanation of "And He Shall Wave"] ד§ [4] (Print לח [38]; PDF 105–106)

The explanation's heading is visible in the sequence לח→לז [37→38].

ד§ [4] (source orthography):

> «ד ומעתה יובן ג"כ ענין שהאדם ניזון…»
>
> [4. And now the matter of the human being's nourishment will also be understood…]

> «…נהנים המלאכים מהקרבנות בהתגלות האורות דתהו… וז"ש בזה"ק (פ' פנחס דרמ"א א') ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דילהון וכמובא באג"ה סד"ה איהו וחיוהי.»
>
> […the angels enjoy from the sacrifices through the revelation of the lights of Tohu… and this is what is written in the holy Zohar (Parashat Pinchas, 241a): and they enjoy from their own foundation and root, as brought in Iggeret HaKodesh at the end of the discourse beginning איהו וחיוהי (He and His Life-Giving Lights).]

[443] Document 0389: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

End of passage: through the end of the discussion of a pleasing fragrance / lights of Tohu in that same paragraph.

Witness: `LT_Emor_Vehenif_printLZ_LH_pdf-103.png` … `-106.png`.

SOURCE_READER — Required Passages in Context (R3) — Zohar — Two Locations

A (240b): קרבנא דעופי [the bird sacrifice]; אתהנון / ליסודא דלהון [to their foundation / they enjoy] — see Wikisource 240b.

B (241a): «וכד אתהנון מעקרא ויסודא דלהון» [and when they enjoy from their own root and foundation] — Stanford sel=385 + Wikisource 241a.

File 0390 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Report or witness from the history of the research[534]

VARIANTS — Zohar, Pinchas: Place A versus Place B

Apparatus: Stanford sel=385 (Hilufim Pinehas 239a–241b).

Textual base: Wikisource/Margaliot (copies in EVIDENCE).

Do not claim that this is the copy of the Zohar used by the Alter Rebbe.

Do not interpret higher/lower from the pronoun alone.

VARIANTS — Zohar, Pinchas: Place A versus Place B — Distinction: Two Locations (Not One Variant)

[534] Document 0390: VARIANTS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Place	Printed folio (standard)	Short linguistic subject	Textual anchor
A	**~רמ ב / 240b**	Enjoyment of birds / יסודא דלהון [their foundation] near the face of the eagle	«קרבנא דעופי» [the bird sacrifice]; «ליסודא דלהון ואתהנון» [to their foundation and they enjoy]; the face of the eagle → bird
B	**רמא א / 241a** (~line 14 in the Stanford apparatus)	General enjoyment from the root/ foundation (faces)	«וכד אתהנון מעקרא ויסודא דלהון» [and when they enjoy from their own root and foundation] / «ואתהניין מיסודא ועקרא דלהון» [and they enjoy from their own foundation and root]

R2 correction: every «240 line 14» as B's location → **רמא א / 241a**.

VARIANTS — Zohar, Pinchas: Place A versus Place B — Variants Within Place A (עופי / ליסודא [Birds / to the Foundation]) — Stanford Sample

Anchor	Variant	Witnesses (as in the apparatus)	Note
קרבנא דעופי / מלה דעופי [the bird sacrifice / the matter of birds]	Different formulations of the question	מ8, etc.	Same topic, not Place B
ליסודא דלהון [to their foundation]	ליסודא ועיקרא דילהון / לעקרא ויסודא [to their foundation and root / to the root and foundation]	ו3, פ5, נ32…	Apparatus of A
אתהנון / איתהנון / אתהנו [they enjoy, variant spellings]	Spelling	ו3 פ5 מ8…	Spelling
מסטרא דיסודא / מסיטרא ומיסודא [from the side of the foundation / from the side and from the foundation]	מסטרא ויסודא [from the side and foundation], etc.	ו3 פ5 מ8 נ32	**Do not** conflate with מיסודא [from the foundation] in B

VARIANTS — Zohar, Pinchas: Place A versus Place B — Variants Within Place B (241a, ~Line 14) — Stanford Sample

Anchor	Variant	Witnesses	Note
וכד אתהנון מעקרא ויסודא דלהון [and when they enjoy from their own root and foundation]	וכד … מיסודא ועיקרא דילהון / אתהנון מעקרא ויסודא דילהון [and when… from their own foundation and root / they enjoy from their own root and foundation]	3ו פ5 מ8 ו18 קר י* פר13	This is the line approved by the collector
מיסודא [from the foundation]	**מסטרא** [from the side] (32נ)	32נ	Same place B; not Place A
ועיקרא / ועקרא [and the root, variant spellings]	Spelling	Many	Iggeret HaKodesh: ועיקרא [and the root] (comparison only)
דלהון / דילהון [their, variant spellings]	Spelling	Many	Iggeret HaKodesh: דילהון [their]
ואתהניין [and they enjoy] (Likkutei Torah/Iggeret HaKodesh quotation)	ואתהנון / ואיתהנון [and they enjoy, variant spellings]	—	The form of the quotation in Likkutei Torah, Emor ד§ [4]

Do not record as a variant: «ליסודא דלהון» [to their foundation] (A) versus «מיסודא ועקרא» [from the foundation and root] (B) — two separate occurrences.

Linked witnesses: `EVIDENCE/stanford_sel385_variants.html`, `zohar_240b_wikisource.html`, `zohar_241a_wikisource.html`.

File 0413 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[535]

With G-d's help. IGK20-Finale-R3. Date: 23.9.2026. The task is to carry out further research on the concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The prompt is complete and self-contained: role, text, all the user's questions, R2 status, the compiler's review and sources are here. There is no need for another model's file. Do not prepare a booklet now. The user expects autonomous progress; carry out the reading and report, not only a plan. No further approval is needed. Check the compiler's claims too: they are not an authority replacing a source. The union dossier and Earth determinations remain outside this round, except for context essential to interpreting the unit. The full map is presented to preserve all the user's questions. In practice, address the priorities in your role, and do not refill dozens of cells y-ou have not examined. State what is already well explained and what specific gap remains.

Role: the precise Emor source, the relationship Zohar–Epistle–Chassidic explanation, and precision in the transition to mitzvot.

Dossier א [1] — a new witness that changes the investigation: open L3, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"], especially ד§ [4], and read the discourse's intro-duction as needed. Do not replace it with וספרתם לכם [And You Shall Count for Yourselves]. Locate the paragraph "he began with the altar and ended with the table" and the quotation from the Epistle's con-clusion. Compare with Zohar 240b–241a and K4 ז§ [7]. Ask: in what sense does each source use root; what descends, what ascends, what is refined, and what adds light? How does the explanation of Tohu

[535]Document 0413: IGK20-Finale-R3_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

here stand against the question that the angels too are from Ban? It is not enough to say that each uses another axis: specify the point of contact and the difference. Must the R2 sentence that the only accessible Chassidic explanation of יסודא [foundation] is Lessons be corrected? Separate the Zohar's wording, Likkutei Torah's wording and an editorial reference to the Epistle; do not determine the editorial layer without evidence. Do not dismiss the interpretation of root in the Epistle's wording merely because the Zohar also speaks of a substrate in this world. Mikdash Melech or Or HaChamah: look for a focused commentary if it can be reached; do not make an opening failure the main business of the round. The commentator may strengthen an interpretation, without necessarily deciding the Alter Rebbe's intent alone. Verification of the Zohar variant is accepted: it is at 241a, line 14, separate from line 2. There is no need to reconstruct the entire apparatus; distinguish what the variant contributes to identifying the quotation's location and what it does not contribute to the direction of דילהון [their].

Dossier ב [2] — syntax, nourishment and returning light: revisit the two decisions separately: the subject of הוא [it]; the scope of the last "in the aspect of returning light." Do not reject a semantic reference to nourishment on account of the grammatical gender of a word invented by the commentator, and do not claim that a reference to food requires applying returning light to sovev.

Propose a preferred reading from the preceding context, not from a rule designed to prevent an alternative. K5: begin by comparing human eating in the Epistle with human eating in the discourse. Do the substance of food and its vitality add an explanation, restrict the scope, or create a real difficulty? Only afterward examine the spirit of the sacrifice and the angels. Construct a table of phenomenon, recipient, source of power, manner of action and result. A difference between columns is not yet a disagreement. Also examine L2, ואכלתם

אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], as a critical check: can a partially explicit bridge be built between refinement and returning light without identifying it with the return of the kav at the feet of Adam Kadmon? The same concept need not have the same scope in every source.

Dossier ג [3] — the mitzvot conclusion: read the text of Tanya ד [4], לז ה [5], and the three anchors in the body of Iggeret HaKodesh 20: the command addressed to separate beings; mitzvot as the foundation and root of Torah; the purpose of the creation of man. Complete an explanation that accounts for the quality of attachment as well, not only the time of service versus the time of reward. Maintain two determinations: there is a comparison with Torah in the body of the Epistle; it does not yield an absolute ranking in every respect. In Tanya לז [37], bring both sides of the precedence of study/the mitzvah in one context. Explain purpose, manner of action and place of revelation without identifying במ"א [elsewhere]. In the time table, separate action, apprehension, reward and revelation of excellence. Do not assign "tomorrow" to Gan Eden on the basis of the Eruvin exposition alone, or Torah's reward to actual study at the resurrection. Repentance in the Mishnah: explain the function of the quotation as a whole before proposing a special reason for the word. If there is no demonstrated reason for its selection, do not turn a later passage on penitents into a decisive explanation. "Thus far we have found": correct this to the limit of transmission; do not write that the sentence attests to truncation of the manuscript or to an intention to conclude.

Deliverable: up to six new insights, three dossiers, a focused comparison table and a continuous explanation of 900–1400 words from returning light through the mitzvot conclusion. A change table only for the IDs examined, and a source/method-of-reading ledger. Formulate the positive understanding with confidence proportionate to

the evidence; do not replace it with a list of prohibitions. There is no artificial requirement for a subagent or a particular enrichment tool.

========== R2 REVIEW AND THE NEW SOURCES ==========

IGK20-Finale-R2 — Compiler's Review and Preparation for R3 — Limit of Reading in This Review

========== THE TEXT, QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH RULES ========

Canonical question map — preserve these IDs; new questions will be marked N-R3-[שם 01-]מודל [N-R3-[model name]-01], etc.:

Limit of Reading in This Review — S40: A Continuous Explanation of the Entire Unit, Distinguishing a Supported Conclusion from a Proposal.

Rules for reading and determination:

1. Begin with the focused sources given in your role. Open the text, not only search results. Bring context before and after when a pronoun or reference depends on it.
2. Mark separately: source text you read; facsimile you saw; transcription you received; search result; later explanation; your inference. The compiler's report is not your reading.
3. Do not require the user to assemble a package from several places. Continue with available research even if Drive or a particular site does not open. Report a blocker once; seek an alternative witness.
4. For each dossier: a precise difficulty, preferred answer, evidence, step of inference, serious alternative, real difficulty, and what remains missing. Do not invent "counterevidence" to fill a template.
5. Not every difference between sources is a contradiction; not every resemblance is identity of mechanism. Separate the source of

the power, the manner of drawing down, the act of refinement, the recipient and the purpose.

6. Do not emend the Epistle on the basis of a conventional order. Do not invent a page number, edition attribution or quotation. In books: book/discourse/section + anchor wording + link; if the page was not verified, say so.
7. “I did not find” requires details of a focused search; “not examined” is not an interpretive result. Do not declare a question closed merely because an elegant formulation appears.
8. Do not construct a booklet or edit previous reports. Write a new R3, and preserve explicitly what was corrected and why.
9. If files can be saved, provide an accessible report and a source file. Do not claim a system was operated or a message sent if you only prepared text. There is no artificial requirement to activate subagents.

Map of available sources and candidates:

- Iggeret HaKodesh 20: https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/1029342/jewish/Epistle-20.htm
- Berachot 40a: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב
- Bava Kamma: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_אע_אמק_אבב ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב
- Zohar: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84
- Variant apparatus also examined by the compiler, with an actual variant at 241a, line 14: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385
- Etz Chaim נ י [50, 10]: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רעש/מייח_זעץ_נ/י_קרפ

- Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah: Bot reports HB7122, text in chapter א [1] and a reference to chapter ד [4]. The text must be distinguished from the commentary טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]; the facsimile was not independently checked by the compiler.
- Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, "להבין בתוספת ביאור ע"פ וידעת היום" [To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse "And You Shall Know Today"]

ה§ [5]: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא%2
ונחתאו/(וקזה_ר2

- Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" [To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, "This Matzah"] ב§ [2]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898813
- K3 ציון במשפט תפדה [Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice], 5735, §§יד–טו [14–15]: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/3140547/jewish/page.htm
- K4 פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, §§ז–ט [7–9], an unreviewed transcript: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192
- K5 ונגלה כבוד הוי' [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722, §§ג–ז [3–7], an unreviewed transcript: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm
- Likkutei Torah, Emor לח ג [38c]: a reference from note 37 in K4; read the text and do not settle for the reference.
- Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah, Vayigash: targets to locate, not verified quotations. A precise discussion of food and knowledge must be located, not replaced with a general discussion of the inanimate and vegetative.
- Tanya: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_א_קלח_אינת ; chapters ה [5] [41] in the same framework.

- Eruvin 22a; Kiddushin 40b; Peah 1:1; Avot 4:17; Ezekiel 1 (especially verses 6, 10, 26).
- Lessons / Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9%2F23%2F2026 ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431/jewish/Igeret-HaKodesh-Epistle-20-Part-9.htm
- Sefer HaMitzvot of the Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a] (discourse and location require examination of the text): the reference in K3 note 27 for the Piena tradition.
- Bot R1 folder, for assistance only: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc
- ZIP R1: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XWmYouEwVAWpx8S65x5_d2CBwREh0i25/view

Places that did not open for one researcher may open for you. K3/K4/K5 opened for the compiler; do not automatically retain Bot's blocked status.

Additional sources and precise addresses for R3:

- L1: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, ששת ימים תאכל מצות [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot], ב–ג§§ [2–3]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814
- L2: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, ואכלתם אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], especially the beginning and the future discussion: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808
- L3: Likkutei Torah, Emor, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"], especially ד§ [4]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840
- Do not replace L3 with "וספרתם לכם" [And You Shall Count for Yourselves]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898837 — this is another discourse.
- Alternative witness for Tzav: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/חספה_גחו)_וצ/(קזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל

- Alternative witness for Emor:

https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא%22רזקזה_רומא)

- Bot R2 folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1xgDmj3FxWTS0SLtNMWDNcTF4MDqHhuOJ
- ZIP R2: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sLUKQ7ZHvyl55mg8Le19Zx_1Ar3cyqYT/view
- Bot R2 source ledger: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1mcCFADpR7zsXhD8m6s0fpuaUEz0EXvYd/view
- Bot R2 source reader: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1A_abyRFWR3VhFKnRq6ZanSEejcj1H6zp/view

Beginning does not depend on opening the package: the passage, questions, research status and addresses are in the prompt itself. Do not shift responsibility for obtaining an available text to the user.

Carry out now the focused task at the beginning of the prompt and submit an R3 report. No additional material is needed in order to begin.

File 0416 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 3

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[268]

IGK20-Finale-R3 — Compiler's Review and Decisions for R4 — The Explanation That Can Already Be Written

The Epistle explains the higher's receiving from the lower through the radiance at the bottom of Asiyah and returning light. The Likkutei Torah parallels explain how the root of food and sacrifice can be revealed through refinement and add to a recipient that is higher than them in revelation. The sources may be combined in the explanation,

[268] Document 0416: IGK20-Finale-R3-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

provided that all the terms are not identified without evidence: Tohu, sovev, kav, refinement and returning light are not synonyms.

The conclusion about practical mitzvot also rests on more than the mere physicality of the object: it concerns fulfilling a command. The excellence of action is examined in relation to the purpose of descent and the service of the lower; the excellence of Torah is also examined in relation to the quality of union and drawing down. The relationships must be explained from the sources, without settling for the slogan that everything is the same or for a single scale of more and less.

In the next investigation it is important to distinguish natural nourishment from intentional service of refinement. One must read where L1 moves from explaining food to human service, so as not to add to the Epistle's sentence a condition of blessing or prayer that it does not state.

IGK20-Finale-R3 — Compiler's Review and Decisions for R4 — Allocation of R4 and Endpoint

- **Grok:** Ki Tetze and Shelach versus Etz Chaim; correction of note 61; nature and refinement in L1; explanation of the first half.
- **Claude:** Torah and action in Ki Tetze and Tanya; the relationship of L3 to K4; the value of the Emor reference without unsupported attribution; a continuous explanation of the conclusion.
- **Grok Bot:** facsimile of the new source; facsimile of L1's two proofs; matching Emor pagination; correction of the location of the two Zohar occurrences; note 61 if accessible.

Each prompt includes the conclusion's text, all forty questions, R3 status, its review, links and a focused task. There is no dependence on another prompt. There is no need to reopen all the parallels or prepare a booklet. The requested endpoint of the round is an expla-

nation that can be used, with a short list of details that remain undecided; a gap that does not change it will not automatically lead to another round.

File 0392 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or witness from the history of the research[536]

GAPS — R4

1. **L5 pointer Shelach → Ki Teitzei:** חי=אש [animal=fire] parenthetical **seen** on PDF111; reverse pointer Teitzei→Shelach **seen** on PDF292. Explicit print line "…כמ"ש בד"ה כי תצא" [as written in the discourse beginning "When You Go Out"…] inside the Shelach nissachim block was **not** isolated this round — status: open / digital-crossref only for reverse direction.
2. **L4/L5 Hebrew folio letter glyph:** arabic headers **68** (Teitzei PDF292) and **~80–82** (Shelach PDF111–112) **seen**; TOC maps Teitzei opener to **לד [34]** and בפ' נסכים [In the Section of Libations] to **מ [40]**. Folio-letter corner OCR

failed; folio letters = **inferred from TOC + arabic×2 pattern** (Emor לח [38]↔76 confirms pattern), not from a clear photographed letter on the same crop.

3. **Note 61 HE photo:** not obtained. EN Lessons URL Cloudflare **403** this round — cannot re-verify EN body live. Do **not** treat memory as HE witness.
4. **Zohar print photo of רמא א [241a]:** not obtained; Wikisource HTML + Stanford sel=385 apparatus used. Prefer print page when available.

[536]Document 0392: GAPS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

5. **Emor "ג [c]" column letter:** ד§ [4] text and pointer region on PDF106 **seen**; column letter **ג [c]** as print glyph not photographed as a separate marker — **inferred** from citation practice / column position (right column of the leaf).
6. **Attribution of Emor Iggeret pointer:** presence in Kehot print ≠ Alter Rebbe authorship. First-edition / editorial witness **not** opened — leave **OPEN**.
7. **Etz Chaim Shaar 50 ch.10:** pairing table reported from known textual contrast + digital; no fresh EC photo this round.
8. Secondary tasks (written Emor attribution; Zohar mefaresh on yesoda): deferred per instructions (only after P1–P3).

File 0393 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[498]

IGK20-Finale-R4-Bot — Witness pack (2026-09-23 ~14:35–15:00 ET) — Deliverables

- `REPORT_HE.md` — Hebrew findings + corrections from R3
- `SOURCE_LEDGER.md` — sources with witness types
- `SOURCE_READER.md` — what was actually read
- `VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS.md` — Zohar Place A/B fix; Emor pagination; L4/L5 print IDs
- `GAPS.md`
- `DRIVE_IDS.md`
- `EVIDENCE/` — focused PNGs only (no hb58812 / HB7122)

[498]Document 0393: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

IGK20-Finale-R4-Bot — Witness pack (2026-09-23 ~14:35–15:00 ET) — Priorities covered

P1 L4/L5 · P2 L1 proofs · P3 Emor לח ג [38c] map · P4 Zohar ledger fix · P5 Note 61 status

File 0394 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or witness from the history of the research[456]

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R4 (Witnesses and Locations Only) — P4 — Zohar (Ledger Correction)

- Bird quotation (close to the Epistle's wording; site paragraph ~537): Stanford assigns it to **241a, line 2** — do **not** leave Place A≈240b for the quotation itself.
- Root/foundation summary: **241a, line 14**.
- **240b:** only the context beginning beforehand.
- Do not decide higher/lower from «דילהון» [their] alone. Do not apply the subjects of the bird passage to the summary of the four faces.

File 0395 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or witness from the history of the research[499]

SOURCE_LEDGER — IGK20-Finale-R4

Legend: **body** = text read | **photo** = PNG seen | **transcript** = received OCR/transcript | **search** = hit only | **late** = late commentary | **inf** = inference

[456] Document 0394: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[499] Document 0395: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

ID: L4-A

Work: LT Devarim — כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies] א§ [1]

Locus: חי–אש / מדבר–רוח [animal–fire / speaking–air] + pointer Shelach

PDF: 292

Print folio: לד [34] (TOC/inf); arab 68 photo

Column: א§ [1] then ב§ [2] on leaf

Witness types: body+photo

File(s): LT_Teitzei_KiTeitzei_§א_printLD_arab68_pdf-292.png , raw-292, pairing crops

ID: L4-D

Work: same maamar ד§ [4]

Locus: נעוץ תחילתן / תורה–מעשה [their beginning is wedged / Torah–action]

PDF: 293

Print folio: לד/לה [34/35] span (inf)

Column: continues

Witness types: body+photo

File(s): LT_Teitzei_KiTeitzei_§ד_pdf-293.png , raw-293 **ID:** L5-A

Work: LT Bamidbar — בפ' נסכים כתיב כי תבאו [In the Section of Libations It Is Written, "When You Come"] א§ [1] region

Locus: חי=אש [animal=fire] parenthetical; nissachim block

PDF: 111–112

Print folio: מ [40] (TOC); arab ~80–82

Column: —

Witness types: photo (+ digital complement)

File(s): LT_Shelach_BpNissachim_pdf-111.png , -112.png

ID: L5-other

Work: ענין הנסכים [The Matter of Libations] (NEXT maamar)

Locus: starts ~PDF112

PDF: 112+

Print folio: מא [41] TOC

Column: —

Witness types: photo boundary only — do not conflate

File(s): same 112

ID: L1

Work: LT Tzav — ששת ימים תאכל מצות [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot]

Locus: opener יג [13]; proofs

PDF: 55 opener; 56–57 proofs

Print folio: יג [13]

Column: —

Witness types: photo+body

File(s): R3 copies 055–057 + LT_Tzav_SheshesYamim_proofs_pdf-056.png , raw 054–058 **ID:** Emor-D

Work: LT Emor — והניף [And He Shall Wave] … ד§ [4]

Locus: Iggeret pointer

PDF: 106

Print folio: לח [38] inf; arab 76 photo

Column: right col ≈ «ג [c]» inf

Witness types: photo+transcript

File(s): `LT_Emor_*pdf-106*` , 103–105, 107 (לט [39]), RIGHTCOL crop

ID: ZOH-A

Work: Zohar III

Locus: birds quote

PDF: —

Print folio: רמא א [241a] l.2 (Stanford)

Column: —

Witness types: search/body HTML

File(s): stanford_sel385_variants.html , zohar_241a_wikisource.html

ID: ZOH-B

Work: Zohar III

Locus: עיקרא/יסודא [root/foundation] summary

PDF: —

Print folio: רמא א [241a] l.14

Column: —

Witness types: search/body HTML

File(s): same **ID:** ZOH-ctx

Work: Zohar III

Locus: prior context

PDF: —

Print folio: רמ ב [240b]

Column: —

Witness types: body HTML

File(s): zohar_240b_wikisource.html

ID: N61

Work: Tanya Lessons / note 61

Locus: elevation חי>צומח [animal>vegetative]

PDF: —

Print folio: —

Column: —

Witness types: blocked EN/HE this round

File(s): —

ID: EC50.10

Work: Etz Chaim Shaar 50 ch.10

Locus: חי=רוח מדבר=אש [animal=air speaking=fire]

PDF: —

Print folio: —

Column: —

Witness types: late/digital report — not photo

File(s): — **ID:** DIG-L4

Work: chabadpedia תצא [Tetze]

Locus: ד,[1] א§§ [4] first maamar

PDF: —

Print folio: site index ≠ print

Column: —

Witness types: body

File(s): URL in SOURCE_READER

ID: DIG-L5

Work: chabadpedia שלח [Shelach]

Locus: בפ' נסכים [In the Section of Libations]…

PDF: —

Print folio: site index ≠ print

Column: —

Witness types: body partial

File(s): URL in SOURCE_READER

ID: DIG-L1

Work: he.chabad aid/5898814

Locus: Sheishet Yamim

PDF: —

Print folio: —

Column: —

Witness types: body (or Cloudflare status)

File(s): —

File 0396 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or witness from the history of the research[269]

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R4) — Zohar

- Stanford variants sel=385: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385 — assigns birds-near-Iggeret wording to **רמא א [241a] line 2**; ikara/yesoda summary **line 14**. **search + HTML body.**
- Wikisource רמא א / רמ ב [240b / 241a] — **HTML body**, not print photo.
- Do not decide עליון/תחתון [higher/lower] from דילהון [their] alone.

File 0397 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Report or witness from the history of the research[500]

[269]Document 0396: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[500]Document 0397: VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS — R4 critical fixes — 1. Zohar Place A / B (CORRECTED — do not revert)

Item	Wrong (R3 leftover)	Correct (R4)	Basis
Birds passage near Iggeret wording (site ~§537)	Place A ≈ **רמ ב [240b]** for the **quote itself**	**רמא א [241a] line 2**	Stanford sel=385 variant mechanism
Summary עיקרא / יסודא [root / foundation] order	conflated	**רמא א [241a] line 14**	same apparatus / page
רמ ב [240b]	treated as quote locus	**prior context only**	print/page flow; site splits ≠ print

Rules: - Prefer one print/photo of רמא א [241a] over more OCR summaries (print not obtained this round → HTML+Stanford). - Do **not** decide עליון/תחתון [higher/lower] from דילהון [their] alone. - Do **not** apply ofot-passage subjects automatically to the four-faces summary.

File 0417 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[537]

With G-d's help. IGK20-Finale-R4. Date 23.9.2026. This is a focused continuation round on the concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Everything needed is in this prompt: task, research status, full text, forty questions, sources and rules for determination. There is no need to copy materials from another prompt. Do not prepare a booklet now. Carry out the research and the report, not only a plan. Do not request further approval to begin. Do not repeat previous rounds instead of examining the new sources. The compiler's report is a s-

[537] Document 0417: IGK20-Finale-R4_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

tarting point for criticism and does not replace your reading. There is no requirement to activate subagents.

Role: complete a connecting explanation of the Merkavah and mitzvot, based on Likkutei Torah and the Epistle, and correct the attribution of the reference.

Work order:

1. Open L4 ד§ [4], and read א§ [1] as well for context. Explain the two directions of wedging in relation to Torah and action. Compare with Tanya ה ,[4] ד [5] and לז [37], and with the sentence “the foundation and root of Torah” in the Epistle. Does this provide a more precise positive answer than a general axis of revelation/purpose? Do not automatically import identity with the returning light of the kav from it; detail the demonstrated connection and the inference.
2. Open L3 ו ,[4] ד ,[1] א§§ [6], and K4 ז§ [7]. Construct a table: the angel’s root, its state after refinement, the root of the animal’s spirit, what the human being refines, and what is revealed. Examine whether the explanations are complementary or a real difficulty remains between them. Do not identify attribution of a root to Tohu with absence of refinement, and do not declare in advance that the Rebbe changes the angels’ location.
3. Correct the opening of your R3: the presence of the reference in Emor has also been demonstrated in a facsimile, but its attribution to the Alter Rebbe has not been demonstrated. Distinguish between the discourse’s content, the printed reference, editorial responsibility and author. If no witness decides attribution, a legitimate formulation is “an explanation connecting them is printed in Likkutei Torah.” Do not allow the bibliographic question to cancel the value of the parallel itself.
4. Read the entire Epistle to map the three anchors you needed: the command addressed to separate beings; the relationship between Torah and mitzvot and outer/inner dimensions; drawings down

and purpose. Also check the places in Emor that refer to the Epistle before §ד [4], if there are any, and the targets in the Epistle. Do not say that the Epistle does not mention Tohu on the basis of the concluding unit alone. The result can be a reference map with an open target. Do not identify במ"א [elsewhere].

5. In the Zohar, check only what may change the interpretation of יסודא [foundation]: the subject of the bird paragraph versus the subject of the overall summary, the source of the spirit versus a foundation in this world, and what L3 adds. Do not claim that all pronouns in all occurrences refer to the hosts. A commentary by Mikdash Melech/Or HaChamah is a secondary target, not a condition for submission or a reason to repeat a fruitless search.
6. Keep the syntactic determination as two separate ones: the subject of כי הוא [for it is]; the scope of the last returning light. K5 explains a component, and does not alone unify

the substance of food and the spirit of the sacrifice. L2 connects refinement and returning light in its own context; it must not replace the end of the kav. 7. Write a continuous explanation of the entire conclusion that holds even without deciding the author of the reference and fine points of words for which no evidence has been found. Distinguish purpose, action and place of revelation; integrate the command and the quality of attachment, not only physicality. Tanya מא [41] is an available target for explaining the below/above connection, not proof of identification of a reference.

Deliverables: four to six determinations with degree of certainty; an L3/K4 table; a paragraph on Torah and action based on L4 and Tanya; a paragraph on what the Zohar contributes and what Likkutei Torah contributes; a full continuous explanation; changes to S13–S40 that you examined, and a ledger. Do not return to starting a booklet. Collect the undecided questions at the end without weakening statements that are already supported.

========== R3 STATUS AND THE CORRECTIONS ==========

Research status after R3 — a full summary for this round, not a replacement for your reading:

1. The body of the Epistle presents nourishment: vegetative→animal →speaking, and even wisdom and knowledge; from there sacrifice →angels of the Merkavah; from there practical mitzvot. Each transition needs its own explanation. Do not turn the three examples into identity of level and mechanism.
2. L1 is Likkutei Torah, Tzav, ששת ימים תאכל מצות [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot] ב§§–ג [2–3], aid5898814. It brings ox meat and grain together and explains added intellect through the root of foods in Tohu and refinement. There, meat comes before grain, "father" alone, wisdom and intellect; in the Epistle, grain comes first, "father and mother," wisdom and knowledge. מצה זו [This Matzah] is another discourse. L1 resolves the absence of a Chassidic parallel to the two proofs, but not all the details of the wording or the identity of Tohu with the returning light of the kav.
3. Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, תוספת ביאור וידעת היום [Further Explanation of "And You Shall Know Today"] ה§ [5], singles out wheat in Daat of Tohu. מצה זו [This Matzah] ב§ [2] uses "father" and the mochin of Abba in immaturity. A mapping of grain=knowledge and meat=wisdom, or father and mother=the higher Abba and Imma, has not been demonstrated in the Epistle. A particular reason for an ox specifically remains missing.
4. Berachot 40a was read in the previous rounds: wheat and the Tree of Knowledge. In Bava Kamma 72a, continuing from 71b, the meat wording differs from the Epistle; Rashi explains lack of precision, and Tosafot mentions fasting. The plain meaning of the sugya must not be presented as a nutritional experiment. L1 is a Chassidic witness for using the proof for added intellect.

5. Etz Chaim, Gate נ [50], chapter י [10], maps animal to air and speaking to fire, the reverse of the Epistle. Mishnat Chassidim was not verified as a witness confirming the Epistle; the text of Tractate Ha-Harkavah must be separated from the commentary טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]. R3's proposal, composition versus functioning, is a hypothesis for reconciliation, not a conclusion already demonstrated.
6. A new source read by the compiler in its digital text: L4, Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies] א§ [1], establishes animal–fire and speaking–air; ד§ [4] discusses two excellences of Torah and action through two directions of wedging. L5, Likkutei Torah, Shelach, בפ' נסכים כתיב כי תבאו [In the Section of Libations It Is Written, "When You Come"] א§ [1], strengthens animal–fire and refers to Ki Tetze. This changes R3's claim that there is no Chassidic source for the pairs. Comparison with Etz Chaim is still required. The section title תצא א' [Tetze 1] or שלח ה' [Shelach 5] is a discourse index, not a printed folio.
7.

Note 61 in Lessons: the first sentence is attached to the animal being higher than the vegetative, including in terms of its creation, and nevertheless being nourished by it. Grok-R3's formulation that the lower is superior in its creation reverses the subject. In parentheses an explanation is proposed for the omission of earth; the proposal concerning dependence and nourishment after creation is qualified. The Hebrew source has not been verified. Do not blur earth as an element with water and salt as kinds of inanimate things. 8. L3 is Likkutei Torah, Emor, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"] ד§ [4], aid5898840, not וספרתם לכם [And You Shall Count for Yourselves]. It connects sacrifice, refinement, revelation of lights of Tohu and the enjoyment of the

angels, quotes the Zohar, and refers to the conclusion of איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]. The compiler saw the reference in a facsimile supplied by Bot. This is print evidence for a connection between the texts, not proof of who wrote the reference. Do not infer that it is the Alter Rebbe's self-reference merely because it is in the body of the line. Even a first-edition facsimile alone will not necessarily decide author versus editor. 9. L3 §ו [6] explains the vegetative/animal relationship through the order of roots in Tohu; K4, פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, §ז [7], distinguishes refined from not-yet-refined within Ban. It has not been demonstrated that these are two contradictory answers or alternative locations for the angel. Separate root, present state, state of refinement and revelation of the root. K4 is an unreviewed transcript; L3 is the Likkutei Torah layer. 10. In Zohar 240b–241a there is a descent of spirit from the faces of the ox and eagle and its return in the sacrifice; the lower is also described as a foundation in this world. The analogy of the Shechinah and the spirit of the righteous person connects origin and return. In the bird passage, paragraph 537 in the site's division, the wording close to the Epistle is found. Later, 539–541, lion and human also participate. Their omission from the Epistle must not be explained as though they are absent from the Zohar. 11. The textual variant at 241a, line 14, is not the same occurrence as line 2. The pronoun דילהון [their] alone must not decide whether the reference is to a higher root or to the lower. The sentence's subject is also examined separately in each occurrence: the hosts in the bird passage must not automatically be applied to the summary of the four figures. Mikdash Melech and Or HaChamah were not read in their texts in the R3 reports. 12. "Enjoy/are nourished" are close to a Zoharic pair; "are sustained" was not located in the sequence read. There is no evidence for three sefirot. The expressions of reason and knowledge and the echo of ox meat/the face of the ox are

literary possibilities, not demonstrated intention. 13. The preferred syntax: כי הוא [for it is] summarizes the phenomenon of the higher being nourished by the lower; food is also a possible subject. This is a question independent of the scope of the last returning light. The latter attaches to the kav by virtue of the preceding context and the reference "as above." Sovev shines at the bottom; a mechanism of return must not be attributed to it here without evidence. "A radiance of a radiance, etc." probably abbreviates what preceded; the scope of the abbreviation is not fully decided. 14. L2, ואכלתם אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], also speaks of returning light after the refinements and in the future, in the context of Malchut. There is a partial conceptual bridge, not identity with the kav at the end of the feet of Adam Kadmon. K5, ונגלה כבוד [And the Glory Shall Be Revealed], 5722, distinguishes the substance of food and sovev. It can be combined with a particular component, but does not alone prove the Epistle's entire mechanism, especially wisdom and knowledge and the spirit of the sacrifice. 15. The Epistle itself already mentions a command addressed to separate beings, mitzvot as the foundation and root of Torah, and outer/inner dimensions. One therefore cannot say that it contains no comparison with Torah at all. Tanya ד [4] includes Torah

and mitzvot versus radiance; Tanya ה [5] gives an advantage to the union of apprehension; לז [37] gives both sides of the precedence of study/mitzvah. K3 says action is greater in the days of Mashiach, not that Torah is greater. L4 ד§ [4] is now another early source for the positive investigation. 16. "Today to perform them" and the Mishnah in Avot concern service, reward and quality of attachment; they are not alone an absolute ranking of action>Torah. Gan Eden, the days of Mashiach and resurrection are not unified under "the future." "Thus far we have found" marks the limit of material transmitted; it is not

proof of truncation or intentional closure. במ"א [elsewhere] has not been identified, and that is not the task of this round.

Joint validity review:

- Do not turn a hypothesis declared in the table into a fact in the continuous explanation. In particular: the two axes of the elements, the reason for omitting the inanimate, the identity of the roots of food with the kav, and the author of the reference in Emor.
- The Epistle explains why the higher is nourished by the lower with "for it is"; the division L1=why and the Epistle=where only therefore restricts its explanatory power too much.
- Natural nourishment, refinement in eating, and intentional service must be distinguished. A condition of blessing or prayer for every reception of vitality must not be added to the Epistle without a source.
- Purpose, action and place of revelation remain separate. The combination with Tanya לו–לז [36–37] and מא [41] is a positive explanation, not identification of במ"א [elsewhere].

New sources and status of the witnesses:

L4: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא_ר22%_אצת/(וקזה — the first discourse, כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies], ד ,[1] א§§ [4]. Read in its text by the compiler; a page facsimile has not yet been examined.

L5: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/הרות_יטוקל_(ומדא_ר22%_חלש/(וקזה — בפי נסכים כתיב כי תבאו אל ארץ מושבותיכם [In the Section of Libations It Is Written, "When You Come to the Land of Your Habitations"], א§ [1]; not the following discourse ענין הנסכים [The Matter of Libations]. Read in its text by the compiler.

Bot-R3 folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1okmvs-EGe12mefiDM4yxwGRFZOCxYp7a

ZIP Bot-R3: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aCXuC2u2za6KEYUfbRG3SAJoez77pjN3/view

Bot-R3 ledger: https://drive.google.com/file/d/127-k06qLeyiirI2_ErkKC6k7dBGCbSXC/view

Emor facsimile seen by the compiler: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ca7CxbghG_LP8aiRyt9hg7dgo8Lwlsyy/view — the file is labelled PDF106, and the image has heading 76; ד§ [4] and the reference are visible in the right column. Correspondence to לח ג [38c] has not yet been established from this alone.

Tzav facsimile seen by the compiler: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BJ5PyMv1mwA2MM6CX1afUO7_Hl-CT_gG/view — heading יג [13], the opening of ששת ימים [Six Days] in the right column, and the beginning of ב§ [2] in the left column. This facsimile does not include the two proofs; photographic verification of them must not be attributed to it.

According to Bot: מצה זו [This Matzah] opens at יא ג [11c]; ששת ימים [Six Days] opens at יג א [13a];

ואכלתם [And You Shall Eat] ז–ח [7–8]; Emor, ביאור והניף [Explanation of “And He Shall Wave”], begins at לז [37], and ד§ [4] is on תוספת ;[38] לח ביאור וידעת [Further Explanation of “And You Shall Know”] begins at ו א [6a]. These are location reports; they do not mean that every section or quotation is on the opening page of the discourse.

========== THE TEXT, QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH RULES ==========

Canonical question map — preserve these IDs; new questions will be marked N-R4-[שם 01-[מודל [N-R4-[model name]-01], etc.:

S40: A Continuous Explanation of the Entire Unit, Distinguishing a Supported Conclusion from a Proposal.

Rules for reading and determination:

1. Begin with the focused sources given in your role. Open the text, not only search results. Bring context before and after when a pronoun or reference depends on it.
2. Mark separately: source text you read; facsimile you saw; transcription you received; search result; later explanation; your inference. The compiler's report is not your reading.
3. Do not require the user to assemble a package from several places. Continue with available research even if Drive or a particular site does not open. Report a blocker once; seek an alternative witness.
4. For each dossier: a precise difficulty, preferred answer, evidence, step of inference, serious alternative, real difficulty, and what remains missing. Do not invent "counterevidence" to fill a template.
5. Not every difference between sources is a contradiction; not every resemblance is identity of mechanism. Separate the source of the power, the manner of drawing down, the act of refinement, the recipient and the purpose.
6. Do not emend the Epistle on the basis of a conventional order. Do not invent a page number, edition attribution or quotation. In books: book/discourse/section + anchor wording + link; if the page was not verified, say so.
7. "I did not find" requires details of a focused search; "not examined" is not an interpretive result. Do not declare a question closed merely because an elegant formulation appears.
8. Do not construct a booklet or edit previous reports. Write a new R4, and preserve explicitly what was corrected and why.
9. If files can be saved, provide an accessible report and a source file. Do not claim a system was operated or a message sent if you only

prepared text. There is no artificial requirement to activate sub-agents.

Map of available sources and candidates:

- Iggeret HaKodesh 20: https://abc770.org/article_node_2383/ ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/1029342/jewish/Epistle-20.htm
- Berachot 40a: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_מ_תוכרב
- Bava Kamma: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_אע_אמק_אבב ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_בע_אמק_אבב
- Zohar: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ב_מר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/א_אמר_ג_קלח_רהז ; https://www.zohar.com/zohar/Pinchas/chapters/84
- Variant apparatus also examined by the compiler, with an actual variant at 241a, line 14: https://web.stanford.edu/dept/press/cgi-bin/aramaic/variants/?sel=385
- Etz Chaim נ י [50, 10]: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/רעש/ם_ייח_זעץ_קרפ/נ_י
- Mishnat Chassidim, Tractate HaHarkavah: Bot reports HB7122, text in chapter א [1] and a reference to chapter ד [4]. The text must be distinguished from the commentary טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]; the facsimile was not independently checked by the compiler.
- Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, "להבין בתוספת ביאור ע"פ וידעת היום" [To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse "And You Shall Know Today"] ה§ [5]: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/קל_הרות_יטו_(ומדא%22רזקזה)/ונחתאו
- Likkutei Torah, Tzav, "להבין מ"ש בהגדה מצה זו" [To Understand What Is Written in the Haggadah, "This Matzah"] ב§ [2]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898813

- K3 ציון במשפט תפדה [Zion Shall Be Redeemed through Justice], 5735, §§יד–טו [14–15]: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/3140547/jewish/page.htm
- K4 פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, §§ז–ט [7–9], an unreviewed transcript: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/4296192
- K5 ונגלה כבוד הוי" [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722, §§ג–ז [3–7], an unreviewed transcript: https://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article_cdo/aid/2988026/jewish/page.htm
- Likkutei Torah, Emor, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"] §ד [4]: identified in the text and in a facsimile; the reference לח ג [38c] requires explicit pagination matching.
- Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah, Vayigash: targets to locate, not verified quotations. A precise discussion of food and knowledge must be located, not replaced with a general discussion of the inanimate and vegetative.
- Tanya: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_א_קלח_אינת ; chapters ה [5] [41] in the same framework.
- Eruvin 22a; Kiddushin 40b; Peah 1:1; Avot 4:17; Ezekiel 1 (especially verses 6, 10, 26).
- Lessons / Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=9%2F23%2F2026 ; https://www.chabad.org/library/tanya/tanya_cdo/aid/3800431/jewish/Igeret-HaKodesh-Epistle-20-Part-9.htm
- Sefer HaMitzvot of the Tzemach Tzedek, קע א [170a] (discourse and location require examination of the text): the reference in K3 note 27 for the Piena tradition.
- Bot R1 folder, for assistance only: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1f8lWd6Ny7pKuJWOqIU4IhNxVxnHA9tYc

- ZIP R1: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XWmYouEwVAWpx8S65x5_d2CBwREh0i25/view

Places that did not open for one researcher may open for you. K3/K4/K5 opened for the compiler; do not automatically retain Bot's blocked status.

L1–L3 sources already located:

- L1: Likkutei Torah, Tzav, ששת ימים תאכל מצות [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot], §§ב–ג [2–3]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898814
- L2: Likkutei Torah, Tzav,

ואכלתם אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], especially the beginning and the future discussion: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898808

- L3: Likkutei Torah, Emor, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"], especially §ד [4]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898840
- Do not replace L3 with "וספרתם לכם" [And You Shall Count for Yourselves]: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898837 — this is another discourse.
- Alternative witness for Tzav: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/(חספה_גחו)_וצ/(קזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל
- Alternative witness for Emor: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/רומא/(קזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל
- Bot R2 folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1xgDmj3FxWTS0SLtNMWDNcTF4MDqHhuOJ
- ZIP R2: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sLUKQ7ZHvyl55mg8Le19Zx_1Ar3cyqYT/view
- Bot R2 source ledger: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1mcCFADpR7zsXhD8m6s0fpuaUEz0EXvYd/view

- Bot R2 source reader: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1A_abyRFWR3VhFKnRq6ZanSEejcj1H6zp/view

Beginning does not depend on opening the package: the passage, questions, research status and addresses are in the prompt itself. Do not shift responsibility for obtaining an available text to the user.

Carry out now the focused task at the beginning of the prompt and submit an R4 report. No additional material is needed in order to begin.

File 0418 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[538]

Role: a positive explanation of the inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders, the grain and the meat, while investigating the new source.

Work order:

1. First open L4 א§ [1] and L5 א§ [1]. Give a positive answer for animal–fire and speaking–air according to the context: the animal's soul, heat/desire, the speaking spirit, sacrifice and prayer. Distinguish what the text says from what you added as explanation. There is now an explicit source; do not repeat "there is no Chassidic source."
2. Compare with Etz Chaim 50:10 in three columns: what is being mapped; what is the role of the element; what is the level of the soul. Is there an actual witness for the distinction between composition and functioning, or only a proposed reconciliation? Present the difficulty that remains. Do not emend the Epistle, and do not declare the contradiction resolved because it is possible

[538]Document 0418: IGK20-Finale-R4_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

to imagine two axes. Also check whether the two lower correspondences are explained in the source or merely given; do not infer four reasons from two pairs. 3. Correct the reading of note 61: follow the note's anchor in the words that the animal is above the vegetative, and the subject of It. Separate the animal's excellence in creation from the omission of earth and from the proposal about nourishment. End with a paragraph on water and salt: is this an open question in the plain meaning, or is the chain illustrative rather than an enumeration of all sources of nourishment? Do not present a single demonstrated reason for the omission. 4. In L1 §§ב–ג [2–3], separate a general explanation of added vitality and intellect from the application to human service. What exactly is the refinement required in each passage? Are physiological eating, eating for the sake of Heaven, a blessing, the recitation of Shema and prayer the same stage? Check where the text moves to the plane of service. Connect it to the Epistle without planting in it a condition that is not stated. 5. Preserve R3's achievement: the two proofs together, differences of order and wording, wheat's particular role in Daat of Tohu. The questions of father and mother, an ox specifically, and wisdom and knowledge do not require an endless search. Try only one more focused source if it answers a missing detail; otherwise mark a reasoned limit. 6. Give an explanation of the returning-light sentence that explains causality, not only location. Separate L1/L3, the Epistle and L2. Do not settle for declaring that all the terminologies are the same principle; specify precisely how they combine and how they are not identified.

Deliverables: five to seven conclusions that change the state of understanding; an Etz Chaim/Epistle/L4/L5 table; a nature/refinement /service table in L1; a continuous explanation from "ומזה" [and from this] to the transition to the Merkavah, with a transition paragraph to mitzvot; changes to S02–S18 that were actually examined, and a

source ledger. A positive paragraph first, with the limit at its end. Do not repeat the entire R3 report.

File 0419 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[539]

Role: a focused witness package enabling determination of the new sources and location errors. Do not reconstruct all five discourses afresh.

Execution priorities:

P1. Locate a facsimile of Likkutei Torah, Ki Tetze, כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies]: א§ [1] with animal–fire/speaking–air, and ד§ [4] with the two directions of wedging and Torah/action. Save a full page and a readable crop if necessary. For each quotation, record the discourse heading, section, visible printed marking, location in the column, PDF page number, and title page/edition if verified. Do not convert the site's תצא א׳ [Tetze 1] into folio א [1]. L5, Shelach, בפ׳ נסכים כתיב [In the Section of Libations It Is Written], א§ [1], is a supplementary witness: locate only the animal–fire paragraph and the reference to Ki Tetze.

P2. In L1, ששת ימים [Six Days], complete the facsimile of the two proofs themselves. The PDF55 facsimile you supplied shows heading יג [13], the discourse's opening and the beginning of ב§ [2], not all the proofs. Check the following page and the ג§/ב§ [2/3] boundary. Separate the location of the discourse's beginning from the location of the quotations. Do not return to the attribution to מצה זו [This Matzah] or צו ז [Tzav 7].

[539]Document 0419: IGK20-Finale-R4_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

P3. The Emor facsimile PDF106 shows heading 76, ד§ [4], and the reference to the Epistle in the right column. Show how this corresponds to the citation לח ג [38c]: what is visible and what is inferred from the pagination system? If needed, add an adjacent page showing the numbering system. Transcribe a few lines before and after the reference; mark parentheses and special lettering. Presence in print is not attribution to the Alter Rebbe. Checking the first edition is useful as textual testimony, but is not alone sufficient to decide author/editor. Look for an attribution witness only if an actual editorial source is identified; otherwise leave open.

P4. Correct the Zohar ledger: the bird passage close to the Epistle's wording, paragraph 537, is assigned in the apparatus to 241a, line 2; the summary with the root/foundation order is at 241a, line 14. Do not leave place A≈240b for the quotation itself. Separate the context beginning at 240b from the quotation. One print facsimile of 241a is preferable to another OCR summary. A site's paragraph division is not the print division.

P5. Note 61: if a Hebrew facsimile of Shiurim BeSefer HaTanya or the source of the note can be opened, bring it with the anchor in the text. Even without Hebrew, it is possible to check in English that the excellence in creation refers to the animal above the vegetative; do not translate EN and present it as a Hebrew witness. Distinguish the qualified proposal in parentheses from the first sentence.

Secondary tasks only after P1–P3: a written witness for attribution of the Emor reference; a Zohar commentator on יסודא [foundation]. There is no task for the printing of "Thus far," no task for Piena, and no opening of במ"א [elsewhere] or the union dossier. Do not download again an enormous PDF that is already available. A blockage does not require stopping: use the alternative witness and determine a precise status.

Provide REPORT_HE, SOURCE_LEDGER, SOURCE_READER, VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS, GAPS and EVIDENCE. Add a short table distinguishing read in text/seen in facsimile/reported/inferred. Save R4 in a new folder; R1–R3 must not be overwritten. Every promised file must exist and be accessible; the ZIP will contain the focused witnesses, not large books that were not requested. Provide a text report even if you could not create files. The prompt includes all the questions so you know what may change a conclusion; there is no requirement to recheck all of them.

File 0420 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[501]

IGK20-Finale-R4 — Compiler's Review and Completion toward a Summary — What Changed in the Compiler's Examination

Grok's new source is correct in content, but incorrect in location: "צו את בני ישראל" [Command the Children of Israel] is in Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the first discourse. I read the text on Chabad and the witness in the Pinchas section of ChabadText. §ג [3] gives four pairs; water, fire and air are explained, and earth is given. This is a positive basis for explanation, even if the relationship to the Etz Chaim map has not yet been decided.

In §א [1] of the same discourse, descriptions of the angels' fixed attributes are adjacent to the description of the world that has been refined. This yields an important proposal for examination: a specific role is not necessarily a sign of a lack of refinement. This is evidence against the assumption on which Claude's new difficulty rests, not a full solution for all levels of mutual inclusion. §§ב–ד [2–4] connect

[501]Document 0420: IGK20-Finale-R4-Assessment.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

repentance, sacrifice, drawing down and Torah; the source must not be reduced to the list of elements.

L6, the discourse text; the witness in the Pinchas section. Digital texts were read, not a print facsimile.

The Sag/forehead sentence was located in Kuntres Acharon ד [4]. I read the text on Wikisource and the passage integrated into the Kehot explanation. The sentence's correspondence to the wording brought in Likkutei Torah, Emor ב§ [2], is strong. The location of the content itself must therefore not be left open, and it must not be attributed to Epistle 20. The question of why the reference calls the target אג"ה [Iggeret HaKodesh] remains bibliographic; it is not an identification of במ"א [elsewhere] in the Epistle.

In Kuntres Acharon, the same context combines nourishment from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders, refinement, mitzvot and drawing down below. This yields a correction to the explanation of Torah and action: the local distinction in Ki Tetze must not be generalized into a slogan that Torah always descends and mitzvot always ascend. Root, action and result must be separated. A source emphasizing mutual inclusion at the root does not negate a drawing down that comes through it.

L7, Kuntres Acharon ד [4] — text; the passage with Kehot's explanation. On Wikisource the witness is marked "not checked"; in the integrated explanation, the textual layers must be separated.

The reference from Shelach to Ki Tetze exists. I reread the paragraph on the element of fire in "בפ' נסכים כתיב" [In the Section of Libations It Is Written] א§ [1]. N-R4-Claude-05 is therefore no longer an open question at the digital-text level. Demonstrating the reference's presence does not decide its author.

L5, Shelach, the discourse beginning “בפ’ נסכים כתיב כי תבאו” [In the Section of Libations It Is Written, “When You Come”], not the following discourse “ענין הנסכים” [The Matter of Libations].

IGK20-Finale-R4 — Compiler’s Review and Completion toward a Summary — Determinations on the Reports

Topic	Decision
The four pairs	There is now a complete and partly explained parallel; correct to Pinchas instead of Tzav
The relationship to Etz Chaim	Two verified maps; distinguishing the objects of mapping helps, but is not an explicit authorial determination
Note 61	Grok’s correction accepted: the animal is the subject; do not reverse the direction of superiority again
Eating and refinement in L1	Separating nature and service is useful; do not infer that the absence of a blessing condition means an absence of refinement in every sense
Returning light	A reason in the Epistle itself; the two syntactic determinations are independent, and the latter is preferably attributed to the kav
L3 and K4	Possible and reasoned complementarity; no need to create a disagreement merely from a difference between root and state after refinement
A particular attribute versus refined	L6 provides a critical test for the assumption of contradiction; do not identify a fixed role with lack of rectification
Author of the Emor reference	Open. An inclination toward editorial attribution is not evidence; not a condition for continuing the explanation
Torah and action in Ki Tetze	An important explanation, but it must not become a fixed dictionary of directions for all sources
The reference to Sag	The content is found in Kuntres Acharon ד [4]; separate from Iggeret HaKodesh 20 and from במ”א [elsewhere]
Tohu in Iggeret HaKodesh 20	I checked another witness and did not find the Sag sentence in it; words from a parallel must not be inserted into the Epistle
Thus far we have found	A transmission boundary only; remains as corrected

Claude's inference from the collection name "Iggeret HaKodesh" to an editorial layer remains weak: designation, collection, printing and the date of the reference must be distinguished. There is no reason to turn this into a new manuscript task in order to finish the unit's interpretation. Nor is unverified civil-calendar chronology needed here.

File 0521 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 4

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[502]

R4 local evidence reused (NOT re-done) — Zohar A/B

- SEEN in R4 VARIANTS + HTML: Place A ≈ רמא א [241a] line 2; Place B ≈ רמא א [241a] line 14; רמ ב [240b] = prior context ONLY.
- Files: `zohar_241a_wikisource.html`, `stanford_sel385_variants.html` (copied).

Local R4 path: `/workspace/IGK20-Finale-R4/` Drive R4: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1bhqfJyVYcK18HtxqGP7IDyOXhb5-gaJE Collector did NOT receive Bot-R4 as attachment — cite as Bot-R4 local/Drive evidence.

File 0399 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[540]

[502] Document 0521: R4_POINTERS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[540] Document 0399: GAPS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

GAPS — R5 (do not change the biur)

1. **L7 Kehot print page/folio** for Kuntres Acharon 4 — not extracted from a print PDF this round. Wikisource body + screenshot suffice for wording; print locus remains open.
2. **Chabad integrated commentary** page (Daily Tanya / Lessons) — Cloudflare/timeout; separation done by using Wikisource as Admur body and **not** quoting blocked commentary as Admur.
3. **he.chabad.org aid/5898923** — Cloudflare challenge; Pinchas body taken from chabadpedia instead.
4. **Emor column «ג» [c] glyph** — still inferred (R4); not strengthened.

5. **Note 61 HE photo** — secondary; not blocking; EN correction already accepted by collector.
6. **Zohar print photo of רמא א [241a]** — still not obtained (R4 HTML/Stanford only).
7. **Attribution** of Emor «אג"ה» [Iggeret HaKodesh] pointer — remains OPEN (content match ≠ authorship).

Gaps above do **not** overturn the positive biur in REPORT_HE.

File 0400 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or witness from the history of the research[444]

LOCATIONS — IGK20-Finale-R5 — L7 — Tanya Kuntres Acharon 4

Field	Value	Status
Opening	להבין מ"ש בפע"ח [To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim]	body (Wikisource)

[444] Document 0400: LOCATIONS.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Field	Value	Status
Target ¶	**הבירורין שבאמת זאת ועוד [And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements]** … מס"ג [from Sag] … מצח הארה בעלמא [forehead, a mere radiance]	READ body; screenshot
Continuation	hashpa'ah via mitzvot maasiyot; sowing mashal (זריעה [sowing])	READ body
Admur vs commentary	Wikisource = Admur body; Kehot/Chabad integrated commentary **not** merged into claim	body vs blocked Daily Tanya
Kehot print folio/ PDF of KA4	—	**GAP** (does not change biur)
vs IgK 20	S"G/metzach sentence **NOT** in IgK 20 (collector)	—

Field	Value	Status
vs L3 Emor Vehenif ב§ [2]	content match to pointer «באג"ה קרוב לסופו… מס"ג… מצח» [in Iggeret HaKodesh near its end… from Sag… forehead]	content only; attribution OPEN

LOCATIONS — IGK20-Finale-R5 — R4 cites (local `/workspace/IGK20-Finale-R4/` + Drive `1bhqfJyVYcK18HtxqGP7IDyOXhb5-gaJE`)

Item	Files	Note
L1 proofs	proofs_pdf-056 + cont_pdf-057	copied to R5 EVIDENCE
L4 ד§/[1] א§ [4]	Teitzei pdf-292 / pdf-293	copied
Emor ד§ [4] arab76	`Emor_§ד_arab76_pdf-106`	לח [38] INFERRED; ג [c] INFERRED
Zohar A/B	VARIANTS_OR_LOCATIONS.md + zohar_241a + stanford_sel385	cite R4; do not redo

LOCATIONS — IGK20-Finale-R5 — Zohar (from R4 only)

Place	Locus	Cite
A birds	≈ רמא א [241a] line 2	R4 VARIANTS + Stanford sel=385
B ikara/yesoda	≈ רמא א [241a] line 14	R4
רמ ב [240b]	prior context ONLY	R4 — quote itself not on רמ ב [240b]

File 0401 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[503]

IGK20-Finale-R5-Bot — closing witness pack — Contents

- `REPORT_HE.md` — Hebrew biur + witness table
- `LOCATIONS.md` — L6/L7/R4/Zohar loci
- `SOURCE_LEDGER.md` / `SOURCE_READER.md` / `GAPS.md` / `DRIVE_IDS.md`
- `EVIDENCE/` — L6 גּ§ [3] photos/crops; L7 Wikisource; R4 copies (L1/L4/Emor); Zohar HTML from R4

File 0402 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or witness from the history of the research[504]

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — What Was Corrected / What Was Added in This Round

[503] Document 0401: README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[504] Document 0402: REPORT_HE.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Topic	Previous status	R5	Why
L6 Pinchas, four pairs	Not opened as primary	**First discourse «ישראל בני את צו / לאשי לחמי קרבני את» [Command the Children of Israel / My Offering, My Bread for My Fire-Offerings] ג§ [3]; PDF180; opening folio עה [75]; Arabic-numbered 150**	New primary source for the pairs of inanimate, vegetative, animal and speaking orders↔ elements
L7 Kuntres Acharon ד [4]	Not opened	**Wikisource text «שבאמת זאת ועוד בעלמא הארה מצח מס"ג… הבירורין…» [And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements… from Sag… forehead, a mere radiance] + continuation on imp arting/sowing**	Mechanism of refinements and imparting through Torah and mitzvot
R4 leftovers	Exist locally	**Cited + copied to EVIDENCE** (not redone)	Economy; no redoing the five discourses
Zohar A/B	Corrected in R4	**Quoted from R4 VARIANTS** — unchanged	241a l.2 / l.14; 240b = prior context
Note 61	Secondary	**Secondary / not blocking**	EN correction «It»= animal above vegetative already accepted

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — A Short Positive Explanation of the Concluding Unit (Usable)

1. **The four pairs (L6 ג§ [3], seen in print):**
   Earth↔inanimate · water↔vegetative · fire↔animal · air↔speaking (the Targum, «לרוח ממללא» [a speaking spirit]).
   The sacrifice «from the animal» is from the element of fire; the fire below ascends and is included in the fire above («לחמי לאשי» [My bread for My fire-offerings]).

This direction corresponds to the L4 pair in Ki Tetze א§ [1] (animal=fire / speaking=air) and the direction of the Epistle — **without** forced harmonization with Etz Chaim, Gate 50, chapter 10 (anima l=air/speaking=fire; digital/later in R4).

2. **A refined world and angels with attributes (adjacent א§ [1], digital+band):**
   In the World to Come (=a refined world that has already been refined), everything is in its place — Michael's camp in love and Gabriel's camp in fear — **it is impossible to change**. In this world, before refinement — repentance and change are possible.
   Limit: there is no automatic contradiction between «an angel fixed in an attribute» and «a refined world»; they are two horizons of the same structure.
3. **Refinements and imparting (L7, Kuntres Acharon ד [4], the Alter Rebbe's text):**
   The refinements in BYA from the 288 through Torah and mitzvot in thought, speech and action are **higher in their root** than the nefesh, ruach and neshamah in the human being — for they are from Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon, while the nefesh, ruach and neshamah rectified through Mah are **a mere radiance from the forehead**.
   Continuation: the inner dimension of the higher does not descend — only the outer dimension; **drawing down** to the kelim/the outer dimension of the kelim is through **practical mitzvot specifically** (not only temporary elevation). The sowing analogy: the seed arouses the vegetative power as far as Sag — **without** opening a union/Piena dossier.
4. **Comparison of the content of the reference in L3 (Emor, והניף [And He Shall Wave], ב§ [2]) ↔ Kuntres Acharon ד [4]:**
   In Emor (R2 passage / `lt_emor_38_start`): «And as written in Iggeret HaKodesh near its end, for they are from Sag in the inner

dimension of Adam Kadmon, and the rectification through Mah issues from the forehead as a mere radiance.»

Identical in content to the Sag/forehead sentence in Kuntres Acharon ד [4].

Limits: (א [1]) comparison of content ≠ proof of who wrote the reference; (ב [2]) a collection name/label «אגה» [Iggeret HaKodesh] ≠ proof of the edition's scope; (ג [3]) the collector checked — the Sag sentence is **not** in the text of Epistle 20.

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — Witness Table (Read / Seen / Reported / Inferred)

Statement	Read in text	Seen in facsimile	Reported/transcription	Inferred
L6 heading + the verse "My offering, My bread" at the opening of Pinchas	Yes (chabadpedia)	Yes, PDF179 עה [75]	—	—
L6 ג§ [3], four pairs	Yes	Yes, PDF180 (+crop)	—	—
L6 א§ [1], refined world / angels, attributes	Yes (digital)	band/ adjacent PDF180	—	—
L6 printed folio עה [75]	—	Yes, TL PDF179	TOC עה [75]	—
L6 Arabic-numbered 150	—	Yes, PDF180	—	—
L7 paragraph on refinements + Sag/ forehead	Yes (Wikisource)	Wikisource screenshot	excerpt transcript	Kehot page not produced
L7 sowing analogy / drawing down through practical mitzvot	Yes	Same text	excerpt	—

Statement	Read in text	Seen in facsimile	Reported/transcription	Inferred
L7 ≠ integrated Chabad commentary	Wikisource text = the Alter Rebbe	—	Daily Tanya Chabad blocked by CF	—
L3 Sag/forehead reference in Emor ב§ [2]	Yes (R2 excerpt)	—	Transcription	Attribution of reference **open**
L1 two proofs, PDF56–57	(R4)	Copied from R4	R4	—
L4 Tetze ד§/[1] א§ [4], PDF292–293	(R4)	Copied	R4	—
Emor PDF106 ↔ ג לח [38c]	(R4)	Copied	R4	ג+[38] לח [c] **inferred** as in R4
Zohar A≈241a l.2; B≈l.14	R4 HTML	—	R4 VARIANTS	—
Note 61 HE	No	No	EN accepted by the collector	Secondary

Hebrew Report — IGK20-Finale-R5 (Closing Witness Package + Positive Explanation) — Zohar (Quotation from R4 Only)

- Place A (birds): **≈241a, line 2** — Stanford sel=385 + HTML R4.
- Place B (root/foundation): **≈241a, line 14**.
- **240b** = prior context only — **do not** say that the quotation itself is on 240b.

File 0403 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[541]

[541]Document 0403: SOURCE_LEDGER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_LEDGER — R5

ID	Source	Role	Accessed
LT-hb58812	`/workspace/IGK20-Earth-R2/scans/hb58812.pdf`	Kehot LT print	PDF179–181 photos (no re-download)
LT-chabadpedia-Pinchas	https://text.chabadpedia.com/…/סחנים	digital body first maamar	READ
LT-chabad-aid5898923	https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923	blocked Cloudflare	search only / unused body
Tanya-KA4-WS	https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ורחא_סרטנוק_אינת_ד	Admur body	READ + screenshot
Tanya-Daily-HE	he.chabad.org dailystudy tanya 11/17/2026	integrated commentary	timeout/blocked — not used as Admur
Emor-R2-excerpt	Finale-R2 `lt_emor_38_start.txt`	L3 בּ§ [2] S”G pointer	READ

ID	Source	Role	Accessed
R4-local	`/workspace/IGK20-Finale-R4/`	L1/L4/Emor/Zohar witnesses	OPENED + copied selects
R4-Drive	folder `1bhqfJyVYcK18HtxqGP7IDyOXhb5-gaJE`	sibling evidence	cited (collector lacked attachment)
Zohar-R4	stanford_sel385 + zohar_241a HTML	Place A/B	cited from R4

Not opened this round: Tanya ch.5, ch.41; zivug/Piyena/ad-kan files; Note 61 HE photo; KA4 Kehot print scan.

File 0404 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or witness from the history of the research[270]

[270]Document 0404: SOURCE_READER.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

SOURCE_READER — what was actually read (R5) — Reused R4 (opened files; not re-argued)

- L1 proofs PDF56–57 — **photo** (copied).
- L4 Teitzei ד§/[1] א§ [4] PDF292–293 — **photo** (copied).
- Emor ד§ [4] arab76 PDF106 — **photo**; לח/ג [38/c] **inference** (as R4).
- Zohar A/B — R4 VARIANTS + HTML (**search/body inherited**).

File 0421 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[542]

With G-d's help. IGK20-Finale-R5. 23.9.2026. A concluding completion round for the concluding unit of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The prompt is self-contained: role, research status, sources, the full passage and all forty of the user's questions are here. There is no need to assemble a package from other reports. No booklet now. Carry out the reading and submit a result, not only a plan. No further approval is needed. Give priority to sources already located and completing the explanation. There is no requirement for subagents. Do not attribute to yourself the compiler's reading; check the compiler's conclusions too. Do not create another round from a bibliographic gap that does not change the explanation.

Your role — IGK20-Finale-R5-Claude: a concluding explanation of Torah, action and the sacrifice, with correction of two questions that have been resolved.

1. Close N-R4-Claude-04 at the level of content correspondence: the Sag/forehead paragraph is in Kuntres Acharon ד [4] (L7), not in Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Separate locating a content target from interpreting the title אגה"ק [Iggeret HaKodesh] and attributing the ref-

[542]Document 0421: IGK20-Finale-R5_Prompt_Claude.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

erence. Read the paragraph and the continuation about mitzvot as drawing down and the purpose of revelation below; this must not identify במ"א [elsewhere].

2. Read L4 §ד [4] in full against L7 and the passage on Torah and mitzvot in Iggeret HaKodesh 20. Formulate the two directions without claiming that ascent is the entire action of mitzvot. Check the difference between the root of the excellence, what the person does, and the result of revelation. Note: the Epistle itself also uses "their beginning is wedged in their end" in explaining mitzvot; therefore, the two halves of the formula must not be turned into a single-valued dictionary for all sources.
3. Read L6, Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, צו את בני ישראל [Command the Children of Israel], §§א–ד [1–4]. Check especially whether the description of fixed attributes and the refined world in §א [1] weakens your assumption that a particular attribute indicates absence of refinement. Return to L3 §§א–ד [1–4] and K4 §ז [7] only on this point. Do not declare all the explanations identical; write what can be reconciled and what still requires a source.
4. Check how L6 combines the correspondences, sacrifice, repentance, Torah and action; distinguish between a parallel that assists the explanation and a claim that this is what the Alter Rebbe intended by every word of the Epistle. There is no need to load the Mishnah with a special reason for the word "repentance."
5. Close N-R4-Claude-05: L5 §א [1] contains a reference to Ki Tetze. The address is in the map; do not leave an available reading as a new question. Editorial attribution remains separate. The Emor reference/author: use the wording "printed in Likkutei Torah," without a new dating investigation. No decision on it is required for submission.
6. Integrate the result into a full explanation of the conclusion. Tanya ד–ה [4–5] and לז [37]: open the text only to the extent that your con-

clusion depends on it; מא [41] is required if you use it to explain a below/above relationship. Do not write that there is no comparison with Torah in the entire Epistle, and there is no absolute ranking. Deliverables: a full continuous explanation; a short table of r oot/action/result in the Epistle, L4 and L7; a paragraph on angels that are refined and have a role; R4 corrections; up to five remaining research notes. No expansion into the union dossier and no new historical round.

The full research status needed for R5, after Grok's and Claude's R4 reports: the Bot-R4 report was not delivered to the compiler. Do not assume what was examined in it. If it is available to you, use it while identifying the witness; do not delay available work to request it from the user.

א [1]. What Is Already Supported

1. Iggeret HaKodesh 20 applies the advantage of the radiance at the bottom: nourishment vegetative→animal→speaking, and even wisdom and knowledge; spirit of sacrifice→angels of the Merkavah; conclusion concerning practical mitzvot. This is a connecting structure, not proof that all the links are identical in level.
2. L1 = Likkutei Torah, Tzav,

ששת ימים תאכל מצות [Six Days You Shall Eat Matzot] §§ב–ג [2–3], aid5898814. The two food proofs appear together, meat followed by grain, "father" alone, wisdom and intellect. In the Epistle, the order is reversed, "father and mother," wisdom and knowledge. The discourse explains a root in Tohu and refinement. מצה זו [This Matzah], aid5898813, is another discourse; do not return to the mistaken attribution of the two proofs to it. 3. In L1 there is a marked transition from explaining food to the plane of service of G-d. Do not add to the Epistle a condition of blessing or prayer for every reception of vitality. The absence of the condition in the sentence does not

prove absence of refinement in every meaning of the term. Natural capacity, refinement and intentional service must be distinguished. 4. Likkutei Torah, Vaetchanan, תוספת ביאור וידעת היום [Further Explanation of "And You Shall Know Today"] ה§ [5], singles out wheat in Daat of Tohu. Father and mother as the partzufim Abba and Imma; grain=knowledge and meat=wisdom; a special reason for the ox — have not been demonstrated. Do not require an endless search or invent a reason. 5. Berachot 40a is the grain source; Bava Kamma 72a, continuing from 71b, is the meat source. The Epistle's wording differs from the Gemara's wording. Rashi explains lack of precision and Tosafot mentions fasting. The Chassidic parallel L1 is the anchor for using the proof for added intellect. 6. Etz Chaim 50:10 maps the animal to the air portion within all the elements, and the speaking to the fire portion. In the Epistle: animal–fire, speaking–air. Mishnat Chassidim is not a witness verified as confirming the Epistle's order. Text and טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree] must be read separately. The difference between the objects of mapping is a proposed reconciliation with more support than mere resemblance, but there is no witness that decides the relationship between the maps. 7. L4 = Likkutei Torah, כי תצא למלחמה על אויביך [When You Go Out to War against Your Enemies] ד ,[1] א§§ [4], aid5898974. א§ [1] gives animal–fire and speaking–air; ד§ [4] explains the excellences of Torah and action through two directions of wedging. L5 = Likkutei Torah, Shelach, בפ' נסכים כתיב כי תבאו [In the Section of Libations It Is Written, "When You Come"] א§ [1], strengthens animal–fire and refers to Ki Tetze. The compiler reread the reference from Shelach to Ki Tetze in the text; question N-R4-Claude-05 is closed at the digital-witness level. This is not a decision about who wrote the reference. 8. The correction of note 61 was accepted: It refers to the animal above the vegetative, not to the lower. The proposal concerning the omission of earth is in parentheses, and the addition about dependence after

creation is qualified. The compiler did not see the Hebrew source. Water and salt do not contradict an illustrative chain; a full reason for omitting the inanimate is not demonstrated. 9. L3 = Likkutei Torah, Emor, ביאור ע"פ והניף הכהן אותם [Explanation of the Verse "And the Priest Shall Wave Them"] §§א–ו [1–6], aid5898840. §ד [4] connects sacrifice, refinement, lights of Tohu and the enjoyment of the angels, quotes the Zohar and refers to the end of איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]. The compiler saw the reference in an R3 facsimile supplied by Bot. The author of the reference is undecided. Say "a connecting explanation is printed in Likkutei Torah"; there is no need to attribute the reference to the Alter Rebbe in order to use the explanation. 10. K4 = פקודא ליתן מחצית השקל [The Commandment to Give Half a Shekel], 5723, §ז [7]: Ban already refined in angels versus unrefined in domestic animals. L3 speaks of the root in Tohu and its revelation. The two distinctions may be complementary; they have not been demonstrated to contradict. "With a particular attribute" is not necessarily synonymous with "unrefined." The new continuation in L6 §א [1] is relevant to the examination, but does not alone settle every question about the degree of mutual inclusion. 11. In Zohar 240b–241a there is descent and return of spirit, a foundation in this world, affinity of species and the analogy of the Shechinah and the righteous person. The bird paragraph, 537, is close to the Epistle's wording; summary 540 concerns

the four figures. Each דילהון [their] must be interpreted according to its sentence. Lion and human also participate in the continuation. The Epistle's choice of ox and eagle corresponds to the spirit of animal and bird; do not claim that they are the only ones in the Zohar. 12. Two independent syntactic questions: כי הוא [for it is] — the phenomenon as a whole, or the food; the last returning light — attaches to the kav by virtue of "as above" and the preceding context. Sovev illuminates; a technical return must not be attributed to it

here without a source. “Etc.” probably abbreviates the previous radiance; no fourth degree is demonstrated. 13. L2 = ואכלתם אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully], aid5898808: returning light in the context of Malchut and in the future after refinements. It must not be identified with the kav at the end of the feet of Adam Kadmon. K5 = ונגלה כבוד [And the Glory Shall Be Revealed], 5722, aid2988026: the substance of food and sovev; explains a component, not all of wisdom and knowledge and the spirit of the sacrifice. Root, radiance, refinement, body and spirit are not synonyms. 14. The body of the Epistle already mentions a command addressed to separate beings, mitzvot as the foundation and root of Torah, Gulgulta/Mocha Stimaah, outer/inner dimensions, and drawings down in ABYA. It cannot be said that it contains no comparison with Torah at all. Tanya ד [4] includes Torah and mitzvot versus radiance; ה [5] explains the advantage of union in apprehension; לז [37] combines the precedence of a mitzvah that cannot be performed by others with the excellence of study. K3, ציון במשפט [Zion through Justice], 5735, says that action is greater in the days of Mashiach. Gan Eden, the days of Mashiach and resurrection must not be unified. 15. “Thus far we have found” is the limit of transmission, not proof of truncation or intentional closure. במ”א [elsewhere] has not been identified. Purpose, action and place of revelation are distinct; Tanya לו–לז [36–37] and מא [41] assist an explanatory combination, not identification of a reference. The union or Earth dossier is not being opened.

ב [2]. New Findings by the Compiler after R4 — Read Them Yourself, Do Not Merely Copy

L6: the bibliographic correction is Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, צו את בני ישראל [Command the Children of Israel], the first discourse, not Parashat Tzav. The text opened on two sites verifies the content of Grok’s report. ג§ [3] lists four pairs and explains water, fire and air; earth is given. א§§–ד [1–4] also concern service in this world, repen-

tance, sacrifice and revelation. Check them in context, without inferring that every detail in the Epistle's conclusion has been explained here. Address: https://he.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5898923

Alternative witness with a Pinchas section: https://text.chabadpedia.com/index.php/סחניפ/(וקזה_ר22%ומדא)_הרות_יטוקל

L7: the sentence about Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and Mah from the forehead is found in Kuntres Acharon ד [4], discourse beginning להבין מ"ש בפע"ח [To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim], in the paragraph beginning ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין [And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements]. The compiler read the text on Wikisource and the wording integrated into Kehot's explanation. This is a strong verbal correspondence to the target of L3 ב§ [2]'s reference; the very use of the name אג"ה [Iggeret HaKodesh] for this reference is a separate bibliographic matter. This did not identify במ"א [elsewhere] in Epistle 20. Text: https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ד_זורחא_סרטנוק_אינת

Integrated explanation, which must be separated from the Alter Rebbe's text: https://he.chabad.org/dailystudy/tanya.asp?tdate=11%2F17%2F2026

Read also the continuation about the purpose of drawing down and the sowing analogy. Do not expand into the union dossier even though it is mentioned nearby. The compiler checked Iggeret HaKodesh 20 again in another witness; the Sag sentence was not found there and must not be attributed to it.

ג [3]. What Requires Correction in the Explanation, Not Another General Search

- The plain meaning of Ki Tetze ד§ [4] does not permit fixing Torah=descent alone and mitzvot=ascent alone. One must also read the result of action in the discourse itself and compare it to drawing

down in L7. The same expression can emphasize a different relationship in another discourse.

- There is no automatic contradiction between a fixed angelic role and its being refined. Check the transition from mutual inclusion to absence of evil; do not interchange concepts.
- The inference from the collection name אג"ה [Iggeret HaKodesh] to editing is possible, but that name alone is not proof. There is no task to construct a dating of the discourse or identify an editor without a witness. Do not use this lack of determination as grounds to delay an explanation.
- Do not quote "I read Tanya ה [5] or מא [41]" when they were not opened. Previous claims may be retained as reports, but a new conclusion dependent on them requires the text.

ד [4]. Witnesses Already Seen and Their Limits

In R3, the compiler saw an Emor facsimile, PDF106, heading 76, §ד [4] and the reference in the right column; its precise correspondence to לח ג [38c] has not yet been verified. A Tzav facsimile, PDF55, heading יג [13], the opening of ששת ימים [Six Days] and the beginning of §ב [2] was seen; the two proofs were not visible in that facsimile. There is currently no Bot-R4 report proving that the additions were obtained. Bot-R3 folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1okmvs-EGe12mefiDM4yxwGRFZOCxYp7a

Emor facsimile: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ca7CxbghG_LP8aiRyt9hg7dgo8Lwlsyy/view

Tzav facsimile: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BJ5PyMv1mwA2MM6CX1afUO7_Hl-CT_gG/view

ה [5]. Deliverable at the End of the Round

Submit a positive explanation that can be used, with a small number of explicit limits. Do not automatically produce a new list of questions requiring another round. Details without answers may remain

as research notes. All forty questions below are included to preserve context; address in depth only your priorities. No booklet now.

Canonical question map — preserve these IDs; new questions will be marked N-R5-[שם 01-[מודל [N-R5-[model name]-01], etc.:

S40: A Continuous Explanation of the Entire Unit, Distinguishing a Supported Conclusion from a Proposal.

Rules for reading and determination:

1. Begin with the focused sources given in your role. Open the text, not only search results. Bring context before and after when a pronoun or reference depends on it.
2.

Mark separately: source text you read; facsimile you saw; transcription you received; search result; later explanation; your inference. The compiler's report is not your reading. 3. Do not require the user to assemble a package from several places. Continue with available research even if Drive or a particular site does not open. Report a blocker once; seek an alternative witness. 4. For each dossier: a precise difficulty, preferred answer, evidence, step of inference, serious alternative, real difficulty, and what remains missing. Do not invent "counterevidence" to fill a template. 5. Not every difference between sources is a contradiction; not every resemblance is identity of mechanism. Separate the source of the power, the manner of drawing down, the act of refinement, the recipient and the purpose. 6. Do not emend the Epistle on the basis of a conventional order. Do not invent a page number, edition attribution or quotation. In books: book/discourse/section + anchor wording + link; if the page was not verified, say so. 7. "I did not find" requires details of a focused search; "not examined" is not an interpretive result. Do not declare a question closed merely because an elegant formulation appears. 8.

Do not construct a booklet or edit previous reports. Write a new R5, and preserve explicitly what was corrected and why. 9. If files can be saved, provide an accessible report and a source file. Do not claim a system was operated or a message sent if you only prepared text. There is no artificial requirement to activate subagents.

Carry out now the focused task at the beginning of the prompt and submit an R5 report. No additional material is needed in order to begin.

File 0422 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[543]

Your role — IGK20-Finale-R5-Grok: finish the explanation of the first half on the basis of the full source.

1. Correct L6 everywhere to Likkutei Torah, Pinchas. Read §§א–ד [1–4], with the focus on §ג [3]: construct four positive answers for the pairs, distinguishing a written reason from an auxiliary explanation. Fire is connected here to the souls of living creatures and their source in the Merkavah; do not substitute a single biological reason of heat. Earth is given, so its explanation does not have the same degree of explicitness. Water as a vegetative element does not classify well water as a plant.
2. Compare Etz Chaim 50:10 with the Epistle/L4/L6. Give a formulation that can be written in the explanation even if the relationship between the maps is undecided. Do not search again for whether there is a source for animal–fire; it has already been found. The axis of composition must not be turned into another axis that the author explicitly declared.

[543] Document 0422: IGK20-Finale-R5_Prompt_Grok.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

3. L7 is a precise new target: read only the paragraph on refinements, nourishment from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders, and the sowing analogy relevant to it. What does it add to L1 and to the ability of the lower to give life to the higher? Does the inanimate mentioned in it help explain that the chain in the Epistle is illustrative rather than exhaustive? Do not infer from it a demonstrated reason for the omission,

and do not identify Sag with the returning light of the kav. 4. Finish S07–S18 without multiplying tasks: grain and meat, two proofs of "from both," the detail of wheat, the parental wording, the syntax of returning light and the abbreviation. Preserve the distinction between general refinement and intentional service. On the questions of an ox specifically/doubled parents/wisdom and knowledge, state what the plain meaning already provides and what was not found beyond it. Deliverables: a table of four pairs with degree of evidence; a paragraph on the relationship to Etz Chaim; a continuous explanation from "and from this" to "good reason and knowledge"; a paragraph on what L7 adds and what it does not; a short status for S01–S18. No duplicated forty-row table and no booklet.

File 0423 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Questions and Assumptions to Be Investigated — They Must Not Be Attributed as an Answer by the Model[544]

Your role — IGK20-Finale-R5-Bot: complete witnesses for closing the concluding unit. The compiler did not receive your R4 report; do not claim it was attached. If you have already completed a task, use the existing witness and do not duplicate work.

[544]Document 0423: IGK20-Finale-R5_Prompt_Grok_Bot.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

P1. L6: Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, צו את בני ישראל [Command the Children of Israel], the first discourse, ג§ [3]. Locate a facsimile page with the four pairs and their reasons. Verify section and heading against the verse את קרבני לחמי לאשי [My offering, My bread for My fire-offerings]. This is not Parashat Tzav. Provide printed page/column as visible, and the PDF number separately. If an adjacent page includes א§ [1] on the world that has been refined and the angels with their attributes, attach only the relevant paragraph.

P2. L7: Kuntres Acharon להבין מ"ש בפע"ח, [4] ד [To Understand What Is Written in Pri Etz Chaim]. A facsimile of the paragraph ועוד זאת שבאמת הבירורין [And furthermore, this: that in truth, the refinements] and of the continuation about drawing down through mitzvot. The Wikisource text and integrated explanation on Chabad opened for the compiler. Separate the Alter Rebbe's wording from the commentary. Compare the Sag/forehead sentence with L3 ב§ [2]'s reference. The comparison can identify content; it does not prove who wrote the reference or the scope of the name אג"ה [Iggeret HaKodesh] in the edition.

P3. Limited additions remaining from R4 only if not done: an L1 facsimile containing the two meat/grain proofs themselves (not only the opening on יג [13]); an L4 facsimile, א§§ [1] and ד [4]; correspondence of heading 76 in the Emor facsimile to the citation לח ג [38c]. State what already exists, what you have now seen and what was not obtained. There is no need to bring five whole discourses afresh.

P4. Zohar location: paragraph 537 and line 2 at 241a, versus summary 540 and line 14 — if already verified, reference to an existing witness is sufficient. Do not write that the quotation passage itself is on 240b because the context begins there. Note 61 in Hebrew is a secondary target; do not wait for it to correct the subject already verified in English.

Deliverables: REPORT_HE, SOURCE_LEDGER, SOURCE_READER, LOCATIONS, GAPS and EVIDENCE. Save a new folder and do not overwrite earlier ones. An accessible report even without files.

A small ZIP with focused witnesses, not enormous books. No manuscript research for attribution of the reference, no Piena, and no “Thus far” dossier. No invented reference; a gap that does not change the explanation stays in the ledger.

File 0503 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 5

Report or witness from the history of the research[545]

> And furthermore, this: that in truth the refinements in BYA, from the 288, through Torah and mitzvot in thought, speech and action, are higher in their root than the nefesh, ruach and neshamah in the human being, for they are from Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon; and the nefesh, ruach and neshamah that have already been rectified through Mah — it issues from the forehead as a mere radiance. This is what is written, “before a king reigned,” etc. This is the reason the human being lives on foods of the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders and refines them through the Mah within him, and lives through them, for they are from Sag. And furthermore, this: as it is written, “My face shall not be seen,” for the inner dimension of the higher cannot descend below, only its outer dimension and the aspect of its back-aspect, which is the fallen remnant of supernal Chochmah. And furthermore, this: speech consisting of words of supernal Chochmah does not beget, while the drop drawn from the vessel of supernal Chochmah contains the power to beget

[545] Document 0503: KA4_Admur_body_excerpt_birurim.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

and bring something into being from nothing, and a drawing down of supernal Chochmah is also included in it. The reason is that the nature and essence of supernal Chochmah are drawn into it. Unlike speech and thought, and even the intellect's conceiving of some wisdom: this wisdom is only a radiance extending from the nature of the intellect in the soul and its essence, and this radiance is only a garment for the nature and essence of the intellect, while the intellect is a radiance and garment for the nature of the soul. Unlike the drop, into which something of the nature and essence of the soul vested in the mochin is also drawn; it therefore begets something truly like itself. This is the difference between the service of the angels, which issue from kisses, and the souls, which issue from the kelim. But the kelim of Atzilut became a neshamah for BYA; therefore intellectual awe and love are like the angels of kisses, from the radiance of the outer dimension of Chochmah, Binah and Daat in BYA. The reason is that the inner dimension of Chochmah, Binah and Daat and the nature and essence of the inner light cannot be revealed except specifically through the radiance of the kelim that descend below, like the human drop from the mochin, and as it is written, "My face shall not be seen." And apart from all this, even in a neshamah of Atzilut, although it is from the kelim of Atzilut, and likewise in nefesh and ruach from the kelim of Yetzirah and Asiyah, their intellectual love [perhaps it should read awe and love] also arouses in the kelim of Yetzirah and Asiyah an aspect of elevation from below upward through an awakening from below, and this is an aspect of withdrawal alone, Heaven forbid. But drawing down from above to below is specifically through practical mitzvot, to draw light into kelim, and specifically into the outer dimen-

sion of the kelim, for the outer dimension of the higher descends below and the inner dimension of the lower ascends above. This is what is written in the Zohar, Parashat Pekudei, mentioned above, "there is an order," etc. Both serve a higher need: elevation and drawing down through raising mayin nukvin from Sag in the aspect of action and speech. This is the purpose of hishtalshelut: that higher light be revealed below, not that the lower ascend above, for that is only temporary; and even this — specifically the ascent of the kelim to higher lights — is the excellence of Shabbat

and Yom Kippur. But not the ascent and withdrawal of the lights, Heaven forbid, as written in Pri Etz Chaim. The human being's nefesh, ruach and neshamah in relation to his body in this world are regarded as lights in relation to kelim, and likewise intellectual awe and love in relation specifically to practical mitzvot. Therefore Moses our teacher, peace be upon him, prayed prayers corresponding numerically to ואתחנן [Vaetchanan, "and I pleaded"] for the fulfillment specifically of practical mitzvot; the same applies to physical speech concerning their laws. But to understand how the etrog, which is from the 288 that have not yet been refined, and likewise the parchment of the tefillin, draws light into the kelim of Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Atzilut, which have already been refined and rectified through the name Mah to be an aspect of Divinity: the analogy for this is sowing and planting, in which the seed arouses the vegetative power in the earth, which is G-d's word, "let the earth bring forth vegetation," etc., "a fruit tree," etc., through raising mayin nukvin to its root. Likewise, the parchment and the etrog arouse as far as the highest levels, namely the name Sag

before the breaking, which is the nature and essence of the lights in Adam Kadmon, not a mere radiance like the name Mah from its forehead. Likewise, through studying and examining their laws, one arouses the aspect of Chochmah, Binah and Daat in the ten sefirot of the kelim of Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva, and to the highest levels as well: the aspect of Chochmah, Binah and Daat in Sag of the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon, issuing through the eyes, etc. All the above concerns positive mitzvot, but not in study

Methodology Files and Cross-Cutting Questions

Material clarifying working methods, degrees of evidence, question design and review of answers. The open assignments from the previous edition were examined: findings were transferred to their issues, and operational documentation was transferred to the archive.

The Course of the Research: Claims, Evidence, Criticism and Alternatives

The files are arranged here by research family and round, within the issue. Questions and briefs are marked separately from answers. Ratings such as PASS, SEALED and the like are historical determinations by the file's author; they are not an independent approval by the editor. English passages have been retained in their original wording so that original evidence is not replaced by a conjectural translation. Document IDs permit returning to the archive.

File 0122 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 2

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[6]

2. The Principal Progress and Its Limits — א [1]. The Power of the Essence and Physical Yesh — A Direct Comparative Source Was Found

Claude's reference to the discourse beginning "מצותה משתשקע החמה" [Its Mitzvah Is from Sunset], Zot Chanukah 5738, was now opened and verified. Section ד' [4] states: "And within BYA itself, the principal revelation of the power of the Essence is specifically in the coming into being of the physical yesh." Section ג' [3] discusses the resemblance between the sense of yesh and the true Yesh; notes 36–37 refer to Epistle 20, Biurei HaZohar and Derech Mitzvotecha 129b onward. [S10]

This provides an explicit basis for distinguishing between the power required for creation and its principal expression in the coming into being of physicality. The contradiction is not resolved by claiming that only matter is created through the power of the Essence. Nor is it sufficient any longer to say that the difference is only the purpose of a dwelling in the lower realms or only the intensity of concealment: the source speaks of coming into being itself. Nevertheless, the expression "revelation of the power of the Essence" does not mean that the Essence is felt in bodily consciousness. How coming into being expresses this power, and the precise relationship between the feeling, the resemblance and the Essence — this remains a demand for explanation, not merely a demand for a reference.

[6]Document 0122: 06 — R02 ARCHIVE — Packet. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Status: the target of locating the comparative source has advanced substantially. The additional sources in the discourse's notes were not opened and must not be presented as read. The initial reference is recorded to Claude's credit; direct verification at this stage was carried out by ChatGPT.

File 0576 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 5

Integrated File: Distinguish the Findings from the Follow-Up Brief[36]

Comparative Review File — Iggeret HaKodesh 20 | R05 — Methodology

The independent research was completed before reading the Claude and Grok files. A model's answer is therefore not evidence, and agreement between the models is not verification either. Three snapshots were examined: Claude-R05-A, Claude-R05-B (the updated one), and Grok-R05-red-team. The correctness of the result, discovery of the source, contribution of the correction and independence of the examination must be separated.

Tags: [E] explicit source; [E-secondary] an explanation or explanatory discourse; [E-subresearch] a source examined in subsidiary research; [I] inference; [P] possibility; [U] open.

File 0294 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 10

Report or witness from the history of the research[10]

[36] Document 0576: YA-IGK20-RESHIT-HAYESH-R05-COMPARISON-AUDIT.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[10] Document 0294: 46 — R10 ACTIVE — Extended Questions, Integrated Commentary Plan, Universal Prompt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

R10-BATCH-02 — חכמה [Chochmah], עלמא דאתגליא [the revealed world], מלכות ולידת הנשמות [Malchut and the birth of souls] — Model-lane comparison at R10 opening

- ChatGPT independent lane: B01–B04 completed. It opened the body of Agha"k, Tanya ch.52, Likutei Torah commentary, and Derekh Mitzvotekha (sections ב' [2] and מ"ו [46]). It produced the R10 question clusters and the next universal prompts.
- Claude/Grok ordinary lanes: the same R10 document and universal prompt are ready; no answer is counted until each model opens sources and returns provenance-tagged evidence.
- Grok Bot lane: Drive routing was updated with R10, Q89–Q175, B01–B04, and the next tasks. A new R10 Bot result has not yet been logged in the folder; the last independently recorded Bot result remains the earlier R08 checkpoint. Therefore no "Bot agreement" is being treated as evidence.

R10-BATCH-02 — חכמה [Chochmah], עלמא דאתגליא [the revealed world], מלכות ולידת הנשמות [Malchut and the birth of souls] — R10 post-close comparison with Grok Bot (added before R11)

Grok Bot delivered independent R10 batches after the earlier R10 draft. These are source records, not model evidence.

1. **T12:** Pass confirmed independently in Sha'ar HaKavanot, Sermons on Passover 12:4: «בעתיקא תליא מלתא [the matter depends on Atika]» and «עתיקא קדישא [Atika Kadisha, the Holy Ancient One]» in the Kriyat Yam Suf context. Keep identifier T12; do not mint T22. The passage does not prove the exact phrase «לידת הנשמות [the birth of souls]».
2. **T17–T21:** Grok Bot opened Pri Etz Chaim / Sha'ar HaKavanot / Etz Chaim loci for the calendar and 7/9/12 ibbur models. These strengthen the Ari background but remain [E-primary] for the Ari

and [I] when applied to Aק"הגה כ' [Iggeret HaKodesh 20] unless Aז"הד [the Alter Rebbe] explicitly cites them.

3. **T06:** exact «לידת הנשמות [the birth of souls]» remains not found in the searched Ari corpus. This is a documented negative search, not proof of absence from every print or manuscript.
4. **T16:** Adam/Chava ↔ 7/9 remains open.
5. **Correction to earlier R10 wording:** Grok Bot's proposed T22 is an alias of existing T12, not a new ledger number.

Independent ChatGPT addendum: the body of Aק"הגה כ' [Iggeret HaKodesh 20] continues after the birth paragraph and explicitly describes the kav at the lower end and אור חוזר [returning light] from Malchut («מאיר ממטה למעלה בבחינת אור חוזר [shines from below upward in the aspect of returning light]»). This advances the framework for Q176–Q179, but it does not define the measure of the kav after the souls have «יצאו ונפרדו [issued and separated]» מן הכלים [from the kelim]. Q70 remains open at that narrower point.

R10 is now the locked baseline; all further changes belong to Delta R10→R11.

File 0059 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 13

Report or witness from the history of the research[12]

Quote verification (Sefaria / opens) — T04 — לא נמצא [not found] Moses close-hunt

Kuksik LT/TO/IGK1–32 hunt logs honest; no NEW [E] close — **PASS as absence note**

[12]Document 0059: 92 — R13-GB01∪GB02 QC LOG.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Quote verification (Sefaria / opens) — HOLD Q42 / Q70

GB01 + GB02 + Kuksik independent misses — **לא נמצא [not found]** reinforced; stay **[U]**

File 0304 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 14

Report or witness from the history of the research[90]

GOAL 1 — Net-NEW Ari/Admur primaries on angel↔neshama / NHYM beyond R13-T05–T09 — Hunt method

Live Sefaria ES (המלאכים נשמות [the souls of the angels] / מחיצוניות הכלים [from the outer dimension of the kelim] / הכלים מפנימיות [from the inner dimension of the kelim] / הנשיקין זווג [the union of kisses] / …) → open Admur + Ari loci **outside** sealed EC39/40/50 + SHP Vayera + LT Shmini 2:3.

Forbidden remints: T26; EC 39; EC 40; EC 50.

File 0030 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[92]

194 — R15 FINAL CLOSEOUT QC.md — Hygiene

Rule	Status
Q42 / Q70 stay **[U]**	**complied**
Moses forever-OPEN not closed	**complied**

[90]Document 0304: 96 — R14-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[92]Document 0030: 194 — R15 FINAL CLOSEOUT QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

Rule	Status
TZ-print# residual **[U]**	**complied**
No new T minted by QC	**complied**
R14–R17 sealed floors untouched	**complied**
R17-189 not reopened	**complied**
Prefer **194** (≥194 free)	**complied**

File 0162 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Report or witness from the history of the research[94]

GOAL 1 — Net-NEW Admur/Ari on angel↔neshama / NHYM / Iggeret cluster beyond sealed set — Hunt method

Sefaria search-wrapper POST (נשמות המלאכים [the souls of the angels] / מחיצוניות הכלים [from the outer dimension of the kelim] / מפנימיות הכלים [from the inner dimension of the kelim] / זווג הנשיקין [the union of kisses] / זווג חיצון למלאכים [an outer union for angels] / תרי"ג מלאכים דסלקין [613 angels that ascend] / …) → open Admur + Ari loci **outside** sealed R13–R14 + banned EC39/40/47/50 + T26.

Prior parallel R14A opens (EC15/26/28/43, SHG19) that **did not enter R14 sealed ledger** re-verified and corrected (EC28 angel text = **28:1** not 28:2; EC26 tzelem = **26:1** not 26:2).

IHK20 body from local Sefaria dump (`igk20_plain.txt` / `sefaria_igk20.json`) — related **Iggeret** cluster.

[94] Document 0162: 102 — R15-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0233 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 15

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[15]

1. Iggeret HaKodesh 20 — body (Kehot / Sefaria) — Read method

Sefaria API Hebrew → nikud/HTML stripped plain · LIT apparatus cross-check · Chabad.org unavailable

2. Derekh Mitzvotekha · Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah §46 — Read method

API separate from OCR / hand-read scan (scan not newly hand-read this lane)

3. Shaar HaKavanot Pesach drush 12 vs Pri Etz Chaim Gate Pesach ch.8 — Read method

Sefaria API Hebrew both

File 0014 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[101]

108 — R16-GB01 FULL — Hunt method

1. Sefaria `search-wrapper` POSTs: מחיצוניות הכלים [from the outer dimension of the kelim] / מפנימיות הכלים [from the inner dimension of the kelim] / זווג הנשיקין [the union of kisses] / נשמות המלאכים [the soul-

[15] Document 0233: 192 — R15-GB01 CLOSEOUT SOURCE QC FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[101] Document 0014: 108 — R16-GB01 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

s of the angels] / גופות המלאכים [the bodies of the angels] / לא נתנה תורה למלאכים [the Torah was not given to angels] / זווג חיצון למלאכים [an outer union for angels] / תרי"ג מלאכים [613 angels] / וברוח פיו [and by the breath of His mouth] / … — filtered to Admur/Ari; skip sealed+pending.

2. Direct opens: SRHK 1–20; unused TO/LT parshiyot (Bo, Devarim, Vaetchanan, Shir 25, Matot, Ki Teitzei, Nitzavim, Mishpatim, Tzav, Emor, Pinchas, …); EC 16/40/42; SHH ABYA 2:1; IHK 15/25.
3. Q42/Q70 phrase hunt: נהפך להיות יש [becomes yesh] / נעשה יש נפרד [becomes a separate yesh] / מידת/מדרגת/דרגת הקו [measure/level/degree of the kav] — **לא נמצא [not found]** NEW.
4. Prior GB02 reject-floor respected (PEC Tefillin/Shema/Shabbat, EC41/29, SHP, TES/Sulam, Sources-on-TO).

File 0020 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[102]

116 — R16-GB03 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive MCP: 105/106/109/110/113 + GB01 FULL 108 + GB02 FULL 112.
2. Direct Sefaria `api/texts` — unused EC 17–19/21–24/27/31–34/37–38/46/51; SHH OA/ABYA/Circles (many empty refs); SHG 4/6–9/11–14/16–18/23–25 (many empty); unused TO (Lech/Chayei/Vayishlach/Vayechi/Tetzaveh/Vayakhel/Toldot1+3/Mishpatim2–4/Noach1–3/Vayera2); unused LT (Bechukotai/Chukat/Kedoshim/Shir1–7/9–14/16–19/23–24/Shemini/Shlach); IHK 1/5/10/12/18/22/26/29; PEC Prayer.

[102] Document 0020: 116 — R16-GB03 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

3. Keyword windows: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · עומדים/מהלכים [standing/walking] · לידת הנשמות [the birth of souls] · תהו/תיקון [Tohu/Tikkun] · מקיף/פנימי [encompassing/inner] · רוח פיו [the breath of His mouth] · עלו במחשבה [arose in thought] · זווג [union] · נהפך להיות יש [becomes yesh] · מידת/מדרגת הקו [measure/level of the kav].
4. Q42/Q70 phrase scan across all GB03 opens → **לא נמצא [not found]** (0).

File 0042 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[17]

140 — R16-GB10 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB09 · ledger T01–T43 · CoS seal T46–T47 (corroboration only) · T44 sealed · T45 fold R14 untouched — **T48+ only**.

2. Independent Sefaria sweep: expanded queries + deep-fetch unused EC/SHH/SHG≠19/35/39/18 · SRHK≠1 · SK≠2:3/3:2/3:5–7/4:1 · LT/TO gaps · IGK≠7/8/20 · DMC · Gate Unity · OHT.
3. Stats: **548** candidates · **443** nonempty fetches · **87** angel↔neshama cohits (NEW-lane after exclusion).
4. Se'if verify top shortlist; cross-check prior GB opened-not-proposed.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.
6. Meta-R14 peshat track → **NOT opened** (per CoS steering).

[17] Document 0042: 140 — R16-GB10 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0051 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[227]

124 — R16-GB05 FULL — Hunt method

Sefaria api/texts on unused LT/TO/DMC SMT≠42/EC/SHG/SHH/SRH K/SK; keyword מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · מחצב [source from which something is hewn] · אהוי"ר [love and fear] · מ"ן [mayin nukvin] · מרכבה [Merkavah] · אנשי קדש [men of holiness] · קדוש בוי"ו [kadosh spelled with a vav] · רוחא דו"ק [the spirit of the six extremities]. Q42/Q70 → לא נמצא [not found].

124 — R16-GB05 FULL — Open-log

File 0067 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[105]

112 — R16-GB02 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive MCP: 105/106/109/110/113 + GB01 FULL 108.
2. Direct Sefaria `api/texts` opens (search-wrapper Cloudflare 403 this pass) — 90+ unused TO/LT/EC/SHG/SRHK/PEC/SHK targets.
3. Keyword windows: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · חיצוני+מלאכ [outer + angel stem] · פנימי+נשמ [inner + soul stem] · רוח פיו [the breath of His mouth] · עלו במחשבה [arose in thought] · זווג [union] · מקיף [encompassing].
4. Q42/Q70 phrase scan across all opens → **לא נמצא [not found]**.

[227] Document 0051: 124 — R16-GB05 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[105] Document 0067: 112 — R16-GB02 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0082 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[18]

140 — R16-GB10 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB09 SUMMARY/FULL · ledger 106 (T01–T43 SEALED) · pending T44–T47 — **T48+ only**.
2. Independent Sefaria sweep: expanded queries (34 phrases × filters) + deep-fetch unused EC gates/se'ifs · SHH · SHG≠19/35/39/18 · SRHK≠1 · SK≠2:3/3:2/3:5–7/4:1 · LT/TO gaps · IGK≠7/8/20 · DMC · Gate Unity · PEC/SHK.
3. Stats: **548** candidates · **443** nonempty fetches · **87** angel↔neshama cohits (NEW-lane after exclusion).
4. Se'if verify top shortlist; cross-check against prior GB opened-not-proposed lists.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.
6. OHT Shemot print dump scanned for comparative cohits.

File 0102 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[106]

136 — R16-GB09 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor GB08 + ledger 106; pending T41–T43; steering remap → **T46+ only**; avoid Ki Teitzei 4:4 + TO Bereshit 4:18–22.

[18] Document 0082: 140 — R16-GB10 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[106] Document 0102: 136 — R16-GB09 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

2. Sefaria search-wrapper + deep fetch (~350 refs) · 88 NEW-lane co-hits · se'if verify.
3. Reject remints: Haazinu 4 · Balak 1 · SHG18 · SK 3:5–3:6 · Ki Teitzei 2 · Shir 8/13/17/24/31 · Masei/Matot shared · DMC 44/45 · EC Klalim 13.
4. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.

File 0159 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[110]

119 — R16-GB04 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive MCP: ledger 106 · GB03 SUMMARY/FULL · R16 ACTIVE 105.
2. Direct Sefaria `api/texts` — unused EC 1–14/52–53; EC Shaar HaKlalim 1–12; SHH Circles/OA/ABYA high (many empty); SHG 26–38 (empty); SRHK named variants (empty on Sefaria this pass); unused LT (Behaalotecha/Naso/Emor/Behar/Bechukotai 2–5/Chukat 2–3/Balak 1/Pinchas/Matot 2/Masei/Devarim 2–3/Vaetchanan 4/Eikev 3/Reeh 9/Shoftim/Ki Teitzei 2/Ki Tavo 2/Nitzavim 2/Vayelech/Haazinu 3/VZot 1–4/Shir 34–36/RH/YK/Sukkot/SA/Chanukah/Purim/Tzav 1/Bamidbar 1–5); unused TO (Bereshit 1–2/5–6/8–9/Noach 4/Lech/Vayera/Chayei Sara 2/Toldot 4/Vayetzei/Vayishlach 2/Miketz/Vayigash/Vayechi 2/Shemot 1–3/Vaera/Bo 2/Beshalach/Yitro 1–3/Mishpatim 5/Terumah/Tetzaveh 2/Ki Tisa/Vayakhel 2/Esther); Shaarei Kedusha Part 3; SK 3:1–7.
3. Keyword windows across ~229 nonempty: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · עומדים/מהלכים [standing/walking] · לידת הנשמות [the birth of souls] · תהו/תיקון [Tohu/Tikkun] · רוח פיו [the breath of His mouth] · עלו במחשבה [arose in thought] · מחצב [source from which

[110] Document 0159: 119 — R16-GB04 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

something is hewn] · בורא קדושים [creates holy beings] · נהפך להיות יש [becomes yesh] · מידת/מדרגת הקו [measure/level of the kav].

4. Q42/Q70 phrase scan → **לא נמצא [not found]** (0).
5. Reject remint: T01–T24 floors · Bechukotai 5:2 / Naso 3 (companion to T16/Vayeshev) · Pinchas Michael/Gabriel (T19 family) · EC early/Klalim (no angel↔neshama hit).

File 0200 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[21]

YA-IGK20 R16-GB03 — Net-NEW beyond R13–R15 + R16-T01–T15 CoS holds — Open-log

File 0211 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[116]

130 — R16-GB07 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB06 SUMMARY/FULL · ledger · ACTIVE · R13–R15 sealed locus tables.
2. Independent Sefaria sweep: unused EC · SHH · SHG ≠19/35 · S-RHK ≠1:2 · SK ≠2:3/3:2 · LT/TO unused · IGK ≠7/8/20 · DMC unused.
3. Proximity: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · יום/לילה [day/night] · א"ס/מדה [Ein Sof/measure] · משרתת כשאר המלאכים [serves like the other angels] · מחצב [source from which something is hewn] · מהלכ/

[21] Document 0200: R16_GB03_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[116] Document 0211: 130 — R16-GB07 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

עומד [walking stem/standing] · סולם [ladder] · זווג פנימי/חיצון [inner/outer union].

4. Reject remints/weak: Re’eh7 · Shir31 · EC15/28:1 · Shir17 · SHH · SK3:6 · EC28:4 same-shaar companion.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.

File 0255 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[234]

129 — R16-GB07 FULL — Hunt method

1. Steering: CoS FOUND T35–T37 — retarget T38+ or honest empty.
2. Independent Sefaria fetch ~265 refs (LT/TO unused + SHG + SK + EC + DMC + IHK) → ~203 nonempty; scan angel↔neshama proximity.
3. Deep-verify top cohits; reject remints; quality-gate distinct axes.
4. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]** (false-positive לא יש [not yesh] filtered).
5. Extra corpora (PEC/SHK/SRHK) empty/400 on Sefaria — no mint without text.

File 0270 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[123]

---

[234] Document 0255: 129 — R16-GB07 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[123] Document 0270: R16_GB04_NET_NEW.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

YA-IGK20 R16-GB04 — Net-NEW beyond R13–R15 + R16-T01–T21 CoS remap — Open-log

File 0306 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[126]

127 — R16-GB06 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB05 SUMMARY/FULL · ledger 106 · ACTIVE 105.
2. Independent Sefaria `api/texts` round2 (~142 refs) + SHH all 19 nodes + IGK §§1–6,9–19,21–32 + prior `hunt_gb06/` (~480 fetch).
3. Keyword proximity: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · מחצב [source from which something is hewn] · מהלכ/עומד [walking stem/ standing] · מ"ן [mayin nukvin] · מרכבה [Merkavah] · סולם [ladder] · נקראים מלאכים [are called angels] · התהוות המלאכים והנשמות [the coming into being of the angels and souls] · אנשי קדש [men of holiness] · נהפך להיות יש [becomes yesh] · מדרגת הקו [the level of the kav].
4. Reject remint / weak: Emor1 hasagah · Pinchas camps · Vayakhel2 · SK 3:x מחצב [source from which something is hewn] · DMC34 distant cohit · SHH Introductions transmission · IGK 0 cohit.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.

File 0312 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[128]

[126] Document 0306: 127 — R16-GB06 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[128] Document 0312: 133 — R16-GB08 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

133 — R16-GB08 FULL — Hunt method

1. Independent Sefaria sweep: **632** candidate refs (unused EC gates · SHG ≠19/35/39 · SRHK ≠1:2 · SHH other nodes · SK ≠2:3/3:2 · LT/TO unused · IGK ≠7/8/20 · DMC unused · PEC/SHK print-adj).
2. Proximity scan → **97** angel↔neshama cohits; **93** new-lane; deep-verify top by se'if.
3. Reject remints/weak: Bechukotai 5:2 · Tzav 2:8 לויתן [Leviathan]/Shemini · Emor1 · Shir 8/13/17/24/31 · Yitro 7–8 · EC20:11 · SHG31/38 · SK 3:5/4:1 · DMC 39/44/45 · Nitzavim 1 · Haazinu 4 · Pinchas camps.
4. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]** (false-positive לא יש [not yesh] / generic קו [kav] filtered).

File 0316 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[177]

132 — R16-GB08 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB07 SUMMARY/FULL · ledger · ACTIVE · R13–R15 sealed locus tables.
2. Independent Sefaria sweep: unused LT/TO · EC ≠15/26/28/29/39/40/42/43/47/50 · SHG ≠19/35/39 · SK ≠2:3/3:2 · IGK ≠7/8/20 · DMC unused · PEC.
3. Proximity: מלאכ+נשמ [angel stem + soul stem] · השגתם רק [their apprehension is only] · הוי׳ ראשונה [the first Havayah] · חיות ובהמות [wild and domestic animals] · ירידה צורך עלייה [descent for the sake of ascent] · איה מקום כבודו [where is the place of His glory] · מחצב

[177] Document 0316: 132 — R16-GB08 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[source from which something is hewn] · מהלכ/עומד [walking stem/standing].
4. Reject remints/weak: Shir17 · Bechukotai5 · YomKippur2 · Haazinu4 · EC20:11 · SK3:5–6 · Nitzavim1.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]**.

File 0354 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 16

Report or witness from the history of the research[133]

136 — R16-GB09 FULL — Hunt method

1. Drive floor: GB08 SUMMARY/FULL · CoS T41–T43 · Research Director T44–T45 (no remint).
2. Independent Sefaria search-wrapper + deep fetch: **~350** candidate refs + multi-query angel↔neshama.
3. Proximity scan → **88** NEW-lane cohits; deep se'if verify top by comparative score.
4. Reject remints/weak: Ki Teitzei 4:4 / Bereshit 4:18–22 (Research Director) · Bereshit 8:2 (GB04 log) · Haazinu 4 · Balak 1 · SHG18 · SK 3:5–3:6 · Shir 8/13/17/24/31 · Masei/Matot shared · DMC 44/45 · EC Klalim 13.
5. Q42/Q70 → **לא נמצא [not found]** NEW decisive primary.

File 0007 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[237]

[133] Document 0354: 136 — R16-GB09 FULL.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[237] Document 0007: 186_R17_MISSING_RETRY_M5_M8_M12.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

186 — R17 MISSING-PRIMARIES RETRY — M5 + M8–M12 — Hygiene

Item	Status
Moses NHY″M	**forever-OPEN**
Q42 MICRO	**HOLD [U]**
Q70 kav measure	**HOLD [U]**
Proposed T##	**NONE**
Sealed T01–T33	**do not remint**
Numbers	**186 MD / 187 JSON** (not 180–185)

File 0061 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[239]

172 — R17-GB06 empty QC — Hygiene

Rule	Status
No T34+ minted by QC	**complied**
R17-T01–T33 floors untouched	**complied**
Q42 / Q70 stay **[U]**	**complied**
Moses forever-OPEN not closed	**complied**
Opened-not-proposed ≠ mint	**complied**

File 0080 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[240]

[239]Document 0061: 172 — R17-GB06 empty QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[240]Document 0080: 182 — R17-GB08 empty QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

182 — R17-GB08 empty QC.md — Hygiene

Rule	Status
No T37+ minted by QC	**complied**
R17-T01–T33 floors untouched	**complied**
T34–T36 not reminted / not collided	**complied**
Q42 / Q70 stay **[U]**	**complied**
Moses forever-OPEN not closed	**complied**
Prefer EMPTY over thin remints	**complied**

File 0187 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[145]

188 — R17-GB09 WRAP QC.md — Hygiene

Rule	Status
No T37+ minted by QC	**complied**
R17-T01–T36 floors untouched	**complied**
Q42 / Q70 stay **[U]**	**complied**
Moses forever-OPEN not closed	**complied**
Prefer ZERO new T on wrap	**complied**
Avoid 186/187 (Kuksik M-retry)	**complied** — used **188**

File 0226 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[149]

[145]Document 0187: 188 — R17-GB09 WRAP QC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[149]Document 0226: 178 — R17 MISSING PRIMARIES M1–M14.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

172 — R17 MISSING PRIMARIES INTAKE — M1–M14 — Hygiene

Item	Status
Moses NHY″M	**forever-OPEN**
Q42 MICRO	**HOLD [U]**
Q70 kav measure	**HOLD [U]**
Proposed T##	**NONE**
Sealed T01–T33	**do not remint**

File 0251 · The Beginning of Yesh and the General Rounds · Round 17

Report or witness from the history of the research[26]

165 — R17-H PARALLEL CHASSIDIC LOCI (terms + loci) — Verdict

File 0665 · Focused Studies · Round 1

Combined File: Findings Must Be Distinguished from the Follow-Up Brief[546]

With G-d's help

IGK20-Focused-F1 — All Material for the Round of Detailed Questions

1. First read `01_Independent_Research.md`: the independent research and the status of each question.
2. Send Claude only `02_Claude_F1.txt`. This is a full prompt, including all the questions, the source passage and the research paths.
3. Send Grok only `03_Grok_F1.txt`.

[26] Document 0251: 165 — R17_H_PARALLEL_CHASSIDIC.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

[546] Document 0665: 00_Start_Here.txt. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

4. Send Grok Bot only `04_Grok_Bot_F1.txt`.
5. Send Gemini only `05_Gemini_F1.txt`.
6. Each file stands alone; there is no need to attach a booklet draft, Handoff or previous reviews. It can be uploaded as a text file or copied in full into one message.
7. To preserve the independence of the examination, it is recommended to obtain the answers first without sending them the other models' answers. Then bring all of them back here for comparison.

The prompts were prepared for delivery; they were not sent from here to external conversations, and external Bot documents were not updated.

File 0541 · The Vegetative Power and the Element of Earth · Round 1

Report or witness from the history of the research[406]

IGK20-Earth-R1 — Question Ledger — E40 — Comparison of the Examples

Source: user and expansion.

Preserve the user's difficulty concerning the tiny seed and reproduction, without relying on unverified numbers of sperm cells or yield. What is the relevant criterion for the plain meaning: size, matter, vitality, species, continuity, or the level of the source?

[406] Document 0541: IGK20-Earth-R1_02_Questions.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

File 0366 · The Conclusion of the Epistle · Round 1

Criticism, compilation or interim determination[547]

The Available Research Archive — The Conclusion of Iggeret HaKodesh 20

The archive preserves the initial research, Bot's R1–R5 files, the round briefs, the compiler's assessments, the closure, source witnesses and bilingual editorial materials. The original history is not silently corrected: the governing conclusions are in the question dossiers, the history of the rounds and the correction ledger.

This is not a complete export of the conversation. The Grok and Claude reports supplied in the body of the conversation were used to edit the files and the history of the rounds; they were not received here as complete independent source files.

The beginning of R1 in the conversation is truncated. Reworded material must not be assigned the status of an original response. This information also appears in the study booklet. The readers preserve 27 source pages, from which 96 readable plates were produced: 23 Likkutei Torah pages were divided into four; four Mishnat Chassidim pages were preserved whole.

Reading order: Initial-Deep-Research; Collector-R1 and Bot-R1; followed by R2, R3, R4, R5; Final-Closure; manuscript/rounds.json ; units01_08 through units33_40; registers.json; evaluation.json; sources.json; source_guides.json. The name of an assessment within a file determines the round under discussion, even if the file is in the next round's folder.

The S IDs of the final brief are preserved in questions_he.json. In some early Bot files, the same numbers denote a different division; do

[547] Document 0366: 00-ARCHIVE-README.md. The complete source is preserved in the Records archive; its passages are integrated by topic.

not merge rows by number without reading the content. A01–A18 and N are preserved in the ledger; they are not a quota of new questions to research afresh.

Available-Research-Unified.txt combines the available files for continuous reading. It does not replace the source files and facsimiles. JSON text in the editorial section is organized content in two languages, not an original conversation. The photographed witnesses remain in Hebrew in the English package as well; the analysis and translations of key paragraphs are provided in both languages.

Comparative Research: Coverage Map and Case Studies

Two different levels of comparison are required here. The coverage map below encompasses the passages integrated into the edition; the qualitative analysis that follows includes 32 labelled case studies and another 18 cases added in the expansion. A passage count is not a quality score: a long document may contain an error, and a short file may correct it. There is no uniform database for a controlled experiment among all models in all rounds.

Issue	Questions and briefs	Criticism and compilation	Reports and testimony	Combined files
1 · Unity of the Lights and Kelim: The Question from Which Everything Begins	0	2	81	1
2 · Cause and Effect, Moses' Apprehension and the Appearance of Physicality	0	47	294	6
3 · Nullification and Yeshut: What Is Separate, and from Whose Point of View?	0	1	3	0

Issue	Questions and briefs	Criticism and compilation	Reports and testimony	Combined files
4 · The Beginning of Yesh and the Thirty Kelim of Malchut	0	112	78	2
5 · Yesh in Atzilut: Palaces and Angelic Bodies	0	38	12	0
6 · Souls, Kisses and Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva: Source, Manner and Product	10	34	399	9
7 · The First Tzaddikim, Adam the First Man, and the Almin in Gulgulta	0	54	201	8
8 · He Alone: The Power of Creation, the Kav and the Kelim	0	10	205	3

Issue	Questions and briefs	Criticism and compilation	Reports and testimony	Combined files
9 · Malchut and Letters: Unity of the Source and Multiplicity of Created Beings	0	1	31	2
10 · Gestation and Birth: What Is Revealed on Emergence into Creation?	0	13	463	2
11 · Torah and Mitzvot: Root, Action and Purpose	0	2	82	0
12 · Unions of BYA: The Positive Evidence and the Unresolved Difficulty	4	25	26	5
13 · The Parsa and "Just as in Atzilut Itself"	0	22	94	4
14 · The Two Descriptions of the Kav and Three Degrees of Radiance	0	7	38	8

Issue	Questions and briefs	Criticism and compilation	Reports and testimony	Combined files
15 · Sovev, the Kav and the Power to Bring into Being and Give Life	1	6	59	7
16 · The Earth That Produces Growth and the Power of Bringing into Being	13	48	95	19
17 · The End of the Kav, Returning Light and the Order of Vesting	2	8	58	0
18 · Sowing, Water, Raising Mayin Nukvin and the Purpose of Man	6	18	51	2
19 · Food and Knowledge: The Higher Receiving from the Lower	24	38	202	3
20 · The Sacrifice, the Mitzvot and Revelation of the Light Below	23	61	287	0

Issue	Questions and briefs	Criticism and compilation	Reports and testimony	Combined files
Methodology files	0	6	30	2
Open assignment	0	0	0	0

What Does the Overall Picture Teach?

The research contribution becomes clear in the transition between roles: proposing an interpretation, locating a source, checking wording, criticism, and a limited determination. A role must not be permanently identified with a model's name. The file that proposed a good distinction may fail at a reference; the file that found a source

may expand its meaning beyond what is written. The recommended method of work is therefore assessed by actions that can be checked, not by general trust in a brand.

An important cross-cutting check is to distinguish correction of a location from determination of meaning: changing a location in Tikkunei Zohar does not by itself decide the question of souls; finding the wording of the four aspects does not resolve every relationship between raising mayin nukvin and drawing down; correcting a claim that no parsa is present does not remove the need to interpret its role. These lessons recur in different parts of the book.

New Comparative Research: What the Book Teaches about Working with the Models

The Research Question and the Unit Examined

The question is not which model is “the smartest” in general. It is which actions contributed to clarifying the Epistle, where outputs required criticism, and how work can be divided so that strengths combine and errors are discovered. For this purpose, a new comparative reading of case studies across the book was conducted here. The old scores from the concluding dossier were not copied into the new calculation.

The sample includes 32 purposively selected case studies: the beginning of yesh, palaces and souls, kav and parsa, unions of BYA, gestation, earth and growth, food, Zohar and mitzvot. This is not a random sample of every sentence in the archive, nor a measurement of an overall error rate. Points were selected where a development that could be checked had been preserved:

a proposal, criticism, a new witness or a changed conclusion. In the opening chapters, where there is insufficient detailed attribution, credit is not assigned to a model on the basis of content alone.

Some of the evidence is a preserved original report; some is a summary or criticism by the compiler of a response supplied in conversation. The type of evidence is specified. Absence of a report is not a model's failure. In particular, there is no uniform basis for numerically evaluating Gemini in the track under discussion, and a score must not be manufactured for it from a brief prepared for it.

Twenty Metrics and the Scoring Method

Every score refers to a particular role within a documented case. The scale is 1–5: 1 — a substantive failure in the claim examined; 2 — a substantive problem that limited the output; 3 — a mixed contribution, with progress and a significant gap; 4 — a useful action, reasoned within its limits; 5 — a decisive and explicit contribution in that case. This is reasoned editorial coding, not a datum measured in a blinded experiment or a statistical test. An error and its correction receive separate metrics, so a successful correction does not erase the initial error.

For each metric, the scores are averaged across cases with documentation for that role. The number of cases is shown in parentheses. A metric without documentation is marked with a dash; it does not receive zero. The summary mean gives equal weight to the covered metrics, rather than a weight derived from how often a model's name occurs in the archive. The number of covered metrics is also shown. Because roles and documentation differ, the mean must not be read as a victory table among base models.

Metric	Grok	Claude	Grok Bot	Compiler*
Content accuracy	2.0 (1)	2.3 (3)	5.0 (1)	3.0 (2)

Metric	Grok	Claude	Grok Bot	Compiler*
Attribution to the author	5.0 (1)	1.7 (3)	—	4.2 (5)
Reading the context	3.3 (3)	3.0 (2)	4.0 (3)	4.4 (7)
Bibliographic location	—	2.0 (2)	4.3 (6)	3.3 (3)
Distinguishing types of witnesses	—	—	4.6 (5)	5.0 (2)

Metric	Grok	Claude	Grok Bot	Compiler*
Degree of certainty	4.0 (3)	2.0 (6)	4.0 (1)	4.1 (8)
Validity of inference	2.0 (1)	2.2 (6)	—	4.2 (9)
Conceptual distinctions	3.2 (4)	3.0 (5)	—	4.2 (8)
Source discovery	4.0 (1)	—	4.6 (8)	4.0 (2)
Correcting the question	—	3.0 (2)	—	4.3 (7)
Considering alternatives	4.0 (3)	4.0 (1)	4.0 (1)	4.0 (3)
Counter-test	4.0 (1)	—	—	4.2 (14)
Self-correction	4.0 (3)	4.4 (7)	—	4.5 (4)
Response to criticism	4.0 (2)	4.1 (8)	—	4.0 (1)
Preserving a correction	4.0 (1)	—	4.0 (1)	4.0 (7)
Continuity of mapping	—	—	1.0 (1)	4.3 (3)
Clarity of explanation	4.0 (4)	3.0 (1)	—	4.0 (4)
Connecting issues	4.0 (2)	3.0 (2)	—	4.2 (11)
Focus of the work	—	—	5.0 (1)	4.2 (4)
Reproducibility	—	—	4.4 (10)	4.0 (4)
Mean; coverage	3.68; 14/20	2.90; 13/20	4.09; 11/20	4.12; 20/20

The compiler's evaluation is a self-assessment of the editorial and critical role. It must not be treated as an independent external score. The number in parentheses is the number of case studies contributing to the cell, not the total number of runs.

Data on time, cost, number of attempts, tool load and exact model version were not preserved uniformly. They are therefore not included in the score. Savings in work are also evaluated here only through task focus, not through unmeasured time.

1. Content Accuracy

Does the claim about the source's content withstand the documented examination? Relevant case studies: M01, M06, M12, M20, M25.

2. Attribution to the Author

Is the author's wording distinguished from later interpretation and a model's formulation? Relevant case studies: M02, M11, M15, M27, M29.

3. Reading the Context

Were the subject, continuation and qualifications read, rather than only a suitable sentence? Relevant case studies: M02, M04, M06, M10, M11, M14, M15, M18, M21, M22, M25, M28, M31.

4. Bibliographic Location

Are the book, chapter, folio and column properly identified? Relevant case studies: M06, M10, M12, M16, M18, M20, M26, M27, M28.

5. Distinguishing Types of Witnesses

Are print facsimile, transcription, screenshot and report named for what they are? Relevant case studies: M10, M16, M26, M28, M29.

6. Degree of Certainty

Does confidence in the conclusion match the evidence preserved? Relevant case studies: M06, M08, M11, M14, M15, M16, M17, M22, M24, M25, M26, M29, M32.

7. Validity of Inference

Is the transition from the datum to the conclusion valid, without assuming what is to be proved? Relevant case studies: M03, M05, M08, M09, M13, M14, M16, M17, M21, M22, M23, M29, M31.

8. Conceptual Distinctions

Are source and recipient, root and product, status and role preserved? Relevant case studies: M01, M03, M07, M09, M10, M13, M23, M27, M28, M30, M31.

9. Source Discovery

Was a located source added that actually changed the investigation? Relevant case studies: M10, M14, M15, M16, M18, M21, M24, M26, M27, M29, M31.

10. Correcting the Question

Was the assumption behind the difficulty examined as well as the answer to it? Relevant case studies: M01, M03, M05, M08, M18, M20, M23.

11. Considering Alternatives

Are different possibilities preserved without forced merging? Relevant case studies: M07, M14, M17, M22, M25, M32.

12. Counter-Test

Was evidence examined that might limit or refute the proposal? Relevant case studies: M02, M04, M05, M06, M09, M10, M13, M14, M15, M17, M21, M22, M25, M30, M31.

13. Self-Correction

Was a previous error corrected explicitly and to the proper extent? Relevant case studies: M01, M04, M08, M09, M11, M12, M13, M18, M21, M25, M29, M30.

14. Response to Criticism

Did the criticism change a claim or examination, not only the style of the summary? Relevant case studies: M01, M02, M04, M08, M09, M11, M13, M21, M25, M30.

15. Preserving a Correction

Was the correction maintained at the later documented stage? Relevant case studies: M02, M04, M08, M11, M12, M13, M19, M25, M28.

16. Continuity of Mapping

Were IDs, designations and question statuses preserved without silent substitution? Relevant case studies: M19, M28, M32.

17. Clarity of Explanation

Does the reader receive an explanation of the difficulty and the decisive transition? Relevant case studies: M05, M07, M14, M17, M23, M24, M27, M30.

18. Connecting Issues

Do parallels and the Epistle's sequence connect without forcing identity? Relevant case studies: M01, M03, M07, M10, M18, M21, M24, M26, M27, M28, M29, M30.

19. Focus of the Work

Is the follow-up task directed at a missing link capable of changing a conclusion? Relevant case studies: M08, M13, M26, M32.

20. Reproducibility

Does a path remain from the conclusion to the text, witness or report? Relevant case studies: M10, M15, M16, M18, M19, M21, M25, M26, M27, M28, M29, M31.

The Case Studies and the Reasons for the Evaluation

M01 — Source Kelim versus Receiving Kelim

Location in the book: chapter 4. **Evidence trail:** C02; the Beginning of Yesh files R01–R04; document 0345. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The summary of the Beginning of Yesh dossier preserves Claude's correction of its own statement: the local receiving keli in BYA is created, while the source keli of Atzilut vested in it does not thereby become created. The compiler also corrected the heading "three layers" so that source and role would not be counted as two entities.

Lesson for the work: an answer that seems contradictory may concern two different subjects. Request a table of "who vests in whom" before constructing a diagram. Self-correction is an achievement separate from the error that required it.

New coding: Claude: content accuracy 3, conceptual distinctions 4, self-correction 5, response to criticism 4; compiler: conceptual distinctions 4, correcting the question 4, self-correction 4, connecting issues 4.

M02 — The Word That Was Not in the Quotation

Location in the book: chapter 4. **Evidence trail:** C03; R04 history. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Grok's criticism of the addition of "created" to a quotation from Etz Chaim was accepted. The conclusion about the local kelim was not cancelled, because it is supported by the Epistle; the way it had been presented as a quotation was corrected.

Lesson for the work: examine separately whether the content is correct and whether the author actually said the words attributed to him. Criticism of attribution does not always require changing the conceptual conclusion.

New coding: Grok: attribution to the author 5, reading the context 4, counter-test 4; compiler: attribution to the author 4, response to criticism 4, preserving a correction 4.

M03 — General and Local Mapping of Nefesh, Ruach and Neshamah

Location in the book: chapter 4. **Evidence trail:** C03; documents 0348 and 0345. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The research distinguished the general mapping Beriah–neshamah, Yetzirah–ruach, Asiyah–nefesh from the role of neshamah in each world. The number of kelim does not alone identify the partzuf: the assumption that ל' [30] proves Malchut and כ"ז [27] proves Ze'ir Anpin was withdrawn.

Lesson for the work: every table must state its criterion. The same designation may be correct in two different maps; rows cannot be compared without preserving the context.

New coding: compiler: validity of inference 4, conceptual distinctions 5, correcting the question 4, connecting issues 4.

M04 — חנה אריאל [Chana Ariel]: A Correct Sentence in Another Context

Location in the book: chapter 2. **Evidence trail:** chapter 2, the research case "A correct concept transferred to an incorrect context." **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

A sentence denying the seeing of a sefirah's keli was initially applied to Moses. Reading the sequence returned it to the preceding unit, which concerns Chochmah and the soul's drawing sustenance. Grok withdrew the application, and Claude accepted the correction; the other parallels were retained.

Lesson for the work: it is useful to ask each model to identify not only a sentence, but also the subject of the paragraph before and after it. Correcting scope should remove the excess evidence without automatically erasing the entire source.

New coding: Grok: reading the context 2, self-correction 4, response to criticism 4; Claude: response to criticism 4; compiler: reading the context 4, counter-test 4, preserving a correction 4.

M05 — A Palace Is Not a Large Vessel in Space

Location in the book: chapter 5. **Evidence trail:** C04; document 0348, palaces and encompassing lights. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The proposal to explain a palace as a large vessel capable of containing encompassing light was rejected. The image did not demonstrate the meaning of vesting, and the precedence of palaces in the list did not demonstrate a ranking of yeshut.

Lesson for the work: A concrete example requires examination separate from the claim. Criticism must ask which relationship it illustrates and which property it added without a source.

New coding: compiler: validity of inference 4, correcting the question 4, counter-test 4, clarity of explanation 4.

M06 — The Almin and the Context in the Idrot

Location in the book: chapter 7. **Evidence trail:** C07; document 0348, correction of the almin source. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

A correction proposed by Claude regarding the source of the almin was not accepted as presented. The examination distinguished between locations in the Idrot, between Arich and Ze'ir, and between numbers that do not belong to the same system.

Lesson for the work: When a source has been "corrected," the new source must be checked with the same rigor. Replacing an incorrect reference with a nearby reference does not complete the investigation.

New coding: Claude: content accuracy 2, bibliographic location 2, degree of certainty 2; compiler: reading the context 4, bibliographic location 4, counter-test 4.

M07 — Kisses and Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva Are Not Classifications of the Same Kind

Location in the book: chapter 6. **Evidence trail:** C05; document 0252, research on unions. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Comparison in the Ari's sources prevented generalizing the "kisses–angels, Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva–human" table into an exclusive rule. The research distinguished the manner of union, the participants and the product, and preserved the need to examine beginning and completion.

Lesson for the work: Before comparing models, it is useful to ask them to define what each column classifies. Agreement on a table is unhelpful if its columns mix different logical types.

New coding: compiler: conceptual distinctions 4, considering alternatives 4, connecting issues 4, clarity of explanation 4.

M08 — Q70: The Assumption about the Pronoun Changed

Location in the book: chapter 8. **Evidence trail:** documents 0018 and 0178; C08. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

In F4, "their nefesh, ruach and neshamah" was presented as though its attribution to souls had already been decided. The criticism pointed to an explicit explanation concerning the sefirot. Claude accepted the correction to its assumption, and the compiler also corrected the brief it had written. Denial of the power of creation was retained, but the nature of "a likeness of Divinity" was not declared resolved.

Lesson for the work: The question itself must remain open to correction. Do not repeatedly ask models to reconcile a contradiction whose textual assumption has fallen.

New coding: Claude: validity of inference 2, correcting the question 4, self-correction 4, response to criticism 4; compiler: degree of certainty 3, correcting the question 5, self-correction 5, preserving a correction 4, focus of the work 4.

M09 — Renaming the Alternative Did Not Resolve the Logic

Location in the book: chapter 14. **Evidence trail:** documents 0018 and 0178, the three radiances. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Claude called a new reading a "change of subject," although in practice it attributed two determinations to the same recipient and required a change in the meaning of "created." In the next review, it acknowledged that dependence. Transferring the radiance's status to the recipient still required qualification.

Lesson for the work: Ask every proposal to list the sentence's subject and the meaning of its terms. Changing a heading does not change the structure of the argument.

New coding: Claude: validity of inference 2, conceptual distinctions 3, self-correction 4, response to criticism 4; compiler: validity of inference 5, conceptual distinctions 4, counter-test 4.

M10 — The תרס"ו [5666] Facsimiles and the Distinction in Revelation

Location in the book: chapter 13. **Evidence trail:** document 0018, section 3; document 0178. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Grok Bot's package enabled the compiler to read the facsimiles of כא [21] and תכד [424] directly. Printed numbers were separated from the PDF numbers supplied in the report. Grok integrated the distinction

between the radiance in the kelim and its revelation in created beings.

Lesson for the work: Roles can be divided: a witness locator supplies a facsimile and location, a researcher interprets, and a critic rereads the witness. Do not count the three actions as though they were all performed by the same participant.

New coding: Grok Bot: bibliographic location 4, distinguishing types of witnesses 4, source discovery 5, reproducibility 5; Grok: reading the context 4, conceptual distinctions 4, connecting issues 4; compiler: distinguishing types of witnesses 5, counter-test 4, reproducibility 4.

M11 — תער"ב [5672]: A Composite Quotation and Its Retraction

Location in the book: chapter 13. **Evidence trail:** documents 0178 and 0221; C15. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Claude retracted three formulations it had previously presented as quotations, calling them a combination or paraphrase. Later, a particular exact wording was found, without retroactively verifying the entire composite. The scope of the comparison between Atzilut and passage through the parsa was also narrowed.

Lesson for the work: It is recommended to require separate columns for source wording and explanation. When part of the wording is verified, preserve the limit of verification rather than reinstating the entire old sentence.

New coding: Claude: attribution to the author 2, degree of certainty 2, self-correction 5, response to criticism 4; compiler: attribution to the author 4, reading the context 4, preserving a correction 4.

M12 — The Compiler Miscalculated the Year

Location in the book: chapter 13. **Evidence trail:** documents 0178 and 0221; C15. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The compiler initially claimed that two ways of designating the same year were not identical. It later corrected this explicitly: העת"ר [5675] and תרע"ה [5675] use the same letters and the same sum. The error does not disappear because the compiler is the critic.

Lesson for the work: Criticism of a researcher also needs checking. The editor must maintain its own correction ledger and give it the same status it demands from others.

New coding: compiler: content accuracy 2, bibliographic location 2, self-correction 5, preserving a correction 4.

M13 — A Local Source versus a Source That Feeds the Local One

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** documents 0178 and 0663. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

At an early stage, Grok did not find a positive link for the local union and referred to a drawing down originating in Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Atzilut. It later maintained the distinction. The review of Claude F8 again corrected the use of the higher union or the union of local Abba and Imma as evidence for Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Asiyah.

Lesson for the work: The question "who acts?" comes before "to whom does the action reach?" Asking for the world's name and the participants in every piece of evidence is more useful than adding more general quotations.

New coding: Grok: conceptual distinctions 3, self-correction 4, preserving a correction 4; Claude: validity of inference 2, conceptual

distinctions 2, response to criticism 4; compiler: conceptual distinctions 5, counter-test 4, focus of the work 4.

M14 — Relative Completeness Is Not Begetting in Every State

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** documents 0663 and 0619. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

An anchor for Grok's approach concerning relative levels was found in Etz Chaim ג ג [3:3]. The criticism preserved the achievement and limited its application: the sentence about the completeness of partzufim is not a determination that every Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva in every world is always in a state of begetting.

Lesson for the work: A new source can strengthen a principle while leaving the application open. It is useful to ask the model to formulate separately the principle demonstrated and the case it seeks to explain through it.

New coding: Grok: source discovery 4, considering alternatives 4, degree of certainty 4, clarity of explanation 4; compiler: reading the context 4, validity of inference 4, counter-test 4.

M15 — A Later Explanation Presented as the Epistle's Wording

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** document 0619; C17. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Claude brought a sentence about souls in Asiyah as evidence from the body of Epistle ט"ו [15]. The criticism identified it as Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchak Frank's "תניא לעם" [Tanya for the People] explanation. The reference in Shiurim to Etz Chaim מז ב [47:2] was retained as evidence for vesting, without presenting it as a solution for chapters ג–ה [3–5].

Lesson for the work: On pages where source and explanation are integrated, check the typographic boundary and the speaker's identity.

A “Tanya” heading above a page does not turn every sentence on it into the Alter Rebbe’s wording.

New coding: Claude: attribution to the author 1, reading the context 2, degree of certainty 2; compiler: attribution to the author 5, reading the context 5, source discovery 4, counter-test 5, reproducibility 4.

M16 — Nahar Shalom: Ze’ir Anpin and Nukva in the Facsimile, Abba and Imma in the Transcription

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** document 0663; C17. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Bot’s package enabled verification of the reading זו”ן [Ze’ir Anpin and Nukva] in print where the online transcription reads או”א [Abba and Imma]. The compiler preserved this as a difference between the two witnesses examined, without declaring a disagreement between editions that had not been compared.

Lesson for the work: When a word changes the identity of the agents, a source facsimile is a high-value task. Distinguish correcting a transcription from investigating textual history.

New coding: Grok Bot: bibliographic location 5, distinguishing types of witnesses 5, source discovery 5, reproducibility 5; compiler: distinguishing types of witnesses 5, degree of certainty 5, validity of inference 4, reproducibility 4.

M17 — Nefesh and Neshamah: An Unproved Alternative

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** documents 0663 and 0619; C13. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The distinction “nefesh is not neshamah” was insufficient to resolve the difficulty: Gate מ [40] includes the nefashot of Asiyah within the

description of the products of the inner union. Grok generally maintained the proposal's limit; some of Claude's summaries presented a firmer correspondence than the qualification in the body.

Lesson for the work: Compare the concluding sentence with the paragraph of qualification. If the conclusion is more certain than the evidence, correct it even when the discussion itself is rich.

New coding: Grok: degree of certainty 4, considering alternatives 4, clarity of explanation 4; Claude: degree of certainty 2, validity of inference 3, clarity of explanation 3; compiler: degree of certainty 4, considering alternatives 4, counter-test 4.

M18 — Derech Mitzvotecha מו [46]: The Opening Is Not the Entire Chapter

Location in the book: chapter 10. **Evidence trail:** C22; document 0039. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

An early report focused on Tohu and Tikkun and missed the later discussions of the drop, the months of gestation and the growth of souls. The later examination expanded the parallel. A Bot report preserved an explicit location for section מו [46] and the relevant expressions.

Lesson for the work: Before a negative conclusion, state how much of the source was read. A heading or opening does not establish the absence of a topic from an entire chapter.

New coding: Grok Bot: reading the context 4, bibliographic location 4, source discovery 4, reproducibility 4; compiler: correcting the question 4, self-correction 4, connecting issues 4.

M19 — Bot Changed the Mapping of the Earth Questions

Location in the book: chapter 16. **Evidence trail:** document 0548, the correction table. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Bot reassigned numbers E01–E41 to other topics. The compiler retained the report as a historical witness, but prevented merging statuses by number alone and returned the comparison to the content of the question.

Lesson for the work: An ID is part of the evidence about the process. In long tables, restore the question's wording beside the ID as well, and check correspondence before combining answers.

New coding: Grok Bot: continuity of mapping 1; compiler: continuity of mapping 5, reproducibility 4, preserving a correction 4.

M20 — Chapter לח [38], Not מח [48]; "כוח ועוז" [Power and Strength], Not "כוח וגבורה" [Power and Might]

Location in the book: chapter 16. **Evidence trail:** document 0548, corrections to Claude's report. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Two formulations in Claude's report required correction: the location of the sentence about the vegetative power in chapter לח [38], and the phrase "כח ועוז" [power and strength] instead of the altered wording on which a question had been built. The compiler returned the examination to the working text.

Lesson for the work: Before constructing a question about a difference in wording, check that the difference exists. A sharp question built on an incorrect quotation is not research progress.

New coding: Claude: content accuracy 2, bibliographic location 2, correcting the question 2; compiler: content accuracy 4, bibliographic location 4, correcting the question 5.

M21 — The Vegetative Power and the Mazal Are Not Alternatives

Location in the book: chapter 16. **Evidence trail:** documents 0561 and 0568. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

A Pinchas facsimile advanced by Bot made it possible to read a sentence connecting the vegetative power with the mazal. The claim of contradiction between the attributions of growth was withdrawn. Who determines every detail of species and fruit remained undecided.

Lesson for the work: A source connecting two factors can refute the assumption that they are alternatives, without giving a full mapping of all their roles. This is a focused correction whose limits must be preserved.

New coding: Grok Bot: source discovery 5, reproducibility 4; Claude: validity of inference 2, self-correction 4, response to criticism 4; compiler: reading the context 5, validity of inference 4, counter-test 5, connecting issues 4.

M22 — Mayin Nukvin before and after Germination

Location in the book: chapter 18. **Evidence trail:** document 0561, section 2; facsimile 0587. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Claude proposed dividing the application of mayin nukvin into two botanical stages. Reading Or HaTorah קצו [196] in sequence did not confirm that the division is explicit. The source also describes rain

and an imparting source and recipient, so the proposal was retained as a limited possible correspondence.

Lesson for the work: A natural analogy may function in several relationships. Ask the critic to check whether the proposed temporal stages were actually stated or were added for the sake of reconciliation.

New coding: Claude: considering alternatives 4, degree of certainty 2, validity of inference 2; compiler: reading the context 5, degree of certainty 4, considering alternatives 4, counter-test 5.

M23 — The Destination of the Radiance Is Not an Earlier Stop on the Route

Location in the book: chapter 17. **Evidence trail:** document 0548, E23; document 0568. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Grok's map placed the destination of the radiance before the order of vesting, then reached it again. The criticism distinguished presentation of the destination from detailing the order, and prevented a double route from being presented as explicit.

Lesson for the work: In a diagram, mark whether an arrow indicates causal order, order of vesting or order of explanation. Repetition in the text is not necessarily repetition of the action.

New coding: Grok: validity of inference 2, conceptual distinctions 2, clarity of explanation 3; compiler: validity of inference 5, conceptual distinctions 4, correcting the question 4.

M24 — The Purpose of Man and Drawing Down in the Higher Realms

Location in the book: chapter 18. **Evidence trail:** documents 0561 and 0568; C20. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The research combined Tanya לו–לז ,[41] מא [36–37], Likkutei Torah and Or HaTorah to distinguish the scope of the action of service from its purpose in the lower realms. This substantive correspondence was not presented as a demonstrated identification of "במ"א" [elsewhere].

Lesson for the work: A positive synthesis can be built without declaring a reference deciphered. Separate the two kinds of achievement in the conclusion.

New coding: compiler: degree of certainty 4, source discovery 4, clarity of explanation 4, connecting issues 5.

M25 — Etz Chaim Does Not Confirm the Same Pairs

Location in the book: chapter 19. **Evidence trail:** document 0379; S02. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The table of pairs recorded a mismatch between animal–fire and speaking–air in the Epistle and Etz Chaim 50:10. Bot's report retained both mappings. The concluding dossier documents Grok's correction of the earlier attribution of confirmation.

Lesson for the work: When a source does not fit, do not silently correct it. Preserve the mismatch and separately seek the positive basis for the Epistle's map.

New coding: Grok: content accuracy 2, self-correction 4, response to criticism 4; Grok Bot: content accuracy 5, reading the context 4, considering alternatives 4, reproducibility 4; compiler: degree of certainty 4, counter-test 4, preserving a correction 4.

M26 — Likkutei Torah, Pinchas: A Positive Witness for the Pairs

Location in the book: chapter 19. **Evidence trail:** document 0402; plates 0509–0520. **Type of evidence:** a preserved independent research report with witnesses.

The R5 report brought the text of the Pinchas discourse and print witnesses in which the four pairs match the Epistle's map. The finding strengthened the explanation, but did not by itself reconcile the difference from Etz Chaim.

Lesson for the work: A good task for a witness locator is a focused request for one sentence that changes the question's status, with a facsimile and context. There is no need for further collecting of books that adds no evidence.

New coding: Grok Bot: bibliographic location 5, distinguishing types of witnesses 5, source discovery 5, focus of the work 5, reproducibility 5; compiler: degree of certainty 4, connecting issues 4, focus of the work 4.

M27 — The Two Food Proofs in the Same Discourse

Location in the book: chapter 19. **Evidence trail:** S08–S14 dossiers; Finale history; sources L1 and L2. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The research moved from general references to Torat Chaim and Or HaTorah to a located identification of the proofs in the discourse "ששת ימים" [Six Days]. The documented contribution profile notes Grok's explanatory strength concerning food and knowledge, and Bot's contribution to locating the witnesses.

Lesson for the work: Distinguish between a useful idea, locating a source and verifying its location. A finding completed through sev-

eral roles is not the exclusive credit of the last participant to quote it.

New coding: Grok: conceptual distinctions 4, clarity of explanation 5, connecting issues 4; Grok Bot: bibliographic location 4, source discovery 4, reproducibility 4; compiler: attribution to the author 4, connecting issues 4.

M28 — The Zohar: Different Occurrences and Textual Variants

Location in the book: chapter 20. **Evidence trail:** documents 0379 and 0402; S20 onward. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Reading the Zohar's sequence and the apparatus distinguished different occurrences of יסודא ועיקרא [foundation and root] from variants at the same location. The R5 report preserved the location of the earlier evidence and did not present reuse as a new reading.

Lesson for the work: In a text with recurring formulas, first identify the locus and only then compare witnesses. Reuse of a verified finding must also be documented.

New coding: Claude: reading the context 4, conceptual distinctions 4, connecting issues 4; Grok Bot: bibliographic location 4, distinguishing types of witnesses 5, preserving a correction 4, reproducibility 5; compiler: continuity of mapping 4, connecting issues 4.

M29 — The Emor Reference and the Content of Kuntres Acharon

Location in the book: chapter 20. **Evidence trail:** document 0402; C20; the concluding dossier. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The correspondence of the Sag and forehead content to Kuntres Acharon ד [4] was identified as a positive finding. The attribution of the writer of the Emor reference was not demonstrated. The documented assessment of Claude noted a tendency in the opening of the R3 report to attribute to the author what the body had left open.

Lesson for the work: Separate "what the reference corresponds to" from "who wrote it." Identifying content does not prove editorial history.

New coding: Claude: attribution to the author 2, degree of certainty 2, self-correction 4; Grok Bot: source discovery 5, distinguishing types of witnesses 4, degree of certainty 4, reproducibility 4; compiler: attribution to the author 4, validity of inference 4, connecting issues 4.

M30 — Torah Descends and Mitzvot Ascend: An Overly Sharp Synthesis

Location in the book: chapter 20. **Evidence trail:** C12; Finale R4–R5 documents. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

Claude proposed a one-directional division that was corrected in light of the sources: root, human service and the result of drawing down must be distinguished. Action does not merely ascend; it draws revelation down below. Torah study, too, is not restricted to one direction.

Lesson for the work: When an elegant synthesis becomes a single-valued dictionary, place a counter-source beside it. The sequence of explanation must carry more than one axis.

New coding: Claude: conceptual distinctions 2, connecting issues 2, self-correction 5, response to criticism 5; compiler: conceptual distinctions 4, counter-test 4, connecting issues 5, clarity of explanation 4.

M31 — A Fixed Angel and a Refined World

Location in the book: chapter 20. **Evidence trail:** document 0402, the positive explanation; the concluding dossiers. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

The Pinchas source made it possible to retain together the angel's fixed attribute and the description of the refined world. The inference that the fixity of the attribute proves the world is unrefined was not retained.

Lesson for the work: A fixed property of an individual does not alone prove the state of the entire system. Clarify in which respect the source speaks on each side.

New coding: Grok Bot: source discovery 4, reading the context 4, reproducibility 4; compiler: validity of inference 4, conceptual distinctions 4, counter-test 4.

M32 — A Focused Stopping Point instead of Recycling Quotations

Location in the book: chapter 12. **Evidence trail:** document 0619, the determination and continuation. **Type of evidence:** documented summary or criticism.

After a basis for distinctions had been found but no reconciling bridge, a limited examination of Etz Chaim כט ג [29:3] and מ [40], Discourse טו [15], was defined. It was made clear that if no new bridge appeared, a record of the gap would be retained without reopening the same round.

Lesson for the work: Define in advance which finding could change the conclusion. A large number of rounds is not a substitute for a condition for progress.

New coding: Grok: degree of certainty 4, considering alternatives 4; compiler: degree of certainty 5, focus of the work 5, continuity of mapping 4.

What Emerges from the Comparison — and What Must Not Be Inferred from It

The most important contribution is not that of a single output, but of an orderly transition between roles. In the discussion of unions in BYA, for example, a conceptual proposal became more precise when positive sources were added, then narrowed again when it was checked whether the source speaks of Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva or Abba and Imma, of a local union or the vesting of a higher level. Agreement between answers is therefore not a substitute for checking the subject of the sentence in the source. Even an answer that explains elegantly why a difficulty is not difficult may precede clarification of the facts on which that difficulty is built.

In the documentation examined, Grok contributed especially connecting proposals: distinguishing the destination of the radiance from the order of its vesting, proposing relative completeness of mochin, and giving a positive explanation of the order of nourishment. Their strength lies in the ability to propose a framework that can be tested. The shortcoming evident in some cases is expansion of the framework beyond what the source proves, and at times adding a reference that does not fit the detail under discussion. A useful way to work with contributions of this kind is to ask separately for each link: what is written, what is inferred, and what source would refute the proposal. See M13–M14, M23, M25 and M27.

Claude's responses show explicit corrections following criticism, including retracting a composite quotation and acknowledging that renaming an alternative does not cancel its logical independence. This

is a real research advantage: a discussion can improve when the previous claim is identified rather than concealed. Alongside this, mistaken attribution, incomplete reading of context and categorical formulations not fully supported by the source were documented. Clarity or linguistic confidence must therefore not be accepted as verification. It is useful to require a short quotation within a sequence, identification of the speaker, and an explanation of exactly what changed from the previous answer. See M06, M09, M11, M15 and M30.

Grok Bot appears in the track primarily in the role of locating and checking witnesses. Finding the continuation in "דרך מצותיך" [Derech Mitzvotecha], clarifying the four pairs of elements in Likkutei Torah, and distinguishing a facsimile's wording from an online version contributed corrections that would not have resulted from comparing explanations alone. But this is a role with access to source materials, not proof of a general advantage of another base model. A failure in continuity of question IDs was documented in this role as well. It is recommended to define in advance for the locator a fixed ID, book title and edition, printed page and image number, and the limit of the claim the facsimile is supposed to test. See M16, M18–M19, M25–M26 and M31.

The compiler contributed by separating questions and setting counter-tests, but must not be excluded from the circle of criticism. The error in calculating the date and a syntactic assumption requiring correction illustrate that one who evaluates others can also generate an error. Its scores here are self-assessment based on documentation, not external criticism. Moreover, the review files were sometimes written from its perspective; they may preserve its corrections in greater detail than quiet contributions by other participants. For this reason, the averages must not be used to declare a winner. See M08 and M12.

The metrics are not uniform in the amount of evidence. A score based on one case describes only that case. Even three cases are not a representative sample of general capability. The documentation provides no basis for a reliable comparison of cost, speed or current versions. Adding numbers in these areas would create an appearance of precision. Further research could broaden the sample, add an independent evaluator, and give the models identical questions with the same sources and tools.

A Practical Method of Work Learned from the Book

First formulate one question anchored in the Epistle's wording. Distinguish the difficulty raised by the text from an explanation one already wishes to adopt. For example: does the source speak of the ability to beget, an actual act of union, or the soul's root? The three questions are related, but an answer to one does not decide the others.

Then prepare a small, checkable source dossier: a facsimile or text, the context before and after it, a reference and identification of the degree of evidence. One decisive source read in full is preferable to a long list whose individual items' evidentiary role is unknown. When using a locator, ask it to distinguish what it saw itself from a reference it found in a commentator.

Next request two readings that are as independent as possible. Each reading must explain the wording, present assumptions and identify its weak point. Do not ask merely for "another answer"; ask for an alternative whose difference from the first can be formulated. Then confront each proposal with the source most difficult for it. This is the stage at which the discussions of the three radiances, unions in BYA and the mazal of vegetation advanced.

Record the correction explicitly: the previous claim, the new evidence, the corrected claim and what remains open. Do not erase the rejected reasoning if understanding its rejection teaches an important distinction; nor should every exchange preceding it be printed again. In this way the history of understanding is preserved without burdening the reader with an operational diary.

Finally, write a conclusion with the degree of certainty the sources permit. An answer can be useful even when it is not final. A point left open requires a precise formulation of the gap: a missing facsimile, edition identification, clarification of context or conceptual bridging. The determination of when to stop a round is not a determination that the question has been resolved. This distinction is one of the research's most important lessons.

From the Research to the Book for the Beginning Reader

The comparison is intended to improve the explanation itself. When research changes the identification of a source or the limit of a conclusion, the plain explanation built on them must be checked. After the research book stabilizes, references to precise pages and file IDs will be added to the reader's book. At the present stage, the reader's book remains as approved; the existence of extensive research must not lead to the inference that every question in it has already been decided.

Research on the Research: From the Individual Answer to a System of Investigation

The Research Question and the Unit of Comparison

This book examines two connected but nonidentical things: how Iggeret HaKodesh 20 is interpreted, and how the investigation im-

proved or went astray when several artificial-intelligence systems were used. Success in locating a source is not yet success in interpreting it; an elegant explanation is not evidence that the source was opened; good criticism does not prove the critic would have reached the result without reading the proposal received. The unit of comparison is therefore a documented research action within a context, not the model's name alone.

We distinguish six roles: formulating the question, proposing an interpretation, locating a witness, reading the witness, criticizing the inference, and editing the conclusion. A person or system can fulfill several of them. This division permits precise credit: who proposed the source, who opened it, who noticed the qualification, and who preserved the correction in the next edition. Attributing the entire achievement to whoever wrote the last summary erases the history of understanding; attributing it to whoever first mentioned a book title gives credit for an action that may not have been performed.

Limits of the Evidentiary Material

The accompanying quantitative survey encompasses all 670 reconstructed database records. Checking file hashes confirms that the examined copies are identical to the files in the inventory; it does not confirm that their contents are correct. All 1,293 duplication chains were checked for references to an existing ID without a cycle. Here too, checking a reference does not prove that two formulations serving different roles are interchangeable in every context.

The concluding archive guide, document 0366, explicitly states that it contains no complete conversation export: Grok and Claude answers supplied in conversation were used to edit the files and the history of the rounds, but they are not all independent original response files; the beginning of the first round is truncated. An editorial recon-

struction must not be called “the model’s original answer.” It should be used as the compiler’s testimony about the answer, and the distinction preserved even when the report is detailed and persuasive.

This limitation differs from an absence of all material. There are detailed locator reports, briefs, reviews, answer excerpts and edited files. They permit study of particular errors, changes in claims and work structure. They do not permit reconstruction of everything the system saw, how many attempts were needed, or what it would have answered without the material previously received. The data therefore support analysis of a process, but not a controlled experiment on model capabilities.

Three Layers of Comparison

The first layer is a documentary survey of the entire database: which families and rounds exist, the type of each document, and where it is integrated. The second is the question ledger: a map of the 256 research questions preserved, with a substantive location rather than an invented determination. The third is a qualitative analysis of turning-point cases. Only at this layer can the strength of a particular interpretation or the severity of a particular error be discussed.

The three layers must not be combined into one number. A hundred repeated records in a ledger are not a hundred successes. The absence of a model’s name in a file is not zero capability. A focused brief may attest to the editor’s good understanding, but it is not an achievement by the model to which it was intended to be sent. The coverage map is intended to reveal where a basis for comparison exists and where it is lacking; it is not a winners’ table.

Independence, Prior Exposure and Compiler Bias

In the R5 review file, document 0576, two Claude versions and a later Grok response were distinguished. Some corrections initially attributed to the later criticism had already appeared in the updated version or the independent investigation. This is a case in which a conclusion can be correct while attribution of the achievement is wrong. The sequence of exposure must be documented before inferring who discovered what.

Reading a previous answer can be highly desirable in study-house work. It permits questioning, sharpening and correction. But then the quality of the criticism is being examined, and agreement is not presented as independent evidence. For a follow-up experiment, an answer given before exposure and an answer after reading a peer should be preserved separately, and the change between them compared. The test is not whether the model remained faithful to itself, but whether it changed its statements for a valid reason.

The compiler too is a participant with a perspective. It chooses which questions to return, how to present the disagreement, and what to emphasize in the summary. Correction of its error in calculating a year, correction of its assumption in Q70, and correction of editorial omissions in this edition show that it cannot be exempted from criticism. An editorial error ledger must be maintained with the same seriousness as the researchers' errors.

An Expanded Evaluation Framework

The twenty metrics of the preceding analysis are retained. Below are sixteen additional distinctions required for examining research conducted in multiple stages. This expands the evaluation tools; it does not mean that every document received a new score on each of the 36 metrics.

Additional metric	What exactly is examined	How to avoid a mistaken inference
Initial independence	Whether a peer's answer was read before formulation	Do not count agreement as an independent observation
Version sequence	Which version was before the critic	Do not credit the critic with a correction already accepted
Credit for discovery	Who proposed, opened, read and verified	Separate four different actions
Question traceability	Whether the question ID preserves its content	A change of number is not a change of claim, and vice versa
Boundary of a negative search	Which text was examined and to what extent	Do not turn "not found" into "does not exist"
Missing input	Whether the original report exists or only its summary	Do not reconstruct wording and attribute it to the model
Inaccessibility of a source	Whether the failure concerns apprehension or access	Do not rate interpretive ability on a file that was not opened
Source versus explanation	Where the text ends and commentary begins	The site's title does not establish the author's identity in every paragraph
Text versus print	Whether this is a transcription, scan or report	A digital witness is not an examination of every edition
Completeness of the output	Whether all parts of the question were answered	An answer to one part does not close the entire dossier
Breadth versus depth	Whether decisive sources were added or only parallels	The number of books is not equivalent to the number of pieces of evidence
Preserving qualification	Whether the summary is faithful to the qualification in the body	Edit an overconfident concluding sentence too
Cost of correction	What must change following discovery of an error	Distinguish a location error from a failure in the explanatory structure
Transfer to the reader's book	Whether simplification preserves the limit of the conclusion	Do not leave the qualification only in the research book
Efficiency of a round	Whether what the question sought was found	An empty result may prevent needless repetition

Additional metric	What exactly is examined	How to avoid a mistaken inference
Editorial completeness	Whether filtering and merging lost a unique claim	A technical heading is not grounds for automatic deletion

A numerical score has value only when the evidence and scoring rule can be seen. The scale in the preceding case studies is a local editorial judgment. It must not be assigned statistical precision that does not exist. The new cases below receive a verbal assessment — achievement, limitation, correction or gap — so as not to invent uniformity between a complete original report and a report about it.

Additional Cases: New Findings, Attribution and Limits of Proof

M33 — A Correction Already Present in the Previous Version

Document 0576 distinguishes Claude-R05-A, Claude-R05-B and Grok's criticism. The distinctions concerning nefesh, ruach and neshamah in angels, the power of BYA's kelim, and the status of the editorial count had partly appeared already in the updated version. Grok's critical contribution is not cancelled, but not every item should be called its first discovery. The documented achievement is critical verification and sharpening; independence of discovery is not demonstrated for every item. The metric of contribution attribution requires a version table, not only a table of final answers.

M34 — Three or Four Levels: A Useful Scale That Is Not the Source's Wording

In the same file, presenting a count of four levels as an explicit structure of the Epistle was rejected. The scale can be used for teaching, provided it is described as an editorial tool. The model's error is not

constructing the scale itself, but raising it from an organizing proposal to textual evidence. This correction retains the pedagogical example while removing an authority it does not possess. It also applies to diagrams in this book.

M35 — Nefesh, Ruach and Neshamah in Angels: Rejecting a Generalization without Sweeping Equivalence

Document 0576 records rejection of the claim that angels have no nefesh, ruach and neshamah, on the basis of Etz Chaim מ' [40], Discourse י" [10]. The correction does not permit identifying every use of the words nefesh, ruach and neshamah with the human system in all its details. The research achievement is preserving two distinctions together: a sweeping absence claim fell, while full identity of the systems remains unproved. A model that replaces one generalization with the opposite generalization does not complete the correction.

M36 — New Souls and Adam, the First Man

The summary in 0576 preserves a system of roots, sparks and levels in Adam, the first man, alongside the possibility of new souls. "New" does not automatically mean creation from scratch after Adam. This tests definition of a term before drawing a chronological or metaphysical conclusion from it. The contribution is disentangling ambiguity; the limit is that this does not license applying one interpretation to every occurrence of the word in the literature.

M37 — Enoch: A Correct Source and an Open Application

The same file preserves the source in Shaar HaGilgulim concerning the aspect of Enoch's soul, without determining that it identifies the "first tzaddikim" in the Epistle. A source about a particular figure can show that a type of description is known in the literature; it does not

prove that the author specifically intended that figure in a sentence that does not name him. Evaluating a model should recognize the ability to leave the application open even after finding an interesting source.

M38 — The Power of Finitude and the Limit the Epistle Itself Places on the Argument

Document 0576 limits the conclusion: a description of the order in which yesh comes into being is not a metaphysical prohibition of every other possibility. When the researcher brings the concept of the power of finitude from an explanatory source, it must be identified as an additional explanatory tool. Moving from explaining the order of coming into being to determining what the power of the Essence cannot do requires proof. The lesson is to examine not only the correctness of sentences but also the strength of their quantifiers: "in this order," "only this way" and "no other way is possible" are not equivalent.

M39 — Seven Pieces of Evidence for a Framework Are Not Evidence for the Particular Mechanism

Document 0127 examines seven references on tzimtzum, kelim and coming into being within Q42. Their usefulness is establishing a general framework: the transition from Atzilut to Beriah must not be presented as though it could be discussed without tzimtzum and a recipient. But accumulating evidence does not by itself identify the particular mechanism by which the soul becomes yesh. This is an important case of a source-rich answer that still does not answer the point of the question. Relevance and task completion must be assessed separately from the correctness of each reference.

M40 — "ממלא" [Memale, Filling] as an Interpretive Heading

In 0300, claim R17-T30, the technical terminology used by the researcher is distinguished from the Epistle's wording. The absence examined is that of the term in the text window under discussion; the verse "אני מלא" [I fill] is not equivalent to the term "ממלא" [memale, filling]. This does not rule out every possibility of interpreting through the concept. It requires only that the heading be marked as interpretation, not quotation. This is an example of checking terms so that the explanation does not conceal the source's precision.

M41 — "Just as in Atzilut Itself": Similarity in the Manner of Illumination

Claim R17-T31 in document 0300 examines the scope of the comparison. Its attachment to the verb of illumination does not permit identifying BYA with Atzilut in every respect. This is a syntactic correction with major conceptual significance. In the examination of the digital text for this edition, the sequence under discussion was found in Epistle 20; the examination confirms the basis of the syntactic analysis and does not turn it into a solution to every parsa question.

M42 — "משם" [From There]: Evidence from the Sequence, Not Proof of Exclusivity

Document 0300, R17-T32, attributes the locative reference to the continuous continuation of the description of the end of Netzach, Hod and Yesod of Adam Kadmon. This is syntactic evidence that should be brought into the discussion of the three radiances. It does not alone prove that another route does not operate, or that the two descriptions are unrelated. The evaluation test here is the researcher's

ability to maintain defined positive evidence without adding an unexamined negation.

M43 — "כמו" [As] and "וככה" [And Likewise]: Organizing the Comparison in Returning Light

R17-T33 in the same document shows that the discussion includes an explicit comparison between orders, not merely repetition of the term returning light. The new insight concerns the structure of explanation: identify the analogy, what corresponds to what, and what is not learned from the parallel. Evaluating a model should check whether the diagram it created preserves these logical arrows. An attractive drawing that joins every level in one line may be less accurate than a verbal description distinguishing two systems.

M44 — Sefer HaGilgulim Is Not Shaar HaGilgulim

Document 0226, M5, records a search that did not succeed in establishing a clean reading of the requested source in Sefer HaGilgulim. At the same time, the work was distinguished from Shaar HaGilgulim, where an introduction bearing the same number discusses a different subject. This is a useful negative result: it prevents filling a bibliographic slot with a source having a similar name. A report should not be penalized for "not found" when the alternative is false attribution.

M45 — A Screen and a Curtain Are Not a Quotation of the Word Parsa

In 0226, M3, a source containing "screen" and "curtain" was distinguished from a source containing the particular term sought. The concepts may belong to the same substantive family, but the paral-

lel requires an argument. A fair evaluation credits the locator for the parallel while withholding a rating of "the exact wording was found." The same rule applies to similar expressions in the Zohar and to a later author's paraphrase.

M46 — An Empty File Is Not Evidence of Study

Records M8–M9 in 0226 document an absence of usable text in some source paths. A filename or saved address is not evidence that the work was read. Here the documentary boundary shows why one cannot infer that the Mitteler Rebbe or the Rebbe has no discussion of the topic. A gap was found in the work process, not a negative finding across the entire literature. This is a metric of documentary honesty and reproducibility.

M47 — The Same Question Number in Two Different Maps

Archive guide 0366 warns that S numbers in early Bot reports do not always match the final forty-question map. Comparing by number alone can attribute a correct answer to a different question. A similar failure was documented in the earth map. This is why the question ledger in this edition presents the question's wording beside its ID; a reference by ID is a locating tool, not proof that the passage answers the question.

M48 — A Bibliographic Error That Must Be Preserved as an Error

Document 0362 records a difference between the verse reference printed in the note and the location of the verse matching the wording. Scholarly editing must distinguish faithful transcription of the note from correction of the reference. A silent correction would erase the datum from which the search began. This edition does not claim

that every printing was reexamined; the finding is attributed to the file and the type of witness described there.

M49 — A Technical Heading That Concealed a Finding

Examination of the preceding edition revealed that section 0371-003 had been filtered out with an instruction file even though it lists source corrections. It was restored. Evidentiary limits that must be preserved were also found in work-control sections. This is a failure of the editor and the filtering rule, not an error by the models studied. It illustrates why a completeness check must read the content of an omission rather than rely on a filename.

M50 — Technical Completeness and Research Completeness

Checking the hashes of 670 files proves that the preserved archive has not changed. It does not prove that editing used every claim correctly. Nor does a valid reference from every passage to a page confirm its conceptual assignment. This edition explicitly separates the two checks: the integrity of copies was checked across the entire database; checking meaning cannot be closed by a sum of rows in a table.

Conclusions about Working with the Models

In the files examined, Claude makes significant contributions in classification and synthesis, alongside cases in which a broad conclusion or composite quotation preceded the evidence. The practical conclusion is to request a complete explanatory structure, while requiring every claim to distinguish quotation, inference and application. The summary deserves special scrutiny: it may be more categorical than the discussion it summarizes. This observation must not be generalized to every version or field.

Grok has documented contributions in challenging generalizations and proposing connecting distinctions, but also a diagram whose order required correction and expansions of source claims that were not fully demonstrated. Its useful application in this documentation is formulating an alternative and examining a weak point in an existing interpretation. When it reads a peer's answer, it should be evaluated as a critic with prior exposure, not as an independent researcher. Precise credit does not diminish the value of criticism.

Grok Bot is here the name of a research role that includes locating and opening witnesses. We have no basis for identifying it as a single experimental variable against the other systems. Its advantage in many files is bringing readable material, and sometimes specifically documenting the absence of a finding. Its limitations include changes of IDs and source material that does not decide the interpretive question. It is therefore asked for context and the limit of a claim as well, not only an address and a facsimile.

The compiler and ChatGPT are evaluated for formulating questions, reading sources, the validity of criticism and preservation of determinations. Every document written by the compiler must not automatically be counted as an independent response by an additional model. Self-criticism is a condition of the method: record what changed, why, and what did not change. An editorial error does not disappear when the output is typeset.

Briefs for Gemini were preserved in several places. A brief is not an answer. Where there is no report of receipt or an identifiable response, there is no capability score or basis for comparison. Likewise, commercial versions must not be ranked here on the basis of names mentioned retrospectively. Version, runtime, search tools and input scope are conditions that must be documented before quantitative comparison.

What Must Be Transferred to the Reader's Book

Three things must pass from the research into the plain explanation: the formulation of the real question, the distinction on which the answer rests, and the boundary the answer must not cross. There is no need to transfer every round. For example, the explanation of unions in BYA must preserve the difference between the source of the influx and the local parties to the union; the explanation of the three radiances must distinguish the existence of the radiance from its degree; the explanation of earth must avoid presenting the vegetative power and mazal as alternatives if the source connects them.

In this way the research book becomes a basis for the reader's book. The page reference enables someone who wants to check the argument to return to the evidence. It is not a substitute for a clear explanation in the body of the commentary. The reader's book may change following a correction in the research, but depth must not be removed from it merely because the reader does not need the entire history of the investigation.

Database Map by Families and Rounds

The file count also includes repetitions and items preserved only in the archive. "Integrated" counts documents of which at least one passage is printed. This is a documentary survey of 670 records, not a quality score or a count of original model answers. The round number is inventory data; a document summarizing a preceding round may be found in the next round's package.

A: the beginning of the Epistle and the general rounds; B: the focused investigations; C: earth and vegetation; D: the conclusion of the Epistle.

Family and round	Files in the database	Integrated documents	Integrated passages
A · 0	26	15	192
A · 1	3	1	5
A · 2	5	3	111
A · 3	5	2	2
A · 4	6	3	90
A · 5	6	4	102
A · 6	3	2	48
A · 7	6	4	29
A · 8	79	74	433
A · 9	15	15	84
A · 10	27	26	184
A · 11	2	2	3
A · 12	19	19	92
A · 13	12	12	79

Family and round	Files in the database	Integrated documents	Integrated passages
A · 14	8	8	52
A · 15	19	19	161
A · 16	73	72	358
A · 17	46	46	568
B · 1	8	8	160
B · 2	16	8	49
B · 3	13	6	20
B · 4	10	5	15
B · 5	12	6	17
B · 6	9	5	10
B · 7	10	5	18
B · 8	7	7	27
B · 9	3	3	8
B · 10	1	1	1
B · 14	2	2	2
B · 17	1	1	4

Family and round	Files in the database	Integrated documents	Integrated passages
C · 0	9	1	1
C · 1	9	9	98
C · 2	6	6	34
C · 3	8	7	24
C · 4	16	15	56
D · 0	13	6	110
D · 1	15	14	95
D · 2	11	11	56
D · 3	49	12	39
D · 4	45	11	43
D · 5	37	12	28

Changes Made Following Editorial Review

The following changes were recorded with stable IDs. The source files were not rewritten. This correction matters for comparing the models too: the compiler's actions and the production process must be criticized, not only the answers they collected.

0371-003 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 20.

0366-001 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0265-016 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 7.

0269-005 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 7.

0007-010 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0030-007 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0061-006 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0080-006 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0187-006 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0226-020 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0010-009 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 7.

0051-012 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0150-012 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 7.

0200-009 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0270-009 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0251-033 — Individual examination: an administrative heading concealed an evidentiary limit, search result or correction that must be preserved; integrated in unit 21.

0362-001 — Individual assignment: textual investigation, missing sources or a method of independent examination; integrated in unit 7.

0599-017 — Individual assignment: textual investigation, missing sources or a method of independent examination; integrated in unit 4.

0665-001 — Individual assignment: textual investigation, missing sources or a method of independent examination; integrated in unit 21.

0146-001 — Record of hashes/IDs and file status; preserved in the archive; transferred to the operational archive.

0146-002 — Record of hashes/IDs and file status; preserved in the archive; transferred to the operational archive.

0339-006 — Record of hashes/IDs and file status; preserved in the archive; transferred to the operational archive.

Reading the Decisive Sources: From Reference to Context

The source guides below distinguish what was found in the documented witness from what remains open. Facsimiles of the other sources are not printed here; the original documentation is preserved in the archive. The explanations are an editorial layer drawn from the preserved research, not a claim that every source was reread in the current production stage.

ששת ימים [Six Days]: Two Proofs within One Mechanism

The witnesses before us preserve the discourse's opening and continuation, so that we do not settle for sentences torn from their context. The food question has two levels: that which proceeds from G-d's mouth vested in it, and the excellence of the root in Tohu in relation to the wisdom of Tikkun. The human being refines the food, and the food adds to the human being. Without these two levels, it is easy to think that the claim attributes developed intellect to the manifest bread, or that refinement is an action that changes nothing in the refiner.

The key paragraph says that the root of foods in the world of Tohu is above the wisdom of Tikkun, hence their power to add to the faculty of wisdom. The two proofs are integrated into the same context: ox meat followed by grain. One must read the connecting sentences, not merely mark the words בישרא [meat] and דגן [grain]. Their presence in the same discourse matters; that they are explained through the same relationship matters more. In English: the foods are rooted above the wisdom of Tikkun and therefore can add to the faculty of wisdom.

Three differences from the Epistle are preserved: the order of the proofs, "father" without "mother," and wisdom and intellect versus

wisdom and knowledge. These are not defects in the source, but limits of its application. It explains the possibility of added intellect from food, and does not alone decide why every word in the Epistle was chosen. The discourse begins at יג א [13a]; this must not be confused with יא ג [11c] of מצה זו [This Matzah] or with the discourse number in the site's menu.

The continuation of the discourse matters for the transition to service. When the application to the service of G-d begins, eating for the sake of Heaven, refinements of sparks, the recitation of Shema and prayer appear. This layer does not cancel the explanation preceding it and does not permit adding such a condition to the sentence about the infant in the Epistle. The contextual witnesses are printed so the reader can see the transition, not merely receive the editor's statement that it exists.

מצה זו [This Matzah]: Abba in Immaturity, without Merging Discourses

This discourse is preserved separately because confusing it with ששת ימים [Six Days] changed the status of the evidence in R2. The fact that both are in Parashat Tzav and concern matzah does not permit transferring a paragraph from one to the other. The discourse's incipit, section and context are three independent means of identification; a menu number does not replace them. The facsimiles enable the distinction to be checked.

The point relevant to the dossier is calling "father" after tasting grain, which serves to explain the mochin of Abba in immaturity. This knowledge is not described as a full conceptual apprehension of the relationship of begetting. The initial image, 'the infant understands its relationship to its parents,' therefore required qualification. The discourse explains how knowledge and faith can be drawn even

where developed apprehension does not yet exist. This is a positive explanation, not merely a rejection of the earlier explanation.

The wording “father” alone fits the local argument about Abba. It cannot be inferred from this that the Epistle, quoting “father and mother,” necessarily expounds the two partzufim. Nor can the exclusive use of “father” in this discourse be taken to rule out every possible meaning of “mother” elsewhere. The comparison teaches a precise boundary: we have a source for interpreting “father” in a particular context, and we do not yet have a source transferring it in full to the Epistle’s sentence.

The continuation pages preserve the matzah discussion as a unit. They are not independent evidence for ox meat, and the reader is not asked to find in them what was found in L1. Separating the discourses is part of explaining the grain itself: wheat in Daat of Tohu, grain in the food proofs, and matzah in immaturity are not three names whose details are all interchangeable.

ואכלתם אכול [And You Shall Eat Plentifully]: Return, the Future and Malchut

This is a witness for examining the term returning light outside the Epistle’s sentence. Eating elevates what is eaten to its root, and the discussion proceeds to eating in the future and to a state after the refinements. The shared features of food, elevation and return help explain the pattern, but do not suffice to prove identity of all the levels and mechanisms. In each occurrence, ask what returns, who acts, and when.

The future paragraph speaks of Malchut and the aspect of Keter from below upward. The wording “wedged” creates a real affinity with the Epistle, which also uses Malchut as Keter from below upward. Yet in the Epistle the kav at the end of the feet of yosher is the explicit

subject of the return under discussion. Here the process and time are different. One who skips this difference presents a verbal correspondence as proof of identity; one who erases the affinity misses an important explanatory parallel.

Particular care is needed with the abbreviation א"ח עט"ב. In this context it means אשת חיל עטרת בעלה [a woman of valor is her husband's crown], and א"ח alone must not be deciphered as אור חוזר [returning light] merely because the term appears nearby. The context test precedes expansion of a familiar abbreviation. The same rule applies to the entire comparison: a shared word invites examination, rather than granting a result in advance.

For the final explanation, L2 remains a partial bridge. It shows how refinements, ascent to the root and Malchut as Keter can combine within one process. It is not the missing sentence 'Daat of Tohu is the returning light of the kav.' Facsimiles of both pages are preserved so that the future and context do not disappear behind a two-word quotation.

Emor: Human Nourishment, Angelic Enjoyment and a Printed Reference

The explanation of והניף [And He Shall Wave] is the precise source where R2 mistakenly used וספרתם [And You Shall Count]. It connects the human being's nourishment from the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders, refinement of the animal's spirit, elevation to the Merkavah and revelation of lights of Tohu. Its importance is therefore not merely that the same Zohar quotation appears, but that it offers a detailed explanation of the enjoyment described by the Epistle. The table and the altar combine in the same process, under the conditions of service stated in the discourse.

The key wording in ד§ [4] is that the angels enjoy from the sacrifices through the revelation of the lights of Tohu, from which their root comes. It is followed in print by the quotation יסודא ועיקרא [foundation and root] and a reference to the end of איהו וחיוהי [He and His Life-Giving Lights]. The substantive translation: the angels benefit from the offerings through the revelation of the lights of Tohu, from which they are rooted. The interpretive connection matters even if the author of the reference at the end of the sentence has not been determined.

There are three separate facts here. The discourse's content appears in the printed text. The reference to the Epistle is also in print. Attribution of the reference to the Alter Rebbe or an editor cannot be learned from its mere presence there. Nor do we have the date of the discourse's delivery and the date of the Epistle's writing at an evidentiary level that permits deciding who added the pointer. The fixed formulation is therefore 'an explanation connecting them is printed in Likkutei Torah.'

The contextual pages also include the reference in ב§ [2] to Sag in the inner dimension of Adam Kadmon and to the forehead. R5 identified its content target in Kuntres Acharon ד [4], not in Iggeret HaKodesh 20. The same facsimile thus serves to check two different references, without assuming that every אג"ה [Iggeret HaKodesh] in the discourse denotes the same Epistle. A particular attribute, a root in Tohu and refinement are examined here with L6 and K4; the three terms must not be read as synonyms.

Ki Tetze: Elements, Sacrifice and Two Directions of Service

א§ [1] supplied the explicit witness for the higher pairs: fire is the animal soul, and air is the speaking order. The Targum's "רוח ממללא" [speaking spirit] is not an association added by the editor; it is brought

in the discourse. The explanation's status thus changed from possible to documented. The reference to the libations passage shows that L5 too should be read, but the parallel itself does not depend on the reader succeeding in opening both sites.

ד§ [4] uses "their beginning is wedged in their end" and "their end in their beginning" to explain Torah and mitzvot. At the root of the explanation, Torah is likened to descending water, while mitzvot are connected with "the end of action was first in thought." But the paragraph's continuation is essential: Torah brings ratzo, mitzvot bring shov, and the result is drawing the power of fire down as far as the animal soul.

Key translation: through this, the power of the fire above is drawn and spreads downward, reaching the animal soul.

It follows that the shorthand "Torah only descends and mitzvot only ascend" must not be retained. It takes one level and presents it as though it were the entire discourse. The correct distinction is between the root of the structure, the human movement and the result of the service. Each carries a direction, and sometimes the direction changes. Describing action as ascent does not cancel its purpose of drawing down either.

The facsimiles encompass both sections so the transition between elements, the animal soul, Torah and mitzvot can be checked. This does not prove that everything said in Ki Tetze is a literal interpretation of Iggeret HaKodesh 20. It is a parallel with the same mapping and vocabulary, whose local uses are preserved. Precisely a full reading of the section prevents exaggerated use of a single sentence from it.

Shelach: A Supporting Witness and References in Both Directions

L5 matters as an additional witness for animal–fire and as part of a system of references between discourses. In some rounds, one site was blocked for one reader while another obtained a digital text or facsimile. The source ledger therefore does not summarize the status in one word, ‘read,’ for all participants. It states who reported and what was preserved. The conclusion about the pairs does not depend on a single blocked witness, because L4 and L6 provide explicit text.

The reference to libations was seen in L4. The compiler also reported the reverse reference in L5 to Ki Tetze. These are two observations, and one must not be proved from the other. The fact that two discourses concern fire and soul does not prove that they contain reciprocal references. When this was located, it strengthened the combination of parallels; the author of the references is still not established by it.

In this discourse, fire is not merely temperature. The discussion of elevating fire and of Divine fire connects sacrifice and soul. Distinguish the explanation of the root of life from its application in ardor and desire in human service. This distinction allows heat to be used as an illustration without making it the sole reason for the correspondence. This is the difference between an analogy understandable to the reader and the explicit source the investigation sought.

The pages are preserved as a sequence of the required reading, not as evidence that every term in L5 is identical to a term in the Epistle. They do not authorize replacing the end of the kav with a system of fire alone. Their contribution is defined: strengthening the mapping, the context of sacrifice and service, and an additional reference that enables the reader to check the connections independently.

Pinchas: The Witness Connecting the Unit's Beginning and End

This is Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the discourse צו את בני ישראל [Command the Children of Israel]. Its incipit caused the mistaken assignment to Parashat Tzav, and the R5 correction is preserved in all the indexes. §ג [3] gives the four pairs together: earth–inanimate; water–vegetative because it produces growth; fire–animal because of the servants of the Merkavah and the souls of living creatures; air–speaking according to "רוח ממללא" [speaking spirit]. Three pairs are explained, and the fourth is given. The reason for fire must not be reduced to bodily heat alone.

§א [1] is a counter-test for another question: Michael in love and Gabriel in fear are described in a refined world that has already been refined. Key translation: a clear world that has already been refined, in which each thing occupies its place. The particularity of an attribute therefore does not itself indicate absence of refinement. The head and foot in the refined world are distinct, whereas in the fetus before completion of its formation they are included together in a different sense. Caution with the word mutual inclusion is part of the determination.

The two concluding quotations, "today to perform them" and "one hour is better," appear in §§א–ב [1–2]. This world is the arena of action and choice, and repentance and good deeds are explained in terms of sovev as opposed to the revelation of memale. The affinity with the Epistle is strong: the same discussion connects a physical world, action, levels, sacrifice and sovev. It is not necessary to claim that this is the only parallel in the literature or that every word of the Epistle was intended to refer to it.

In §§ג–ד [3–4], elevation is not the end of the story. "לחמי" [My bread] is explained through the analogy of bread restoring vitality to the body; fragrance and pleasingness are linked to elevation and descent, and

sacrifice differs from the other mitzvot in actual revelation as well. The continuation into the Written Torah and Oral Torah explains why action must not be separated from the command and its interpretation. The facsimiles print this context so that the conclusion about mitzvot does not rest on the four pairs alone.

Vaetchanan: Wheat's Particular Role in Daat of Tohu

The discourse is להבין בתוספת ביאור על פי וידעת היום [To Understand with Further Explanation the Verse "And You Shall Know Today"]. ה§ [5] is the target concerning wheat and knowledge, and the preceding pages preserve the sequence of the heading and sections. A PDF position is not a column letter; this distinction is preserved even when the filename suggests a folio number. The witness's role is to enable a return to the sentence within its unit, not to add certainty absent from the photographed heading.

The decisive sentence attributes the root of wheat to Daat of Tohu, above the human being, and explains that although it has descended below, it gives life to the human being and draws knowledge into him. Substantive translation: wheat is rooted in Daat of Tohu above the human; although it has descended below the human, it gives life and draws knowledge into the person. This is a particular reason for wheat, beyond the general explanation that all foods of the inanimate, vegetative and animal orders can add from their root.

The difference between a particular and a general reason must not be turned into competition between sources. L1 explains how both grain and meat add intellect; Vaetchanan explains why wheat is connected to knowledge. The particular answer does not require every meat to receive the same mapping, and the general answer does not make wheat's particular role redundant. This distinction also protects the words grain, bread and matzah from uncontrolled interchange.

Later, the analogy is used for Torah vested in physicality. This strengthens its relevance to the Epistle's conclusion, but does not identify Daat of Tohu with the kav's returning light. The source supplies a root and an explanation for added knowledge; the Epistle supplies a reason in terms of the radiance at the bottom. The two contributions can combine without declaring the technical terms identical.

Mishnat Chassidim: The Mishnah Text and the Commentary טעם עצו [Taam Etzo; The Taste of Its Tree]

Mishnat Chassidim first entered the dossier through a secondary excerpt, and facsimiles were added only later. The change in method of access is not incidental: it enables checking whether the sentence belongs to the mishnah text or to the commentary below. In the preserved edition, the text of Tractate HaHarkavah appears above Taam Etzo. A sentence from the lower part must not be quoted as though it were necessarily the wording of the mishnah itself.

The mapping discussed in the research is close to Etz Chaim: the speaking order is likened to the fire portion in relation to the other elements. This does not provide simple confirmation of the Epistle's order. Nevertheless, the discussion of every created being's composition from all the elements helps distinguish constituent parts from classes of created beings. This is a real contribution even when the source does not resolve the question for which it was opened.

No sentence by the Epistle's author was found in the dossier explicitly saying how to compare the two mappings. The text of Mishnat Chassidim therefore does not authorize emending animal–fire to speaking–fire in the Epistle, nor does it prove that the difference is meaningless. Its role is as a comparative witness: it shows what is

said in the other system and in what kind of language. The broader claim requires further evidence.

The facsimiles include the tractate's sequence so that chapters, text and commentary can be distinguished. The heading "Mishnat Chassidim, Gate נ [50]" is incorrect: Gate נ [50] belongs to the reference in Etz Chaim. Separating book titles, chapters and commentaries is a condition for using the shared idea. A study booklet cannot replace bibliographic precision with a mixed formulation even when the general intention is understood.

Repeated Checks in This Edition

Reexamined in digital texts: the body of Epistle 20 for the presence of the parsa and the sequence of descriptions of the kav; the opening of Epistle ט"ו [15] for the union of Ze'ir Anpin and Nukva of Asiyah; and Etz Chaim מ"ז ה' [47:5] for the difference between a higher union feeding the lower and local Abba and Imma. These examinations strengthen the distinctions explicit in the discussion, but do not complete the reconciliation of the question of begetting across all sources.[548]

Or HaTorah — Three Examples of Source Witnesses

The three facsimiles below are brought only as an example of the method of checking sources. The other facsimiles were removed from the body of the edition; they are preserved in the original archive. These examples must not be seen as blanket confirmation of every quotation in the book.

[548] Check in this edition: Wikisource, Tanya part 4, chapter 20; Tanya part 4, chapter 15; and Etz Chaim, Gate מז [47], chapter ה [5]; digital texts opened on 25.9.2026 UTC. https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/כ_ד_קלח_אינת ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/וט_ד_קלח_אינת ; https://he.wikisource.org/wiki/ה_קרפ/זמ_רעש/ס״יח_זקע . This is not a new examination of printed editions.

שבארץ שבו מלובש מאמר האלקי תדשא הארץ דשא כו' מוימ"ב ע"כ תמיד בכח המאמר האלקי הזה הוא מצמיח עד אין שיעור והפסק, רק שאין כח בארץ להוציא צמחה מפני שכח הצומח שבה צריך התעוררות מן המשפיע העליון אשר בשמים ממעל והן המזלות הקבועים בשמים, הנה לזה אמר שאין לך עשב למטה בארץ שאין לו מזל המכה ואומר לו גדל, ופי' הכאה זו, היינו שמעורר בהכאה זו לכח הצומח המלובש בעשי' זה שיצמיח את העשב והוא מ"ש ואומר לו גדל כו', וזהו דמיון להביא בחי' המשכת מ"ד לעורר העלאת מ"נ כי הצמיחה מכח הצומח מלמטה למעלה דומה להעלאת מ"נ שעולה מן המקבל וצ"ל המשכת מ"ד מן המזל לעורר העלאה זאת כו' (וכך הוא בזווג גשמי שמעורר הזכר לנקבה לחממה שתוכל להזריע תחלה כו' וכמ"ש במ"א בפי' כתיש כחישין כו'), וכמו"כ ענין המשכת גשמים בארץ ג"כ להוציא כח הצומח שבארץ מן ההעלם לגילוי כמ"ש בגשמי' והרוה את הארץ והולידה והצמיחה כו' וכמ"ש במ"א, וההפרש בין בחי' מ"ד הראשון לבחי' מ"ד השני הוא שזה בא בבחי' החיצוני' וזה בא בבחי' הפנימי' כו', וככה יובן בכל בחי' משפיע ומקבל הרוחני' למעל' כמו המזלות שמקבלים משמרי האופנים והאופנים והמלאכים מקבלי' דין מן דין בדרך עו"ע כידוע דהיינו שהמלאך מקבל השפעתו מעליון הימנו בהכרח שיעלה מ"ן לעליון הימנו תחלה כי רוח אייתי רוח ואמשיך רוח כדרך כל משפיע ומקבל, אך כדי שיוכל התחתון להעלות מ"נ בהכרח שיומשך תחלה כח ועוז מעליון לתחתון שיוכל להעלות מ"נ והיינו ג"כ ג' מדרגות הנ"ל מ"ד ומ"נ ומ"ד כו', וכך הוא בכל המשכת והשפעת עילה לעלול עד רום המעלות.

ומעתה הנה יובן ענין שרש קנין דשמו"א הנ"ל, דהנה מבואר למעלה שבחי' ג' מדרגות הנ"ל מ"ד ומ"נ ומ"ד היינו ג"כ בחי' קנין כמו קנין הגשמי שהקונה נותן הכסף והוא בחי' המשכת מ"ד כדי שיוכל להיות העלאת הדבר לרשות הקונה ע"י משיכה כו' כנ"ל, וכך הוא למעלה מעלה עד רום המעלות ובכל העלא' העלול לגבי העילה ובכללות נק' קנין שמים וארץ הן בחי' משפיע ומקבל למטה וכך הוא עד רום המעלות דהיינו עד שרשם ומקורם הראשוני' לכל השתלשלות העולמות שהן בחי' או"א דאצי' בבחי' יחוד וזיווג החיצוני' לצורך שפע העולמות שיקבל מזו"נ שנק' שמים וארץ (ועמ"ש מענין קונה שמו"א בתו"א פ' תרומה בד"ה מי יתנך כאח לי גבי אמצאך בחוץ, והנה ג"ע העליון ותחתון נק' ג"כ שמים וארץ ובחי' כי כל בשמים ובארץ דאחיד בשמיא וארעא זהו ענין קנין שמים וארץ), נמצא לפי הנ"ל סדר הקנינים תורה קנין א' זהו שהתורה קדמה שני אלפים שנה לעולם אשר בחי' אלפים אלו הוא אאלפך חכ' אאלפך בינה, והוא ענין יחוד פנימי דחו"ב ששרשו נמשך מלמעלה מעלה וזהו ונוצר חסד לאלפים שהוא בחי' חסד שלמעלה מסדר השתלשלות, ונוצר אותיות צנור ואותיות רצון, שנמשך הרצון העליון בבחי' צנור להתלבש בשני אלפים הנ"ל שהיא התורה ועמ"ש מענין ונוצר חסד בת"א פ' יתרו בד"ה מראיהם ומעשיהם, ומ"ש מענין צנור ורצון בד"ה בשלח פרעה, ומענין לאלפים בפ' מקץ גבי ענין שמונה נסיכי אדם, אח"כ שמים וארץ קנין א' הוא יחוד

יובן שהמזל המכה בו ואומר לו גדל הוא ענין מזלות הנמשכים ממו"ס ועמ"ש בד"ה שינייך כעדר הרחלים עכ"ה), אך ענין שפע העדן בגן הזה הוא במדה וקצבה משי"ב שהם ו"ק דאצי' (עמ"ש בד"ה והי' מדי חדש בחדשו) ועז"נ ויטע ה' אלקים גן בעדן אשר ב' שמות הוי' אלקים הם עד"מ כמו המזל המכה בהנטיעות כו' וע"כ גם קודם שנברא אדה"ר הי' הג"ע הנמשך מבינה שבמל' דאצי' וזהו ונהר יוצא מעדן כו', וזהו ענין ענג ר"ת עדן נהר גן, אך ע"י תומ"צ ממשיכים תוס' אור בג"ע והיינו ענין ויניחהו בג"ע לעבדה ולשמרה, ועד"ז נא' אם בחוקותי תלכו כו' ונתתי גשמיכם בעתם כו', ועץ השדה יתן פריו דקאי ג"כ על צמיחת האורות בג"ע, והגם שבלא"ה הג"ע נצמח בו תענוג העליון הנק' נטיעת הגן וכמ"ש במ"א עפ"י המדרש פ' קדושים פכ"ה ע"פ ונטעתם מתחלת ברייתו של עולם לא נתעסק הקב"ה אלא במטע תחילה שנאמר ויטע ה' אלקים גן בעדן כו' שזהו ע"ד כי האדם עץ השדה שבחי' אדם שעל הכסא נק' עץ השדה כו', והוא ז"א דאצי' וזהו הנטיעות שבגן ושרש המשכה זו מבחי' עדן שהוא חכ'.

אך י"ל כי ידוע שביחוד חו"ב שה"ע ונהר יוצא מעדן יש ב' בחי' מה שנמשך תמיד חוק הקצוב זהו מחו"ב עצמן אבל מה שהחכ' מקבל אור חדש מא"ס ומאיר בבינה זהו נמשך ע"י אתעדל"ת וכמ"ש מזה בלק"ת בשה"ש בביאור השני שע"פ יונתי בחגוי פ"ג, וזהו ענין ויניחהו בג"ע לעבדה ולשמרה והיינו ג"כ כמ"ש בזהר באדר"ז דר"צ ע"א האי חכמתא איקרי עדן והאי עדן אתמשך מעדן עילאה סדכ"ס הנ"ל, והמשכה זו מעדן עילאה זהו ע"י תומ"צ. והענין י"ל עפ"י מ"ש במ"א בענין אין לך עשב מלמטה שאין לו מזל כו' והנה גבוה מעל גבוה שומר שהמזל מקבל מלמעלה יותר כו', והמקור לכולן הוא דבר ה' ממאמר תדשא הארץ דשא כו' עץ פרי כו', ונז' מזה ג"כ בקצרה בלק"ת בד"ה כי תצא דרוש הראשון פ"ב, ועד"ז בענין נטיעות הג"ע הנה יש לכ"א ג"כ מזל מלמעלה מאצי' המגדלו, ואפ"ל שזהו ענין כי האדם ז"א דאצי' הוא שרש עץ השדה שבג"ע, אך כי גבוה מעל גבוה שומר כו' ושרש המשכה זו הוא ג"כ מדבר ה' היינו מל' דא"ק שנעשית עתיק וכתר לאצי', וזהו נמשך ע"י דבר ה' שבתורה וכמ"ש ודברי אשר שמתי בפיך דפי' הרמ"ז פ' בראשית דף ד' סע"א דהיינו מל' דא"ק כו', ועד"ז נת' בסידור ע"פ ישלח דברו וימסם כו', וזהו ואשים דברי בפיך כו' לנטוע שמים וליסוד ארץ היינו שעי"ז ממשיכים תוס' אור בג"ע העליון הנק' שמים ובגעה"ת הנק' ארץ, וזהו דענין כי גבוה מעל גבוה שומר בקהלת סי' ה' פי' ברבות בשלח ס"פ כ"ג דקאי על חיות המרכבה וגבוהים עליהם קאי על ע"ס או על מלכות שמים וכמו שנק' שם אלקים לשון רבים ע"ד אלקים קדושים הוא וכן מפורש במד"ר בקהלת דצ"ו ע"ב וגבוהים עליהם זה הקב"ה עו"ש זה חי העולמים מלך, ובת"ז תיקון ע' דקכ"ו ע"ב פי' כי גבוה מעל גבוה הם זו"נ דאצי' שהם הוי' ואדנ"י וגבוהים עליהם הם חו"ב דאצי' ובסה"מ סי' ב' פי' כי גבוה מעל גבוה הם ע"ס דאצי' וע"ס הגנוזות כו' וע' בזהר בראשית דכ"ג ע"א, אלא במדרש מיירי לענין ההשפעות הנמשך בעוה"ז ששרש השפעה זו נמשך מד' חיות המרכבה כמ"ש מזה בלק"ת בשה"ש בד"ה לבבתני אחותי, וע"כ עליהם נא' כי גבוה מעל גבוה כו' וכנ"ל. וכמ"כ עד"ז לענין ההשפעות שבג"ע יש ג"כ גבוה מעל גבוה שומר וע"ז פירשו דקאי על ע"ס דאצי' ולמעלה יותר כו' וכנ"ל.

קיצור. ענין אקב"ו, מוסיפין אור באצי', ענין ג"ע שהזיו שבו הוא ע"ד אין לך עשב מלמטה שאין לו מזל מלמעלה המכה בו, והוא במדה וקצבה וע"י תומ"צ מוסיפין אור כו', כי ביחוד חו"ב ונהר יוצא מעדן יש ב' בחי', מקור ושורש, מזל המכה בעשב, הנה גבוה מעל גבוה שומר ע"ד מאמר תדשא הארץ שבע"מ וגבוה מעל גבוה הם חיות המרכבה, ועד"ז בנטיעות שבג"ע שהם הארת ע"ס דאצי' שבבריאה יש גבוה מעל גבוה שומר זו"נ ואו"א עד מל' דא"ק שנעשית עתיק לאצילות ושם נק' עדן עילאה.

במ"ש בסעיף א' שע"י המצות לעבדה ולשמרה מוסיפים אור בג"ע יותר מעצם בחי' הג"ע. אפ"ל כי הנה מבואר במ"א מ"ש ויטע ה' אלקים גן כו' כי בבריאת העולם נאמר רק שם אלקים כמ"ש בלק"ת מזה בד"ה באתי לגני ובג"ע נאמר ויטע ה' אלקים שם מלא הרי נז' גם שם הוי' ולכן נא' ע"ז ישבעו עצי הוי', אך הנה כתיב אז תתענג על הוי' על דוקא ע"ד שנת' בפי' ותתפלל חנה על הוי' בת"א ס"פ משפטים בד"ה לא תהי' משכלה ועקרה וע' בסידור שער השבת בד"ה זהר פ' יתרו דפ"ח ע"ב יעו"ש באריכות דפי' על הוי' היינו למעלה משם הוי', ולכן ארז"ל קוב"ה אתי לאשתעשע בג"ע עם צדיקייא כיון שמקור העונג נמשך מבחי' שלמעלה משם הוי', ועמ"ש מזה על זהר פ' אחרי דס"ז ע"ב ד"ה כאיל תערוג על אפיקי מים יעו"ש, והמשכה זו מבחי' על הוי' נמשך ע"י עסק התומ"צ למטה וכמ"ש מזה בלק"ת סוף שה"ש בד"ה כי כאשר השמים החדשים פ"א ופ"ב, וזהו ענין התוס' אור שממשיכים בג"ע ע"י התומ"צ וזהו ענין נועם הוי' וכמ"ש מזה בד"ה ראו כי הוי' נתן לכם את השבת, גם אפ"ל התוס' אור בג"ע כי ועץ החיים בתוך הגן, אך בחי' אין גבוה ונעלה מעץ החיים כמ"ש בזהר ח"ג פ' שלח דקנ"ח ע"ב ע"פ היש בה עץ אם אין דבחי' אין זהו ע"ק וא"כ ע"י המצות תרי"ג דאורייתא עם ז' מצות דרבנן שהם בבחי' כתר לכן עי"ז נמשך מבחי' אין בהעץ חיים, והיינו ע"י ונהר יוצא מעדן יובל שמו חיים שמו בזח"ג פ' אחרי דנ"ח, ועיין בלק"ת פ' ואתחנן בד"ה וזאת המצוה שע"י המצוה ממשיכים יחוד סובב וממלא וא"כ ויטע ה' אלקים גן י"ל האיר בו ממכ"ע בגילוי ולא כמו בעולמות שגם ממכ"ע מוסתר כמ"ש בת"א פ' חיי שרה ע"פ ואברהם זקן, אך המשכת תוס' אורות בג"ע היינו יחוד סוכ"ע וממכ"ע שהוא הגילוי מבחי' סוכ"ע כו'. וזהו ענין ויניחהו בג"ע לעבדה ולשמרה וארז"ל אלו הקרבנות כי בקרבנות נא' ריח ניחוח להוי' שע"י העלאת מ"ן מבירור נה"ב שזהו ענין ריח ע"ז ממשיכים ניחוח להוי' דהיינו המשכה בשם הוי' כמ"ש בלק"ת בשה"ש בד"ה לבתתני אחותי כלה ושם פ"א ובהקיצור, ובסוף דרושי שמע"צ בד"ה והקרבתם אשה עולה ריח ניחוח, ולכן הביהמ"ק נק' ג"כ גן כמשארז"ל ע"פ באתי לגני אחותי כלה כי זהו ע"ד ויניחהו בג"ע לעבדה ולשמרה שע"ז ממשיכים תוס' אור בג"ע כנ"ל, והקרבנות הן רו"ש כמ"ש בלק"ת פ' שלח בדרוש פ' נסכים ועכשיו התפלה במקום קרבנות יעו"ש, בענין כל הקורא ק"ש בלא תפילין כו'. אך ענין

From the Draft to the Book: Comparing the Models' Editorial Work

Concluding chapter of the research book, Volume III

What Is Examined Here

This chapter documents the final stage of preparing the reader's book: what the systems that read the draft proposed, which proposals addressed the same problem, what was ultimately chosen, and what can be learned from the difference between an impressive report and a useful correction. It continues the cross-cutting comparison in this volume, but concerns a different task. There, research processes, sources and inferences were examined; here, the editing of material already written is examined.

The comparison's main result is that the contributions complemented one another. Claude supplied the most detailed and extensive record among the three review reports on the same text. Grok Bot supplied a shorter list, including several independent refinements and a formulation chosen over the corresponding alternative. Heavy Grok reinforced the assessment of continuity in the places it read and raised one design proposal; it itself defined its examination as partial. Useful distinctions were also found in earlier comments by Grok 4.7. These facts describe the outputs before us, not a general ranking of the systems.

ChatGPT served here both as the tool for integrating the edits and as the tool for preparing this chapter. The evaluations below are therefore documented editorial determinations, not scores by an independent external examiner. The human initiator defined the book's purpose, described his experience, and decided on continuation of the

work. Proposals do not acquire Torah authority from the name of the system that proposed them.

Distinguishing the Stages of Work

The three final review reports have a common starting point: the book text preserved under ID `2f9f944`, with a hash beginning `d41548fc`. It was assembled from 44 files, with 20 chapters, 179 source passages and 629 notes. The copy received for consolidation was checked against the manifest: each part, as well as the assembled book, matched in size and hash. This is a technical integrity check; it does not prove that every sentence is correct or every source was re-opened.

Grok 4.7's comments belong to an earlier version, whose hash begins `be3de506`. They must not be counted as an additional review of the final version. Its status file reports nine comment files containing 93 proposals. The file tree examined contained eight comment files with 79 proposals; the file reported for parts 034–036 was not found in that tree. Thus 93 is a reported count, while 79 is the count of proposals available in the preserved dossier here. A documentary gap is not proof of a model's lack of capability, but it limits what can be attributed to it in this examination.

Output	Basis of comparison	Scope of reading according to the report	Recorded proposals	Limit of use here
Claude	Final review version	Declaration of reading the entire book, including notes; detailed reading map	24 records; 32 change locations	Determinations checked in context; no external verification of all sources was conducted here

Output	Basis of comparison	Scope of reading according to the report	Recorded proposals	Limit of use here
Grok Bot	Same final version	Declaration of reading the entire book, including notes	10 records	Some proposals overlap with Claude's; they must not be counted twice
Heavy Grok	Same final version	Partial examination; list of parts and explicit reservations	One record	The report must not be taken to show that unread parts have no problems
Grok 4.7	Earlier version	Partial working comments	79 available; 93 according to the status file	Preserved separately; only proposals checked against the final version were transferred to it
ChatGPT	Consolidation and editing tool	Checking proposals in context, editing and integrity checks	Not a parallel review report	No self-score of general quality and no declaration of rereading all sources

Metrics That Matter to the Reader

The three review reports on the final version contain 35 records altogether. This is not a count of 35 errors: some are stylistic alternatives, some overlap, and one Claude record includes nine index corrections. Severity too was assigned by each reviewer according to its judgment. Claude marked one record as essential; Grok Bot and Heavy did not mark any record as essential. This does not prove that one was always stricter and the other always more lenient.

Dimension	Claude	Grok Bot	Heavy Grok	Grok 4.7
Documentation of reading	Detailed, with division of the book and notes	Detailed, with ranges and checks	Open about its partial scope; descriptions of some parts are inconsistent	Status file and local maps; discrepancy between the file list and files found

Dimension	Claude	Grok Bot	Heavy Grok	Grok 4.7
Location of the proposal	Anchor, previous passage, alternative and explanation	Anchor, previous passage, alternative and explanation	One anchor and two ways of handling it	Local anchors and explanations in varying templates
Clear benefit in this round	Restoring qualifications, consistency of concepts, arithmetic and index	Precision in attribution, correction of a summary, distinction between two sources	Confirmation of continuity within the reading limits; clarification of the role of the notes heading	Sensitivity to terms, technical language and cumbersome phrasing
What was actually chosen	Most formulations directly; others in adapted or overlapping wording	Independent corrections and a preferred alternative in the “Merkavah” entry	Retaining the heading with wording clarifying that it belongs to the notes	Three local wording corrections; another distinction overlaps the final correction
Time and cost	No measurable log for comparison	No measurable log for comparison	No measurable log for comparison	No measurable log for comparison

The outputs were evaluated through practical questions: might the reader understand something that is not stated? Does the proposal restore a qualification? Does it clarify to whom a statement belongs? Can it be inserted at a defined location without damaging the source passage or note? Is the new formulation actually simpler? These met-

rics are more useful than an average score without a uniform sample and conditions.

Seven Cases Showing How a Determination Was Reached

1. A Correct Heading Matters Even When the Paragraph Itself Is Good

Chapter 10 had the heading “Wedged for the Third Time,” while the paragraph beneath it counted the formula’s occurrence in that chapter as the second. Claude pointed out the discrepancy. A heading describing the purpose of the entire paragraph was chosen: “נעוץ תחלתן בסופן” [Their Beginning Is Wedged in Their End]: Three Times in the Epistle. No change to the interpretation of the Epistle was required. This is a local correction, but it has a real role: preventing the reader from thinking a stage in the argument was missed.

2. A Small Word Determines the Degree of Confidence

The body of chapter 6 preserved “אפשר” [possible] and “קרוב לומר” [plausible to say], but the summary paragraph said that the level also applies to souls that descended and to aspects called worlds, without the same qualification. Claude asked for it to be restored. The correction was accepted both in the summary and in a nearby conclusion. The case shows why a summary needs separate examination: abbreviation can turn a possibility into a determination even when the body of the discussion is precise.

3. Two Reviews Encountered the Same Problem, and the Shorter Wording Was Preferred

The glossary entry “Merkavah” mentioned “the face of the ox” and “the face of the lion” alongside a reference to chapter 19, where the

central discussion is “the face of the ox and the face of the eagle.” Claude and Grok Bot noticed the conflation. Claude’s alternative also added an explanation of the roots according to chapter 19; Bot’s alternative immediately separated the Epistle’s wording about those enjoying the sacrifices from “the face of the lion and the face of the ox” in Likkutei Torah. Bot’s wording was chosen. The preference is local: in a glossary entry, directly separating the sources is sufficient and places less burden on the reader.

4. A Short Summary Can Say the Opposite of the Explanation

Chapter 8 explained that the letters of the name in the Holy Tongue are the created being’s vitality, not a label attached to it after its creation. The summary shortened this to “letters are not names.” Grok Bot asked to replace the formulation with “the letters are not labels attached to things after they have been created.” The proposal was accepted because it preserves the distinction in the chapter’s body. This is not an additional source or a new method, but a correction of the summary’s fidelity to the argument already written.

5. Correct Attribution Matters Even within an Exercise

An exercise in chapter 18 concerned the spelling “אבא ואימא” [father and mother], and at its end the Rebbe’s note “בשינוי לשון” [with a change of wording] was mentioned. As explained in the book’s notes, that statement refers to another quotation, from Bava Kamma. Bot identified that the reader might mistakenly connect it to the exercise’s question. A short clarification was added. The correction does not decide the reason for the difference in wording; it prevents attributing a note to a passage about which it was not stated.

6. A Repeated Heading Is Not Necessarily Needless Duplication

Heavy Grok proposed removing the heading "Further Study" from the notes section because it repeats the name of the part already appearing in the book's body. It also proposed retaining it as a marker for the notes section. Checking the context revealed the marker's usefulness: the heading separates the notes to chapter 20 from the notes to the methodological part. It was therefore not deleted but changed to "Notes to the Part 'Further Study.' " This is a case where the observation is useful, but deletion is not the preferred solution.

7. Earlier Documentation Prevents Later Exclusive Attribution

In an early Grok 4.7 sheet, record S-011-2 had already flagged the gloss "their status changed at the moment of departure." The same problem recurred in record CLAUDE-FINAL-023. Both proposals seek to say that the souls are no longer within the kelim without adding an unexplained assertion about a change in their status. This clarification was accepted in the final text. It must therefore not be presented as the later reviewer's exclusive discovery. The documentation also shows value in repetition: a distinction recorded earlier still needs an editor to preserve it in the version delivered.

What the Arithmetic and Index Taught

Claude and Bot both found that the summary counts six cases in which an error occurred in an earlier examination, although the seventh case also describes such an error. The decision was to correct the summary to seven, in accordance with the account already written, rather than retrospectively alter the case's story to fit the number.

Both also found a line in the source index — “Siddur im Dach — Chapter 17” — with no corresponding reference in the existing text. The line was removed; no reference was invented to justify the index. Alongside this, chapters were added to entries where they had been missing, and it was clarified that the index points to the places where the work is mainly discussed. A useful index requires correspondence to the content, not merely a list that appears complete.

In Claude’s nine index corrections and Bot’s additions, references within the book were checked. This check must not be expanded into a claim that every reference was rechecked in the printed source. This is the difference between valid navigation within the book and verification of a source outside it.

Time, Fatigue and Choosing a Tool

According to the research initiator’s personal estimate, work on the seven investigations required about six hours, and preparing the book from the material already collected required about sixty hours. There is no experimental clock here: searching, waiting, reading, writing and correcting were not measured in the same way, and some occurred in parallel. The time ratio describes the working experience, especially the gap between rapid production of material and preparation of a continuous book.

The difficulty was not only formulation. Moving files from system to system also required repeated checks: a file that appeared to have been saved was sometimes partial, or replaced by a reference to another file. In Heavy’s transfer, it was ultimately clarified that the report files in the repository did not contain the complete local text. The operator’s explanation concerning a particular connector’s size limit is documented as his testimony; it is not a general rule of GitHub or artificial intelligence. In the present consolidation process, all parts

of the book were transferred in full and checked by hashes. Technical feasibility depends on the tools and transfer method available to the worker.

The research initiator described stalls and long waits in several systems, particularly in his work with Astra, in contrast to continuous, rapid work in the final review he called Sonata. He said he used Astra at Medium, High, Extra High and the maximum level, and later Sol 6.1; on the review side he worked with Grok Heavy, Grok 4.7, Grok Bot and Claude, and in Claude with Fable, Opus and Sonata. The designations are recorded as supplied in the working environment, without determining that each is an official version name or that the report alone verifies which model ran each action.

The practical lesson from the testimony is to check suitability for the task. An “advanced” label, price or answer length is not enough. Complex research may require considerable depth; editing a given text also requires stability, consistency and the ability to return a complete file. From this documentation we cannot derive a table of speed or cost, so neither received numerical scores.

Responsibility of the Integrating Editor

The editor must distinguish accepting an observation from accepting its proposed wording. In the “Merkavah” entry, a shared observation was accepted and one alternative chosen. For the notes heading, the benefit of clarification was accepted, and deletion was replaced with a more precise name. Where an early comment and a later summary paragraph addressed the same gloss, credit was preserved for both witnesses.

Consolidation itself also requires checking. It is not enough to report that a proposal was “accepted”: one must see that it appears in the correct place, that the context still flows, and that no source pas-

sage or reference has disappeared. The final check compared the 179 source passages with the base text and preserved all 629 existing note keys. One new key was added for a reference to this chapter. This is not a declaration of a renewed review of every work of Kabbalah and Chassidut on which the explanation rests.

The Full Record of Determinations

Below are all the change locations resulting from the review reports, together with three earlier Grok 4.7 comments checked in the final version. Where numbers overlap, the relationship between the reports is indicated; the same paragraph was not corrected twice. Alternative proposals that were not chosen are preserved in the accompanying documentation dossier, and the main cases were discussed above. Additions to the personal account and the reference to this chapter are documented separately at the end of the record.

CLAUDE-FINAL-001

The heading was aligned with the paragraph counting three occurrences, including the occurrence under discussion as the second.

Before the correction

“Wedged” for the Third Time

In the final text

“נעוץ תחלתן בסופן” [Their Beginning Is Wedged in Their End]: Three Times in the Epistle

CLAUDE-FINAL-002

The designation “the Rebbe” was defined at its first mention.

Before the correction There we will also ask what can be learned from the Rebbe's words about the discovery of means of communication in their time

In the final text

There we will also ask what can be learned from the words of the Rebbe, His Holiness the Rebbe of Lubavitch, about the discovery of means of communication in their time

CLAUDE-FINAL-003

The explanation and the research volumes were named explicitly, so as not to confuse the project's two parts with four books.

Before the correction

The two books grow out of the same study.

In the final text

This explanation and the research volumes grow out of the same study.

CLAUDE-FINAL-004

The condition that the souls had not yet descended from Atzilut was preserved.

Before the correction

Later in the Epistle we will encounter souls that have departed from Atzilut, and the Alter Rebbe will describe them as "a likeness of an aspect of Divinity in immense contraction";

In the final text

Later in the Epistle we will encounter souls that have not yet descended from Atzilut, and the Alter Rebbe will describe them as "a likeness of an aspect of Divinity in immense contraction";

CLAUDE-FINAL-005

The question mark was restored in accordance with the wording already brought in the book's note; wording attributing it to the version in the note was chosen.

Before the correction

And in his notes he wrote: "אפילו [even]: refers to what precedes it ('משכלים נבדלים אפילו' [even than separate intellects]), for separate intellects mean angels".[^CH02-NEW-B02-CLAUDE-CH02-16]

In the final text

And in the version of his notes quoted in the note, it is written with a question mark at the end: "אפילו [even]: refers to what precedes it ('משכלים נבדלים אפילו' [even than separate intellects]), for separate intellects mean angels?".[^CH02-NEW-B02-CLAUDE-CH02-16]

CLAUDE-FINAL-006

The summary again preserved "possible" and "plausible to say."

Before the correction

It shows that the level of "a likeness of an aspect of Divinity" is broader than it first appears, and applies also to souls that have descended into this world and to aspects called worlds.

In the final text

It proposes, in terms of "possible" and "plausible to say," that the level of "a likeness of an aspect of Divinity" is broader than it first appears, and that it applies also to souls that have descended into this world and to aspects called worlds.

CLAUDE-FINAL-007

The brief reference was aligned with the reading explained in chapter 15, without proposing a new interpretation.

Before the correction

It is stated that the kav shines from below upward “from the outer dimension of the kelim of Malchut of Atzilut”

In the final text

It is stated that the kav shines from below upward to the light of the neshamah of the final level in Asiyah, and “from the outer dimension of the kelim of Malchut of Atzilut” is the origin of this light of the neshamah

CLAUDE-FINAL-008

An imprecise reference to a definition at the beginning of the chapter was removed.

Before the correction Extension — drawing down from a source to recipients, not expansion in space, as we defined at the beginning of the chapter.

In the final text

Extension — drawing down from a source to recipients, not expansion in space.

CLAUDE-FINAL-009

It was clarified that “דער רבי” [the Rebbe] in this quotation denotes the Baal Shem Tov.

Before the correction

The Rebbe, the Baal Shem Tov, says that “to Him” is the Divinity in the kelim of the ten sefirot of Atzilut.

In the final text

The Baal Shem Tov, whom the source here calls “דער רבי” [the Rebbe], says that “to Him” is the Divinity in the kelim of the ten sefirot of Atzilut.

CLAUDE-FINAL-010

The count was aligned with the three expressions detailed in the paragraph.

Before the correction

Now the two expressions we saw become clear

In the final text

Now the three expressions we saw become clear

CLAUDE-FINAL-011

The conclusion from the parallels was separated from the Epistle’s explicit wording.

Before the correction

From here the Epistle teaches that human service draws down higher lights in all the worlds, “which is the purpose of the creation of man,” and this purpose is realized in revelation in the lower world.

In the final text From here the Epistle teaches that human service draws down higher lights in all the worlds, “which is the purpose of the creation of man.” And according to the Tanya parallels brought in the chapter, this purpose is realized in revelation in the lower world.

CLAUDE-FINAL-012

The reading of "ומזה" [and from this] was marked as a proposal to be explained in the next chapter.

Before the correction

The "and from this" of the next sentence rests on the entire preceding argument: on the earth's power, on the end of the kav and on returning light, and also on what we learned here about sowing. It must not be restricted to the sowing sentence alone.

In the final text

According to the reading we will propose in the next chapter, the "and from this" of the next sentence rests on the entire preceding argument: on the earth's power, on the end of the kav and on returning light, and also on what we learned here about sowing. It must therefore not be restricted to the sowing sentence alone.

CLAUDE-FINAL-013

The definition of refinement was aligned with the definition used elsewhere in the book.

Before the correction

"Refinement" means the way in which a power is included in holiness and what is revealed through it.

In the final text

"Refinement" is, as we defined it, the service through which the good power is brought out of concealment and elevated to holiness.

CLAUDE-FINAL-014

The summary was corrected to seven cases according to the account of the seventh case; overlaps BOT-FINAL-002.

Before the correction

In six of the cases, an error also occurred in a review report or in the first proposed correction: in cases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8.

In the final text

In seven of the cases, an error also occurred in a review report or in the first proposed correction: in cases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

CLAUDE-FINAL-015

Grok Bot's wording, which directly separates the two sources, was chosen; overlaps BOT-FINAL-003.

Before the correction

"The face of the ox" and "the face of the lion" in the Merkavah are mentioned as the root of the souls of living creatures. See chapters 17, 19.

In the final text

The Epistle mentions "the face of the ox and the face of the eagle" in the Merkavah, which enjoy and are nourished by the spirit of the animal and bird in the sacrifices (chapters 2, 19); Likkutei Torah mentions "the face of the lion and the face of the ox" as the root of the souls of living creatures (chapters 2, 17).

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.1

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the two discourses "צו את בני ישראל" [Command the Children of Israel] — chapters 14, 17, 19.

In the final text

- Likkutei Torah, Pinchas, the two discourses "צו את בני ישראל" [Command the Children of Israel] — chapters 14, 17, 19, 20.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.2

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer], chapter כז [27] — chapter 7.

In the final text

- Derech Mitzvotecha, Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer], chapter כז [27] — chapters 7, 13.
- Derech Mitzvotecha, Mitzvat Achdut Hashem [The Mitzvah of the Unity of G-d], chapter ב [2] — chapter 13.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.3

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Derech Mitzvotecha, other places (Mitzvat Haamanat Elokut [The Mitzvah of Belief in Divinity] ח [8]; Minui Melech [Appointing a King] ג [3]; Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah [The Root of the Mitzvah of Prayer] מו ,[26] כו ,[3–2] ג–ב [46]) — chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

In the final text

- Derech Mitzvotecha, other places (Mitzvat Haamanat Elokut [The Mitzvah of Belief in Divinity] ח [8]; Minui Melech [Appointing a King] ג [3]; Periyah u-Reviya [Being Fruitful and Multiplying], section ב [2]; Shoresh Mitzvat HaTefillah [The Root of the Mitzvah of

Prayer] מו ,[26] כו ,[11] יא ,[7] ז ,[4–2] ב–ד [46]) — chapters 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.4

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, Discourses for Shavuot — chapter 14.

In the final text

- Or HaTorah, Bamidbar, Discourses for Shavuot — chapters 14, 16.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.5

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Likkutei Torah, Shelach — chapter 8.

In the final text

- Likkutei Torah, Shelach — chapters 8, 16.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.6

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- HaYom Yom, י"א [11] Tishrei — chapter 13.

In the final text

- HaYom Yom, י"א [11] Tishrei — chapters 1, 13.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.7

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Tanya LaAm [Tanya for the People] — introduction; Further Study.

In the final text

- Tanya LaAm [Tanya for the People] — chapter 11; introduction; Further Study.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.8

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Rashi on the Torah — chapters 3, 5, 6.

In the final text

- Rashi — chapters 3, 5, 6, 16, 18.

CLAUDE-FINAL-016.9

The index was expanded according to existing occurrences in the book's body and notes.

Before the correction

- Kitzurim VeHaarot LeTanya [Summaries and Notes on Tanya] — chapter 20; Study Cases (case 4).

In the final text

- Kitzurim VeHaarot LeTanya [Summaries and Notes on Tanya] — chapter 20; Study Cases (case 4).

- Haarot VeTikkunim LeTanya [Notes and Corrections to Tanya] (the table of notes the Rebbe attached to Tanya) — chapters 14, 16, 18.

CLAUDE-FINAL-017

An index line without a reference in the existing text was deleted; overlaps BOT-FINAL-005.

Before the correction

- Siddur im Dach [Prayer Book with Chassidic Discourses] — chapter 17.

In the final text

The line was removed; no replacement text was added.

CLAUDE-FINAL-018

The reader was directed to the existing identification lines, rather than the margins; overlaps BOT-FINAL-009.

Before the correction

Counting letters is a different check, and is not the number displayed in the margins.

In the final text

Counting letters is a different check, and is not the number displayed in the identification lines.

CLAUDE-FINAL-019

“גם” [also] was aligned with the paragraph’s continuation, which states that nullification can exist even without apprehension.

Before the correction

The created being's nullification "קמיה" [before Him] is true nullification, and it exists specifically when the source is not apprehended by the created being.

In the final text

The created being's nullification "קמיה" [before Him] is true nullification, and it exists also when the source is not apprehended by the created being.

CLAUDE-FINAL-020

It was clarified that the exercise uses three of the four reading questions.

Before the correction

Does it distinguish between the three questions: where is the thing, from what did it come into being, and what is its status?

In the final text

Does it distinguish between three of the chapter's four reading questions: where is the thing, from what did it come into being, and what is its status?

CLAUDE-FINAL-021

The qualification was preserved in a conclusion resting on a possibility.

Before the correction

It follows that the decisive factor is the soul's relationship to its source, not the place to which it descended.

In the final text

It follows that, according to this possibility, the decisive factor is the soul's relationship to its source, not the place to which it descended.

CLAUDE-FINAL-022

The abbreviation was explained in editorial brackets, without changing the wording of the source passage.

Before the correction

מבחי׳ א״ס ב״ה הסוכ״ע רק שהוא ע״י אותיות אלו כו׳׳.

[From the aspect of Ein Sof, blessed be He, encompassing all worlds, except that it is through these letters, etc.”]

In the final text

מבחי׳ א״ס ב״ה הסוכ״ע [הסובב כל עלמין] רק שהוא ע״י אותיות אלו כו׳׳.

[From the aspect of Ein Sof, blessed be He, encompassing all worlds [that which encompasses all worlds], except that it is through these letters, etc.”]

CLAUDE-FINAL-023

The gloss described departure from the kelim, without an additional statement about a change in status. The same point had already been recorded in Grok 4.7’s S-011-2.

Before the correction

“שכבר” [already] — already upon their departure, not at a later stage; their status changed at the moment of departure.

In the final text

“שכבר” [already] — already upon their departure, not at a later stage; at the moment of departure they are already no longer within the kelim.

CLAUDE-FINAL-024

The formulation was aligned with the definition of revelation as actual manifestation, not necessarily physical seeing.

Before the correction

Here the Epistle shows where it becomes visible to the eye: in a soul, an angel and a palace, when they emerge as a separate existence.

In the final text

Here the Epistle shows where it becomes manifest in actuality: in a soul, an angel and a palace, when they emerge as a separate existence.

BOT-FINAL-001

Attaching the Rebbe's note to a quotation that is not the subject of the note was prevented.

Before the correction

The Rebbe's note "בשינוי לשון" [with a change of wording] likewise records the change without explaining its reason.

In the final text

The Rebbe's note "בשינוי לשון" [with a change of wording], written about the citation of Rav Nachman's words from Bava Kamma and not about "אבא ואימא" [father and mother], likewise records the change without explaining its reason.

BOT-FINAL-004

The summary was aligned with the distinction between the life-giving name and an external label.

Before the correction that letters are not names, but the vitality of things;

In the final text

that the letters are not labels attached to things after they have been created, but their vitality;

BOT-FINAL-007

The recurring analogy was connected to its appearance in chapter 1.

Before the correction

The Tzemach Tzedek, in Derech Mitzvotecha, illustrates this relationship with an analogy. A king gives a gift, sometimes with his right hand and sometimes with his left hand.

In the final text

We already encountered the king analogy brought by the Tzemach Tzedek in Derech Mitzvotecha in chapter 1; here it illustrates this relationship from the perspective of the action. A king gives a gift, sometimes with his right hand and sometimes with his left hand.

BOT-FINAL-008

The editorial role was described without assuming an unexplained identity.

Before the correction

and to collect before the editor the points requiring examination.

In the final text

and to collect before whoever edits the explanation the points requiring examination.

BOT-FINAL-010

The reading map explained that “unit” also denotes a source passage.

Before the correction

The Epistle’s wording is brought in each chapter in short passages, within a quotation frame.

In the final text The Epistle's wording is brought in each chapter in short passages, within a quotation frame; in the chapters, such a passage is sometimes also called a "unit."

BOT-FINAL-006.1

The index reference was updated and its scope clarified. The HaYom Yom reference had already been corrected in Claude's overlapping proposal.

Before the correction

- Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle יד [14] — chapter 15.

In the final text

- Tanya, Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle יד [14] — chapters 15, 16.

BOT-FINAL-006.2

The index reference was updated and its scope clarified. The HaYom Yom reference had already been corrected in Claude's overlapping proposal.

Before the correction

- Discourse beginning "ונגלה כבוד ה'" [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722 — chapter 18.

In the final text

- Discourse beginning "ונגלה כבוד ה'" [And the Glory of G-d Shall Be Revealed], 5722 — chapters 18, 20.

BOT-FINAL-006.3

The index reference was updated and its scope clarified. The HaYom Yom reference had already been corrected in Claude's overlapping proposal.

Before the correction

— chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17.

In the final text

— all chapters; its wording is brought continuously in the source passages.

BOT-FINAL-006.4

The index reference was updated and its scope clarified. The HaYom Yom reference had already been corrected in Claude's overlapping proposal.

Before the correction

It shows in which chapters, or which parts of the book, each work is discussed.

In the final text

It shows the chapters, or parts of the book, in which each work is mainly discussed; a source mentioned in passing may not be recorded in every place where it occurs.

GROK-FINAL-001

The alternative preserving the marker for the notes section was chosen, while clarifying that it is the name of a notes section, not a repeated opening of the book's body.

Before the correction

Further Study — Research Tools and Artificial Intelligence

In the final text

Notes to the Part "Further Study"

THOROUGH47-S040-1

The wording proposal from the earlier version was checked at the corresponding place in the final version. The research qualification and source content were preserved.

Before the correction

That the exact expression was not found in the places examined does not prove that it is absent from the rest of the literature.

In the final text

The exact expression was not found in the places examined; this is not evidence that it is absent from the rest of the literature.

THOROUGH47-S040-6

The wording proposal from the earlier version was checked at the corresponding place in the final version. The research qualification and source content were preserved.

Before the correction

The precise reference in the apparatus to the source of the note was not opened here.

In the final text

The precise reference to the source from which the note was brought was not opened here.

THOROUGH47-S037-6

The wording proposal from the earlier version was checked at the corresponding place in the final version. The research qualification and source content were preserved.

Before the correction

names of “partzufim””

In the final text

names of ‘partzufim”’

Map of the 35 Final-Review Records

The table returns each record to its place, including records merged with a proposal by another reviewer. “Accepted” indicates that the problem was addressed; it does not mean that all the alternatives in that record were inserted into the text together.

ID	Priority in the report	Editorial handling
CLAUDE-FINAL-001	Essential	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-002	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-003	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-004	Desirable	Accepted

ID	Priority in the report	Editorial handling
CLAUDE-FINAL-005	Desirable	Accepted in adapted wording
CLAUDE-FINAL-006	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-007	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-008	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-009	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-010	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-011	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-012	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-013	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-014	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-015	Desirable	The observation was accepted; Bot’s wording was chosen
CLAUDE-FINAL-016	Desirable	Accepted; the nine index items are detailed separately
CLAUDE-FINAL-017	Desirable	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-018	Possible	Accepted

ID	Priority in the report	Editorial handling
CLAUDE-FINAL-019	Possible	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-020	Possible	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-021	Possible	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-022	Possible	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-023	Possible	Accepted
CLAUDE-FINAL-024	Possible	Accepted
BOT-FINAL-001	Desirable	Accepted
BOT-FINAL-002	Desirable	Merged with CLAUDE-FINAL-014
BOT-FINAL-003	Desirable	Its wording was chosen; merged with CLAUDE-FINAL-015
BOT-FINAL-004	Desirable	Accepted

ID	Priority in the report	Editorial handling
BOT-FINAL-005	Desirable	Merged with CLAUDE-FINAL-017
BOT-FINAL-006	Possible	Accepted; the HaYom Yom reference was merged with CLAUDE-FINAL-016.6
BOT-FINAL-007	Possible	Accepted
BOT-FINAL-008	Possible	Accepted
BOT-FINAL-009	Possible	Merged with CLAUDE-FINAL-018
BOT-FINAL-010	Possible	Accepted
GROK-FINAL-001	Possible	The alternative retaining the heading in clarifying wording was accepted

What Was Added at the Research Initiator's Request

These additions are not credited to any one of the review reports. The foreword gained a short account of the six- and sixty-hour estimates, the difficulty of transferring files, and the effort of the work. In the paragraph about working times, the old formulation that no number of hours had been established was removed, and the status of the personal estimate was clarified instead. Tool names and experience with them were collected in an existing note and a brief mention in the "Further Study" part. A reference to the present chapter was added,

and the original volumes' extents were defined as data preceding this addition.

The computerized determination record preserves the previous and new passage for every action. A total of 53 replacement or addition operations were carried out: 42 originating in the three final review reports, three wording comments from the earlier sheets, and eight operations connected with the personal account, documentation and the new research chapter. The operation count is not an error count: it also depends on how corrections are packaged in the file.

The Available Grok 4.7 Files

The following files are supplied in the documentation dossier in their original language. They belong to an earlier stage; apart from the three proposals checked and brought above, there is no renewed decision here to accept or reject each of the 79 proposals. The overlapping point S-011-2 was documented in the seventh case study.

File	Available proposals
`011-012.md`	4
`013-015.md`	14

File	Available proposals
`019-021.md`	8
`022-024.md`	8
`025-028.md`	11
`031-033.md`	14
`037-039.md`	12
`040-044.md`	8

File 034–036 appears in the status list with 14 additional proposals, but was not found in the tree examined. It is not reconstructed from imagination, and is not included in the count of 79. A small change

in delivery format — a file not uploaded — changes the editor's ability to use work already reported.

Documentation Sources and Limits of the Conclusion

The book edited: repository `ariepresman-code/iggeret-hakodesh`, folder `research/igk20/drafts/editor-r5`, ID `2f9f944559539c21cbb1a691dfbc52ba166f8bbc`. The full hash is preserved in the manifest and verification file attached to the output. The source PDF for Volume III is the part beginning at page 1458 of the 2203-page research edition; the preceding pages were preserved, and this chapter was added from page 2204.

- Claude's review dossier. Delivery ID: `3c274a0`.
- Grok Bot's review dossier. Delivery ID: `f18d44f`.
- The Heavy Grok dossier in the repository. The report text and reading map supplied to the editor in the research initiator's message were used to complete the picture; the operator reported that the repository copies were partial. Do not assume that the link alone contains the complete transfer.
- Grok 4.7's working sheets. An earlier version; eight proposal files were actually found.
- The research initiator's testimony about hours, tool names, stalls and work with Sonata was supplied in the concluding conversation. It is preserved as personal testimony, without deriving unmeasured cost or time data from it.

The review reports were not written within a uniform blinded experiment, and the reviewers worked under different access conditions. Not all external sources were reexamined here. The practical conclusion therefore concerns the method of work: require a proposal that can be located and checked, preserve evidentiary limits, distinguish

a full reading from a partial examination, and verify that the wording chosen actually reached the reader in full.