



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 18 | Korach | Sichah 5

Gifting G-dliness

Translated by Rabbi Shmuel Kesselman

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | Editor: Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2023 05783

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Words in bold type are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while maintaining readability. As in all translations, however, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

Feedback is appreciated — please send comments to: info@projectlikkuteisichos.org

1.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE GIFTS AND KORACH

The following passage:¹ “And I, behold! I have given you the safeguard of My offerings, of all the sanctities of the Children of Israel....,” which discusses the gifts given to the kohanim, and the narrative of Korach’s dispute, appearing earlier in the *parshah*, are placed near each other (and are thus connected). *Sifri* explains this connection (and Rashi quotes it):² After “Korach came and protested against Aharon over the priesthood,” Hashem said that to solidify Aharon’s entitlement to the priesthood, He would compose and sign a deed and ratify it in the court. Hashem accomplished all this through the priestly gifts.

We need to clarify:

This idea explains the connection and continuation between the **priestly** gifts and Korach’s dispute. But what is the connection between the narrative of Korach’s dispute and the **tithe** given to the **Levites**? (“And to the sons of Levi, I have given every tithe....”³ This verse appears immediately afterwards, in the same statement as the instructions of “*I am your share*⁴ — the gifts that I have given you, they are your share”⁵ — the priestly gifts.)

Moreover, not only is the discussion regarding the Levites’ tithe unrelated to the narrative concerning Korach’s dispute, its content appears to be the complete opposite. Korach disputed **only** the priesthood — “yet you seek priesthood”⁶ — **not** the rights of the Levites. This is because Korach himself was a Levite (and, in fact, one of the most **prominent** Levites — “the son of Yitzhar, the son of Kehas”)!⁷

¹ *Bamidbar* 18:8.

² Rashi on *Bamidbar* 18:8.

³ *Bamidbar* 18:21.

⁴ {*Bamidbar* 18:20.}

⁵ *Targum Onkelos* on *Bamidbar* 18:20.

⁶ *Bamidbar* 16:10.

⁷ *Bamidbar* 16:1.

Perhaps we might answer that this itself explains the connection: Korach was a member of the tribe of Levi, and he, together with other members of his tribe, instigated the dispute. Their identity as Levites fueled their dispute and provided the grounds for their claim. This is evident from Moshe's response, "Listen now, sons of Levi: Is it not enough for you that the G-d of Israel has segregated you from the assembly of Israel... to perform the service... and he drew you near, and all your brethren the offspring of Levi, with you, **yet you seek priesthood.**"⁸ Thus, we could mistakenly presume that, as a result of this dispute, the prominence and role of the tribe of Levi was diminished, G-d forbid. Therefore, **together** with the commandment regarding the priestly gifts, Hashem also instructed them to give a tithe to the Levites, etc. This indicates that the Levites kept their prominence.

This answer is problematic, however, because Torah teaches about the tithes **in continuation** of its discussion of the priestly gifts, and uses a "vav" {and}⁹ which shows that the second {the tithe} is **additional** to the first. Thus, the connection between the Levites' tithes and the narrative of Korach's dispute is of the **same** nature as the connection between the priestly gifts and the narrative of Korach's dispute. Meaning, the Torah records it {here} to emphasize the advantage, from the outset, of the role of the Levites, and not (just) to forestall the thought that the advantage was lost.

Additionally, since everything in Torah is absolutely precise, we must presume that the connection between the gifts given to the kohanim and to the Levites, and Korach's dispute, is not just a general one (that the priestly gifts **only** serve as a symbol, bolstering Aharon's priesthood in the wake of the protest).¹⁰ Rather, we must presume that the **specifics** of the laws regarding the gifts given to the kohanim and the Levites share some connection with Korach's dispute, and in some way, refute Korach's allegation.

⁸ *Bamidbar* 16:8, ff.

⁹ *Bamidbar* 18:21, "And to the sons of Levi...."

¹⁰ Especially since there was already a demonstration of this from the fact that "Aharon's staff blossomed" (*Bamidbar* 17:23) and it was placed "as a safekeeping, as a sign — as a remembrance that I chose Aharon" (*Bamidbar* 17:25 and Rashi, loc. cit.).

2.

DIVISION

In the past, we have discussed at length:¹¹ *Noam Elimelech*¹² writes that the idea behind Korach's actions was — as the *Targum* translates it¹³ — “Korach **divided**.” This is analogous to the “firmament that separated between the waters,”¹⁴ dividing and splitting the higher and lower. This explains what the dispute about Aharon's priesthood was really about.

A kohen is totally segregated from worldly matters. He busies himself exclusively with holy matters, as it says,¹⁵ “Aharon was **set apart**, to sanctify him as **holy of holies**, he and his sons forever.”

Moreover, Aharon was the Kohen Gadol about whom it states,¹⁶ “He shall not leave the Sanctuary — {Korach and his assembly therefore claimed} “Why then do you raise yourselves above Hashem's congregation?”¹⁷ — That is, how and why does Aharon's holiness and elevation influence the Jewish people (the congregation of Hashem), also to become **separated** from worldly matters, when in fact their *avodah*¹⁸ is to **engage** with physical matters, making them vessels for G-dliness?

Therefore, their protest, “Why then do you raise yourselves above Hashem's congregation?” was not at odds with their desire to be kohanim themselves. Korach wanted a different sort of priesthood, one that had no connection with “the entire congregation.”¹⁹

¹¹ See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 8, p. 166 ff., and the sources cited there.

¹² Quoted and explained in *Or Hatorah*, “Korach,” pp. 697 and p. 723; also discussed in *Sefer HaMaamarim* 5627, s.v., “kol peter rechem.”

¹³ And Rashi quotes it at the beginning of the *parshah*.

¹⁴ *Bereishis* 1:7.

¹⁵ *Divrei HaYamim I* 23:13.

¹⁶ *Vayikra* 21:12.

¹⁷ *Bamidbar* 16:3.

¹⁸ {Divine service.}

¹⁹ {*Bamidbar* 16:3.}

This resembles something we find in the realm of holiness regarding Shammai.²⁰ As a result of his integrity²¹ — “he pushed him away with the builder’s cubit in his hand.”²² “When Beis Shammai expresses an opinion with which Beis Hillel disagrees, their {Beis Shammai’s} opinion is considered as if it were not recorded in the Mishnah.”²³ This {discounting of Beis Shammai’s opinion} is because Beis Shammai’s approach {was uncompromising} characterized by what it says, “He measures {*sham*} his path... exacting in his ways.”²⁴

Another example: Concerning Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai and his colleagues, it states, “Many tried to act according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai and were unsuccessful.”²⁵ Furthermore, Rabbi Eliezer, his son (and colleague), even after the thirteenth year in the cave, would “smite.”²⁶

This explains why the instructions regarding the gifts for the kohanim follow the narrative of Korach’s dispute. The priestly gifts express the connection and relationship between the Jewish people and the kohanim — the Jewish people give of their possessions to the kohanim (who are removed from materialistic matters). Meaning, the Jewish people **elevate** their physical possessions, which become priestly gifts. The effect of this giving was far-reaching. In fact, regarding these gifts, it says, “I {Hashem} am their portion,” as discussed above — they give these possessions to **Hashem**.

But ostensibly, this answer does not suffice: True, practically Korach contested the priesthood, and Aharon’s priesthood, in particular. However, his intention (and his perspective on the priesthood) was that the people and kohanim be related only in a detached way. Korach did not want a **fusion** between the “lower” — the world, and the “higher” — holiness and G-dliness. Accordingly, the way to “rectify” {Korach’s mistake} is to dedicate **completely**

²⁰ Whose soul-source was from the vector of *Gevurah* (*Zohar*, vol. 3, 245a; see the Introduction to *Tanya*).

²¹ See *Bava Basra* 160b, which speaks about *kohanim* who were quick tempered.

²² *Shabbos* 31a. {The *Gemara* tells of a man who came to Shammai and asked Shammai to teach him the entire Torah while he stood on one foot. This was Shammai’s response.}

²³ *Berachos* 36b.

²⁴ *Likkutei Torah*, “*Shir Hashirim*,” 48c.

²⁵ *Berachos* 35b.

²⁶ *Shabbos* 33b.

materialistic matters to Hashem. (This effects a total fusion of the supernal with the lower terrestrial — a physical object becoming completely holy. This is like sacrifices offered on the Altar to Hashem, which become absolutely holy.) But **priestly** gifts, in general, do not serve this purpose, for the priestly gifts were **eaten (benefitted from) by the kohanim**, and several of the priestly gifts were *chulin*.²⁷

3.

WHAT DID KORACH WANT?

In many years, we read *parshas Korach* in the week of the third of Tammuz (or — like in this year²⁸ — on the day itself), the day when my father-in-law, the Rebbe, was freed from imprisonment in the year 5687 (1927).

Based on the widely acknowledged principle that everything is ordained by Divine providence, and especially according to *Shelah*, who writes²⁹ that all the festivals are alluded to in the *parshah* that we read at the time of the festival, we can presume that the (substance of the) day has some connection to the content of *parshas Korach*.

Based on the aforementioned explanation regarding Korach's dispute, perhaps we can explain this connection straightforwardly:

Korach was not bothered by the priesthood, per se — by the fact that the kohanim were to be segregated from materialistic matters. As discussed above, he was opposed to kohanim **sharing** this holiness with “the entire congregation.”

The same is true regarding the people who opposed the work of the Friediker Rebbe, and who persecuted the Rebbe: They were not disturbed by his

²⁷ {Mundane, i.e., not consecrated to the altar, and thus not subject to any of the rules of consecrated foods.}

²⁸ {5724 (1964)}

²⁹ *Shnei Luchos HaBris*, s.v., “*Torah Shebiksav*,” beg. of “*Parshas Vayeishev*.”

personal *avodah* of Torah and mitzvos. Rather, his work of “**spreading** Torah to the entire breadth of our country”³⁰ — to all the Jewish people who lived in that country — is what perturbed them. (And for this, they had the Frierdiker Rebbe arrested.)

Similarly, through his release on the third of Tammuz, Hashem demonstrated in a revealed way to all that the Rebbe could continue his work of **spreading** Torah. This resembles the way Hashem squashed Korach’s allegations. To solidify Aharon’s entitlement to the priesthood, Hashem, {as it were} “composed and signed a deed giving the priesthood to Aharon, and ratified it in the court.”

But seemingly, these two events are not entirely similar: The third of Tammuz was not the day when the Rebbe was freed (fully; he was merely released from prison). Afterwards, he was then sent into exile (to Kastrama), where he could not continue his work spreading Torah in the appropriate manner. Only **later**, on the twelfth and thirteenth day of Tammuz, was he completely freed. (And even afterwards, difficulties persisted until he emigrated from that country.)³¹

We must conclude that the comparison between the Rebbe’s release and the idea of “composed and signed a deed giving the priesthood to Aharon, and ratified it in the court,” is related the stage of his release and redemption as it was restricted (at least, superficially) within the limitations of exile in the hands of those who had him arrested.

³⁰ The Frierdiker Rebbe’s letter regarding the celebration of these days — 15 Sivan 5688 (printed in *Sefer Hamaamorim* 5688, p. 146).

³¹ See *Sefer HaToldos* of the Frierdiker Rebbe (Kefar Chabad, 5733), vol 3.

4.

WHY NOT MORE?

We will clarify this by prefacing with a simple question about the priestly gifts (and similarly, about tithes):

The gifts³² that a Jew must give to a kohen comprise specific (small) portions of the Jew's possessions. Even *terumah*,³³ *challah*,³⁴ and the like — gifts to the kohen that a Jew had to take from the **first** of a possession — have a measurement. The gift needed only to be the first {of the produce or dough} (and even rabbinically, regarding *terumah*, a generous person would give 1/40th,³⁵ and the same is true regarding *challah*).³⁶ But a person was not obligated to give all his produce as *terumah*, etc. In fact, the law requires that the gift be one for which “the remainder is of a recognizable quantity.”³⁷ The same is true of tithes. They are only one tenth of the person's fruits and produce.

This raises a question: We can understand why the Torah gives a minimum requirement; and why a person cannot give less than a certain amount. But why is there a maximum? Why may a person not give away and consecrate all his possessions to Hashem? (And regarding many of the gifts, not only can the person not give all his property to Hashem, but he cannot give more than a specific amount.)³⁸ In fact, *Rambam* rules:³⁹ “A person should never consecrate or designate all his property as a dedication offering. A person who does so violates the Torah's guidance.... Instead, a person who dispenses his money {to *tzedakah*} should not dispense more than a fifth.”

³² *Bava Kamma* 110b; *Chulin* 133b; *Tosefta*, “*Challah*,” ch. 2; *Sifri*, “*Korach*,” 18:20; *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Bikkurim*.”

³³ {*Terumah* — A Torah commandment to give a portion of the harvest to a kohen.}

³⁴ {The halachic definition of *challah* is a reference to Positive Mitzvah #133. It entails separating a section of dough from your kneading and giving it to a kohen. This piece of dough is called “*challah*.” Any dough that is made of wheat, barley, spelt, oat or rye is obligated in this mitzvah. The kohen and his family would eat the *challah* while in a state of ritual purity. The rabbis established that a home baker should give 1/24th of the dough to the kohen, while a commercial baker has to donate 1/48th of his dough.}

³⁵ *Terumos* 4:3.

³⁶ *Challah* 2:7.

³⁷ *Chulin* 136b.

³⁸ The Sages say not to tithe by estimation (*Avos* 1:16).

³⁹ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Arachin VeCharamin*,” ch. 8, par. 13.

5.

CHESED AND GEVURAH

The explanation for all the above:

Chassidus⁴⁰ explains the difference between a kohen and a levite. The kohen is a man of *chesed*,⁴¹ kindness; and the levite is emblematic of *gevurah*, restraint. Korach (who was a levite), through his dispute over Aharon's priesthood, sought *gevurah* to overpower *chesed*, that levites serve in the place of kohanim.

In a person's *avodah*, the difference between *chesed* and *gevurah* is as follows: *Chesed* elicits bounty from Above to below — “returning” {*shov*}⁴² to the world. *Gevurah* elevates from down below to Above — “running” {*ratzo*} (escaping the world).

Thus, the source of Korach's claim was that he wanted the primary *avodah* to be that of *gevurah*, the *avodah* of *ratzo* and ascent.

Korach believed that the lower planes, **in and of themselves**, were not vessels for G-dliness. Therefore, they must experience *ratzo* — a movement of escaping their current status as being “lower” and elevate themselves to G-dliness.

[This idea does not contradict what was discussed above (and explained in other sources)⁴³ that Korach fought against the idea that the kohanim (and especially the Kohen Gadol) elicit a desire in all Jewish people to elevate themselves by their *avodah* here in the world. Since this desire comes about

⁴⁰ *Ohr HaTorah*, parshas *Korach*, p. 686, p. 692; parshas *Acharei* p. 541; *Tehillim Yahel Ohr*, p. 190; *Sefer HaMaamarim* 5627, s.v., “kol peter rechem”; *Hemshech “Ayin Beis,”* vol. 2, p. 1043; see *Likkutei Torah*, “*Korach*,” 54b ff.; *Sefer HaLikkutim*, “*Korach*.”

⁴¹ *Zohar*, vol. 3, 45b; *Tanya*, “*Likkutei Amarim*,” beg. of ch. 50.

⁴² {*Ratzo VaShov*: (Chassidic term; lit., “run and return”) *Ratzo* is a state of longing to cleave to Hashem; the passionate desire of the soul to transcend its material existence, to “run forward” and cleave to its Source; *shov* is the soul's sober determination to “return” and fulfill its mission in the body, the resolve to live within material reality, knowing that this is Hashem's ultimate intent.}

⁴³ *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 8, p. 106 ff.; p. 116 ff.

through Aharon the kohen, a man of *chesed*, who would elicit and diffuse G-dliness from Above into the world as it exists below, Aharon ensured that the Jewish person's desire to ascend would not be a desire to **escape** the **lower world**. Rather, the lower world, in its current state, should become a vessel for G-dliness. This process **resembles** the teachings, "Let all **your actions** be for the sake of the name of Heaven,"⁴⁴ and, "In all **your ways** know Him."⁴⁵

For this reason, the refutation of Korach's argument and the correction of its fallout was not through sacrifices and sanctified items, which are given entirely to Hashem by being offered on the altar. Rather, the refutation and correction came about specifically through the priestly gifts:

Offering sacrifices (and, in general, the idea of sanctified items, wherein a Jewish person consecrates his belongings to Hashem) does not demonstrate the fact that **lowly** physical objects, as they are, can house G-dliness. This is because the sacrificial animals leave the realm of the mundane; they lose their connection to the person, down here, and they become holy — they are offered on the altar.

The priestly gifts, however, are different. A person would give away some of his own possessions to the kohen, who would consume it. And it would be "for distinction — for greatness,"⁴⁶ "similar to the way kings — even non-Jewish kings — eat,"⁴⁷ to the extent that many of the priestly gifts (that apply outside of Israel) remain *chulin*. Specifically, in this way, is it evident and emphasized that the earthly matters, even in their current state (as *chulin*) can connect with G-dliness.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Avos 2:12.

⁴⁵ Mishlei 3:6.

⁴⁶ Rashi on Bamidbar 18:8.

⁴⁷ Zevachim 91a.

⁴⁸ Note *Derech Mitzvosecha*, "Mitzvas Achilas Kadshei Kadashim Lakohanim," and the *maamar* entitled, "Vehu Omed Aleihem" 5663, which states that the consumption by the Altar {i.e., burning the offering} is the refinement and elevation from below upwards, whereas the consumption by the kohanim is the drawing from Above downwards. See further on inside the text.

6.

SPECIFICALLY MAASER MAKES THE POINT

However, the priestly gifts do not thoroughly emphasize how even earthly matters, in their current state as “lower,” can connect with G-dliness.

This is because:

a) Most of the priestly gifts⁴⁹ — the ten in the Temple and the four in Jerusalem — are **first** consecrated as holy. Only afterwards does the owner become obligated to give them to the kohen. And, “they receive them from the table of the **Most High**.”⁵⁰ The same applies to *terumah*, *bikurim*, and *challah*. First, they are uplifted and given to Hashem, and only afterwards, they are given to the kohen. As the verse emphasizes in our *parshah*,⁵¹ “Their first, which **they give to Hashem**, to you have I given them,” “The first fruits of everything that is in their land, which **they bring to Hashem**, shall be yours,”⁵² “**You shall give to Hashem, *terumah***.”⁵³ And even property stolen from a convert, “Hashem acquires it” first, and later it is given to the kohen.⁵⁴

b) Even the other priestly gifts — the ten gifts⁵⁵ that are given outside the Temple — are all items that even while in a Jewish person’s possession, already belong to the kohen,⁵⁶ such as the “gifts” of the (animal) front leg, jaw and maw, the field of inheritance, and the fields of *cheirem*.⁵⁷

⁴⁹ For what follows, see *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 71 and the sources cited there; vol 8, pp. 33 ff.

⁵⁰ *Bava Kamma* 13a.

⁵¹ *Bamidbar* 18:12 (*terumah*).

⁵² *Bamidbar* 18:13 (*bikurim*).

⁵³ *Bamidbar* 15:21 (*challah*).

⁵⁴ {If someone robbed a convert who then died without heirs, the robber is to return the item to a kohen whose priestly watch was active at the time.} *Bava Kamma* 109b; Rashi on *Bamidbar* 5:8. Although in *Devarim* 18:3-4 {when discussing *terumah* etc.} it says, “This shall be the due of the kohanim from the people..., the first of your grain..., and the first of the shearing of your flock **you shall give to him**.”

⁵⁵ *Terumah* and *challah* that were mentioned earlier are also among “the ten gifts that are given outside the Temple,” according to how this division {of priestly gifts} is outlined in the Gemara and Rambam.

⁵⁶ See Responsa of *Rashba* (vol. 1, sec. 18; and *Abudraham, shaar* 3; et al.), where he explains that one does not recite a blessing on gifts given to the kohanim, because the kohanim receive them from the table of the Most High, not from the giver. See also *Encyclopedia Talmudis*, “*Birkas HaMazon*.”

⁵⁷ Note *Bechoros* 32a which states: “*Charamim*, as long as they are in the owner’s possession, are like consecrated property in all respects...” {Fields that a person consecrated to Hashem using the term “*cherem*,” without

[Additionally, these “gifts,” and the fields of inheritance,⁵⁸ are not mentioned explicitly in our *parshah*.⁵⁹ And those “gifts” (as our Sages say)⁶⁰ were gifted by Hashem to the kohanim as reward for Pinchas’ zealous deed, which occurred only later.]

For this reason, following on from the details of the priestly gifts, our *parshah* also discusses the tithe given to a levite. This is because: (a) even after separating and giving the tithe to the levite, the item remained completely *chulin*, with no holiness attached to it at all,⁶¹ and any Jewish person could consume it.⁶² (b) There is **no** specific portion that already belongs to the levite before the Jewish person separates it.

This emphasizes further that even an entirely mundane object, literally of “the lower realms,” can be connected with Hashem by being given to the levite, because “Hashem is their portion.”⁶³

specification, would automatically be given to the kohen; *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Arachin Ve’Charamin*,” ch. 6, par. 4.}

⁵⁸ Which are *chulin* — *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Bikurim*,” ch. 1, par. 6-7.

⁵⁹ See *Ramban to Devarim* 18:3, where he writes: “There (in our *parshah*) He stated all things that He gave the kohanim in sacred matters.... But the foreleg, the jaw, and the maw... are completely *chulin*....”

⁶⁰ *Chulin* 134b.

⁶¹ Rashi on *Bamidbar* 18:30.

⁶² *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Maaser*,” ch. 1, par. 2.

⁶³ *Devarim* 18:2.

THE LEFTOVERS

Korach began his dispute over Aharon's priesthood with the following rhetorical question, among others: "Is a *tallis* colored entirely of *techeiles*⁶⁴ obligated in *tzitzis*?"⁶⁵ Chassidus⁶⁶ explains the deeper meaning behind this question: A *tallis* (garment) that is entirely of *techeiles* alludes to the level of *makif*.⁶⁷ *Makif* should not need *tzitzis* (tassels that come out of it), and internalized effusion. (With this metaphor, Korach sought to illustrate the essence of his dispute against Aharon's priesthood, as explained in Chassidus at length.)

In *avodas Hashem*, on a subtle level, this refers (also) to the following: When a Jew refines himself **on account of** a flow of Divine light from Above, and not **on account of** his own efforts to ascend — although he will unite with G-dliness, there is a shortcoming. Since this union started from Above, the resulting union, relative to his existence, is *makif*. The internalization of the G-dly energy is missing. This happens when a person's *avodah* springs from his selfhood.

On this basis, we can also suggest that on a subtle level, even the institution of the tithes does not adequately remediate the {ill-effects of} Korach's dispute. Rather, we also need for the priestly gifts and tithes to have an effect on the lower realms, by emphasizing and illustrating this idea on the portion of the property that **remains** in the Jewish person's possession.

A Jewish person would fulfill the mitzvah of giving the priestly gifts (and the tithe) because they are **mitzvos of Hashem**. Therefore, by themselves,

⁶⁴ {A *tallis* has two kinds of threads attached to the corners, white wool (or whatever the garment was made of) and blue wool. This blue wool, known as *techeiles*, was made using a dye from a certain sea-creature. Only one of the four threads on each corner of the garment needed to be *techeiles*.}

⁶⁵ *Bamidbar Rabbah*, ch. 18, par. 3; *Tanchuma*, "Korach," sec. 2; et al.

⁶⁶ *Likkutei Torah*, "Shelach," 6c; *Or HaTorah*, "Shelach," p. 575; *Hemshech Samech Vav*, p. 283; *Hemshech Te'erav*, p. 1044.

⁶⁷ {The "surrounding" G-dly light that cannot be contained in whatever it is around due to its transcendental nature.}

these gifts do not fully demonstrate how even physical objects, as they exist in **their** current state and definition in this world, become vessels for G-dliness. [This is evident also from the statement of our Sages (even regarding regular charity) that once Hashem has commanded that the various tithes be given, then to begin with, a portion of a person's money and property does not belong to him. Rather, he possesses it as a deposit.]⁶⁸

However, when the separation and donation of the priestly gifts underscore that the leftover possessions {after giving these gifts} are for the **person** to use for his needs, it is **because** Hashem gave them to him. And for this very reason, these remaining possessions are used by the person (below) **in the way** that Hashem desires.

In this way, specifically, is it evident how actual physical things, as they **remain** entirely in the person's possession, a reflection of this earthly existence, can also become, in essence, totally connected with G-dliness. This connection gives expression to the dictum,⁶⁹ "In all your ways **know Him.**"

Creating "a home for Hashem in the lower realms" is thus achieved with perfection.

We can suggest this is the deeper reason that there are specific measurements for both the priestly gifts and the tithes, and that a person cannot consecrate all his possessions: The connection that **these** possessions have with G-dliness is of a different nature than those items that the person must give away. For this reason, "the Torah **spared** the money of the Jewish people"⁷⁰ (so that these items can become elevated in the manner appropriate **for them**).

⁶⁸ See the *Maamar Amar Rabbi Shmuel ben Nachmani 5690*, ch. 3 (printed in *Sefer HaMaamarim Kuntreisim*, vol 1, 119a).

⁶⁹ See *Tanya*, "Likkutei Amarim," end of ch. 3.

⁷⁰ See *Mishneh Torah*, end of "Hilchos Arachin Vacharamin" (*Rosh Hashanah 27a*). Note *Kesser Shem Tov*, sec. 218; *Tzavaas Haribash*, sec. 109; *Or Torah* by the Mezritch Maggid, 101d; see *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 17. p. 229 ff.

8.

ONE OPTION, ANOTHER OPTION, BOTH TOGETHER

We can posit that the following levels of Hashem's unity are **somewhat similar and analogous** to the three aforementioned matters (actual holy items, most [and the primary forms] of the priestly gifts and the tithes, and the assets that remain in the person's possession): The unity of "Hashem is One" prompted by us in the world, and ascending Above; the unity of "Hashem is One" that descends from Above to this world; and the fusion of *yichuda tataah*⁷¹ and *yichuda ilaah*.⁷²

"Hashem is One"⁷³ in the form of an ascent from the lowest level to Above refers to the recognition that even after the creation of the worlds, the existence of these worlds remain in a state of complete *bittul*,⁷⁴ just as it was before the worlds were created. Meaning, created beings, in truth, are not {autonomous, concrete} existences. Their true form of existence is as they exist Above (in *Atzilus*).⁷⁵

This consciousness engenders in a person abstinence and the withdrawal from worldly affairs — the lifestyle⁷⁶ (and *avodah*) of *tzaddikim*, who are divested of physical matters.

"Hashem is One" in the form of (a flow) from Above to the lower plane⁷⁷ refers to the recognition of G-dliness as it spreads into and invests itself in every being. Meaning, the world exists, but its existence is divinity. **This** level of unity elicits an *avodah* (not of abstinence, but on the contrary) of involving oneself in

⁷¹ {*Yichuda tataah*, lit., "the lower union," refers to the manner in which our world sees itself connected with G-dliness: the world exists, and yet it is subservient to G-dliness.}

⁷² {*Yichuda ilaah*, lit., "the higher union," reflects an entirely different frame of reference; all that exists is G-dliness. There is no conception of independent existence.}

⁷³ For what follows, see *Hemshech Samech Vav*, pp. 153 ff., 228, 242; *Toras Shalom*, pp. 51 ff., 184 ff.

⁷⁴ {*Bittul* — *Bittul* connotes self-nullification, humility, and the negation of ego. It is the antithesis of *yeshus*.}

⁷⁵ {*Atzilus*, lit., "emanation," the first and highest of the four spiritual worlds, the realm of spiritual existence which, although encompassing attributes which have a specific definition, is in a state of infinity and at one with the Infinite Divine Light.}

⁷⁶ See *Tanya*, "Iggeres Hakodesh," epistle 27 (the explanation).

⁷⁷ This is a higher level than the first form (*Hemshech Samech Vav*, p. 242).

physical matters. The person enjoys the physical, but his delight is of a G-dly nature.

However, even in this unity, although involving a physical item, the originally polar parties still appear as two discrete entities that have been joined — G-dliness and the physical object.

However, the fusion of *yichuda tataah* and *yichuda ilaah* brings to the fore how the physical object and what the person does with it (and his delight in it) can become G-dly.

9.

THE THIRD OF TAMMUZ

Based on all the above, we can explain the connection between the **third** of Tammuz, specifically, and *parshas Korach*:

The events of the twelfth and thirteenth of Tammuz, when the {Frierdiker} Rebbe was completely freed, even from the exile to Kostroma, do not fully demonstrate how the Rebbe's work of spreading Torah and Judaism even affected the "lower beings" who had him arrested — that they should also agree. This is because the Rebbe had then actually left their jurisdiction. (Although throughout that country, as a whole, his opponents were acting against the Jews and Judaism).

Specifically, on the third of Tammuz, when **they** sent him in exile to Kostroma, while he was traveling there (before even arriving), he arranged that **there**, Jewish boys should be gathered together to form a cheder, the mikvah should be fixed,⁷⁸ and he said Chassidus there, etc.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 4, p. 1063.

⁷⁹ The Frierdiker Rebbe delivered the *maamar* "Gefen MiMitzrayim," printed in *Sefer HaMaamarim Kuntreisim*, vol. 1, p. 352.

These activities, specifically, demonstrate how the very lowest beings, while still exhibiting the lowest version of themselves (they were sending the Rebbe to exile), “gave their consent” to the spreading of Torah and Judaism that the Rebbe engaged in.

This is similar to the complete process of rectification that removed and destroyed Korach’s dispute. That is, even physical items, as they remain in **their** current state of existence as the literal lowest beings, are at their core G-dliness.

10.

MAY HASHEM BE WITH US

Based on all the above, one may posit that these three ideas (that served to nullify and rectify Korach’s dispute) are, in general terms, alluded to in the Torah that the Rebbe said, upon his release from jail, on the way to Kostroma.⁸⁰

“We beseech of Hashem, ‘May Hashem, our G-d, be with us, as He was with our ancestors; may He not abandon us nor forsake us.’⁸¹ May Hashem be with us, as he was with our ancestors, although we are not like our ancestors who had literal self-sacrifice for the sake of Torah and mitzvos, etc.”

By way of introduction, seemingly, we need to clarify:

a) Regarding the wording of the prayer, “May *Havaya* {Hashem} *Elokeinu* {our G-d} be with us...” We can understand that regarding the name *Havaya*, which refers to the way Hashem exists in the past, present, and future (in one moment) — G-dliness beyond any connection to the world — it is necessary for us to add and declare how He is with us. This is in contrast to the name “*Elokim*,” which means, “He is strong and mighty, and He is omnipotent in both the heavenly and the terrestrial realms,”⁸² and He is *Elokeinu* {our G-d}. This

⁸⁰ Printed in *Sefer HaMaamarim Kuntresim*, vol. 1, p. 350.

⁸¹ *Melachim I* 8:57.

⁸² *Tur* and *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 5 (and Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 5, par. 3); *Tanya*, “*Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah*,” ch. 7.

means that Hashem is our strength and life, and this shows that Hashem is with us. Seemingly, why is it necessary to add, “with us”? Alternatively, the verse should have said, “May *Havaya* be with us”!

b) “May Hashem, our G-d, **be with us**” is an incomparably greater statement than saying, “May He not abandon us nor forsake us.”

c) The Rebbe said, “although we are not like our ancestors who had literal self-sacrifice for the sake for Torah and mitzvos, etc.” Ostensibly, this is difficult to understand: The Rebbe had shown actual self-sacrifice (even while he sat in jail, and also subsequently). Even were we to suggest that out of humility, the Rebbe held that his self-sacrifice was equivalent to that of our ancestors, he did not need to make this point using words that altogether disregarded his actual self-sacrifice (“although we are not like our ancestors who had literal self-sacrifice for the sake of Torah and mitzvos, etc.”).

11.

REDEMPTION FOR ALL JEWS

The explanation: The Rebbe wanted to bring redemption to all the Jewish people, even to those who are merely “dubbed Jews.”⁸³ For this reason, he specifically quoted the verse, “May Hashem, our G-d be with us,” and added, “although we cannot compare ourselves to our ancestors.” Meaning, even those Jews who are not at all comparable to our ancestors (as they do **not** engage in actual self-sacrifice for Torah and mitzvos) should, nonetheless, be included in “Hashem, our G-d is with us, as He was with our ancestors.”

Based on the above — that the Rebbe wanted to bring about redemption even for those Jewish people who are merely **nicknamed** Jews, independent of their state of affairs regarding observing Torah and mitzvos — we can posit that by adding, “although we cannot compare ourselves to our ancestors,” the Rebbe

⁸³ A quote from the letter the Frierdiker Rebbe penned on the 15th of *Sivan*, cited in fn. 30. {A “dubbed Jew” is a Jew who has no overt connection with his Jewishness.}

alluded to the following *Midrash*:⁸⁴ “King Shlomo says before Hashem: A king hires workers and they do their job well, so he then pays them their due wages. Is this considered a great virtue, a reason to praise the king?! Rather, when is the king to be praised? If he hires bad workers who do not do their job well and he still pays them their wages. This is a great act of kindness. And the verse says, ‘**May Hashem, our G-d, be with us, as He was with our fathers.**’” Meaning, the Rebbe wanted to bring the experience of redemption even to the “bad workers.”

12.

THREE AND THREE

Based on the above, we can clarify that there are three levels within the idea, “May Hashem, our G-d be with us...” (and we can posit that these three levels are like the three levels discussed above).

a) *Havaya* (becomes) *Elokeinu*. — Hashem is our strength and life-force. This represents the level where the person’s entire being, and his strength and life-force, in a revealed sense, is G-dliness.

b) “Hashem, our G-d be **with us...**” — The person is an independent entity, but Hashem is **with** him. However, since “*Elokeinu*” is with him, this proves he is connected with G-dliness.

c) “May He not abandon us nor forsake us.” — The Rebbe wanted to affect even those Jews who are at the level of “the lower realms,” literally — those merely called Jews. These Jews have no overt connection with G-dliness.⁸⁵ The Rebbe wanted to bring redemption to them, too. For this reason, he added, “As he was with our ancestors, although we cannot compare ourselves to our ancestors..., etc.” In doing so, he alluded to the *Midrash* mentioned above. Thus, he could make even those “bad workers” feel, at least, “May He not abandon us

⁸⁴ *Midrash Tehillim* on ch. 26.

⁸⁵ See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 8, p. 329 ff.

nor forsake us.” Meaning, that even in **their current** state, it should be noticeable that they are neither disconnected nor forsaken by Hashem.

Herein, specifically, it is evident that even those who are the “lowest,” in terms of their current lifestyle, are also connected with G-dliness. No matter on what level a Jew finds himself, his true, internal self is G-dliness. As the Rebbe put it:⁸⁶ “Every Jew’s heart is healthy {in its connection} with Hashem and His Torah” (notwithstanding an individual’s particular situation concerning the observance and fulfillment of mitzvos).

This affected even the “lowest realms” of the world. It even affected those people who had the Rebbe arrested, so that even in their current state, they agreed to the Rebbe spreading Torah, and they actually helped him by freeing and releasing him.

13.

A PROMISE

Since these days are remembered (and also) re-experienced,⁸⁷ everyone — **“with us”** — possesses the direction and empowerment derived from the third of Tammuz. They should remain unfazed by any hindrances and hurdles that may impede the spreading of Torah and Judaism. Also, we have been promised (in keeping with the second meaning of the word “*Yehi*” {not “may,” but } “*It shall be* that He will not abandon us nor forsake us”) that the prayer will be fulfilled: “It shall be that Hashem, our G-d, is with us, as He was with our ancestors. He will not abandon nor forsake us,” “And to all Jewish people, there should be light,⁸⁸ spiritually and physically.”⁸⁹

— Based on talks delivered on *Shabbos parshas Korach*, the third of Tammuz 5724 (1964), the nineteenth of Kislev 5725 (1964), and the third day of *parshas Korach*, 5737 (1977)

⁸⁶ A quote from the letter the Frierdiker Rebbe penned on the 15th of Sivan, cited in fn. 30.

⁸⁷ Based on the well-known statement of the *Arizal* that when they are “remembered” properly, they are “re-experienced” (see *Ramaz* in *Tikkun Shovavim*, cited and elucidated in *Lev Dovid* (by *Chida*), ch. 29).

⁸⁸ {Cf. *Shemos* 10:23.}

⁸⁹ These were the concluding words of the Rebbe, in his *sichah* of the third of Tammuz mentioned above.