



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 16 | Yisro | Sichah 4

Hashem Descended

Translated by Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Originally published and © by Kehot Publication Society and reprinted with permission

A note on the translation: Rounded parentheses and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; squiggly parentheses are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in squiggly parentheses are those of the translators or editors, and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time maintaining readability. The translation, however, carries no official authority. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists. **Your feedback is needed – please send all comments to: info@projectlikkuteisichos.org**

1.

THE DIFFICULTY THAT BOTHERS RASHI

On the verse, “Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai,¹” Rashi comments:

One might think that, possibly, He actually descended upon it. Therefore, Scripture says: “from the heavens I have spoken with you.”² This teaches....

(The continuation of Rashi’s comments will be discussed in sec. 3).

Evidently, Rashi’s intention is to solve the apparent contradiction between two verses. Here it says, “Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai,” which plainly implies that Hashem actually descended upon Mount Sinai. A later verse, however, states “*from the heavens* I have spoken with you.” To address this contradiction, therefore, Rashi explains: *This teaches....*

However, we cannot say that this is Rashi’s intention here, because:

(1) Why would Rashi need to preface with the phrase: “One might think that, possibly, He actually descended upon it”? Rashi should have immediately stated the difficulty,³ e.g., “Another verse states, ‘from the heavens I have spoken with you.’”

(2) *The main issue:* The *contradiction* between the two verses arises only after encountering the *later* verse, “from the heavens.” Why would Rashi anticipate the contradiction already here on *our* verse?⁴

[Particularly, since Rashi does address the paradox later: On the verse, “from the heavens...,” Rashi remarks, “Yet another verses states, ‘Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai.’” {Then, Rashi proceeds to offer two interpretations to resolve the paradox.} Rashi’s interpretation on that verse will be discussed in sec. 4.]

We must conclude, therefore, that Rashi’s intent is not to resolve the contradiction between the two verses. Rather, Rashi’s intent is to address an

¹ Ex. 19:20.

² Ex. 20:19.

³ As Rashi does *himself*—in his commentary on the second verse (cited, later, in the text).

⁴ *Maskil Le’Dovid* (see also R. Ovadia Bartenura) suggests that Rashi, with his interpretation “this teaches that He bent down,” is clarifying the phrase later in this same verse, “to the peak of the mountain” (see there). However, since Rashi does not quote these words (*to the peak of the mountain*, and doesn’t even allude to them by concluding his heading with, “etc.”), this proves that Rashi’s remarks are intended to explain only the words, “Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai.”

uncertainty that arises concerning the first verse, even before we encounter the later verse, “from the heavens.” The uncertainty that arises: “One might think that, possibly, He actually descended upon it.” And since this uncertainty cannot be settled from this verse, Rashi cites, as proof, a later verse, “Therefore, Scripture says: ‘from the heavens I have spoken with you.’”

We need to understand: What already casts a doubt on the meaning of this verse, whether “He actually descended upon it”?

2.

THE UNCERTAINTY ARISES FROM AN EARLIER PASSAGE

The explanation is as follows: An *earlier* verse says,⁵ “The entire Mount Sinai *smoked* because Hashem had descended upon it in *fire*.” The mountain was (only) fuming, but the mountain (and anything on it) did *not* actually burn. Seemingly, if a fire had literally descended on the mountain, the mountain should have *burnt*⁶ [particularly, the vegetation, and anything else on the mountain’s surface, for the verse says explicitly that there was a thorn bush on Mount Sinai,⁷ and obviously this was not the only such bush⁸ or vegetation growing on Mount Sinai]?⁹

One might propose that although the mountain was full of smoke, a miracle had prevented anything on the mountain from catching fire. However, why

⁵ Ex. 19:18. Similarly, later it says, “the torches... and the *smoking* mountain (Ex. 20:15).” Note, though, the verse, “like a *consuming fire* atop the mountain (Ex. 24:17).” Analysis of this latter verse, however, is beyond our scope.

⁶ As was the case with the thorn bush, concerning which it says, “the thorn bush was burning with fire (Ex. 3:2).”

Regarding Mount Sinai, however, it also says, “the mountain *burned with fire* (Deut. 4:11 (and Rashi cites this verse in *our* Torah portion, on verse 19:18) and Deut. 5:20). Nevertheless, since here only smoke is mentioned, it makes sense to say that the meaning of *burning*, בוער, (in our context) is not that fire was *seen*, but just that it was extremely hot, and smoke-filled. We can see that בוער does not always mean literally *burning* from the *Book of Esther* (1:12), “his anger burnt, בערה, within him.” Also, see Rashi on Ex. 15:8.

But regarding the narrative of the burning thorn bush, it is clear that בוער does mean actual *burning*, since the verse concludes, “and the thorn bush was not being consumed (Ex. 3:2).”

⁷ Ex. 3:1-2.

⁸ See *Ramban* on Deut. 1:6.

⁹ See Ex. 3:1, “he led the flocks after the free pastureland,” and Rashi’s comments there. Also, “neither shall the sheep nor the cattle graze facing that mountain (Ex. 34:3).” Note Rashi’s remarks, too (on Ex.3:2), “*within the thorn bush*: But not from any other tree.”

Moreover, if one posits that there were no trees or grass – just a mountain of rocks – then there could also be no smoke, within the natural order. [Although the smoke rising “up to the heart of the heavens (Rashi on Deut. 19:18)” was miraculous – there is no compelling reason, in *pshat*, to magnify the miracle, by postulating that the production of smoke was also outside the natural order. For further insight, see *Maamarim 5704*, s.v., “*Ve’kol Ha’Am*.”]

Or *HaChaim* remarks on Deut. 19:18 that the mountain itself was on fire, and that the rocks were burning, etc. According to this interpretation, the smoke does indicate that things were burning. However, this interpretation is not in accord with *pshat*.

propose a scenario requiring a special miracle? Particularly, considering that *earlier*, it says that the burning thorn bush on Mount Sinai did burn. Consequently, a simpler explanation is that this phenomenon was a *natural one*, viz., a fire did *not* actually descend upon the mountain, but was suspended above it, and for that reason, the mountain did not burn. Instead, it was full of smoke because of the fire that was (only) close by.¹⁰ [When a fire is sufficiently close to an object, the fire characteristically causes the object to smoke.]

Therefore, Rashi immediately comments on this verse, “One might think that, *possibly*, He actually descended upon it,” since the doubt whether “He actually descended upon it,” arises already here because of the {preceding} passage.¹¹

Based on the above, we must clarify, on the other hand: Why is Rashi still uncertain whether or not Hashem actually descended on the mountain, and needs to prove that He did not actually descend from the later verse, “from the heavens I have spoken with you”? Don’t we already know that He could not have actually descended on it from the earlier passage, “the entire Mount Sinai smoked,” as explained above?

3.

HOW ARE ALL THE DETAILS IN RASHI DEDUCED?

Rashi continues and says:

“This teaches that He bent down the upper and the lower heavens, and spread them upon the mountain like a bedcover upon a bed; and the Throne of Glory descended upon them {i.e., upon the upper heavens and the lower heavens}.

The source for this interpretation is the *Mechilta*.¹² However, as mentioned frequently, Rashi cites only those Midrashic interpretations that are consistent with the straightforward method of understanding Scripture, and that are important to the proper understanding the simple meaning of a passage. This is

¹⁰ Because the heavens intervened between the fire and the earth, as Rashi comments, “He bent down the heavens...,” as will be discussed later.

¹¹ Rashi did not give this interpretation *earlier*, on the verse, “The entire Mount Sinai smoked because Hashem had descended upon it in fire,” (which is the verse that introduces the doubt), but rather on the later verse, “Hashem descended,” as this later verse constitutes the *central point* of the narrative. This is consistent with Rashi’s approach in *several places*, where he waits until all the pertinent details of the narrative are related (in case a solution to the problem can be found in them).

¹² On the verse.

particularly true, as in our case, when Rashi does *not* reference the source of his interpretation (although in numerous other instances, he does do so).¹³ Clearly then, Rashi derives his interpretation, with all of its details, (*not* from the *Mechilta*, but) from the *pshat* of the verse.¹⁴

We need to understand: In order to resolve the contradiction between these two points [(a) “Hashem *descended* upon Mount Sinai”; and, (b) “from the heavens I have spoken with you”], it would have sufficed, apparently, to say succinctly, “This teaches that He bent down the heavens upon the mountain and descended upon them.”¹⁵

How does Rashi deduce from *the simple meaning* of the verse that: (a) “He bent down the *upper* and *lower* heavens”; (b) not only did He bend them down, but that He also “*spread them...*”; (c) and then Rashi adds a further detail, “*like a bedcover upon a bed*”; (d) “the *Throne of Glory* (not *Hashem*, as the verse puts it) descended upon them”?¹⁶

4.

INCONGRUITIES BETWEEN RASHI’S COMMENTARY ON THE TWO VERSES

Aside from the peculiarities noted in Rashi’s commentary on this verse, we need to reconcile Rashi’s commentary *here* with his commentary on the other verse,² “from the heavens I have spoken with you.” On that verse, Rashi remarks:

¹⁷

“Yet another verse says, ‘Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai’! Comes the third verse and reconciles them: “From heaven, He let you hear His voice so as to discipline you; and on earth He showed you His great fire.”¹⁸ – His Glory was in heaven, but His fire and power were manifest on earth. Another interpretation: He bent down the heavens, and the heavens above

¹³ The intention here is to those references found within the body of Rashi’s commentary. In contrast, the parenthetical references were inserted later, and are not present in manuscripts or in the early publications of Rashi’s commentary.

¹⁴ This is also evident from the several differences between Rashi’s wording, and wording of the *Mechilta*. Here is not the place, however, to elaborate on this point.

¹⁵ See *Targum Yonatan ben Uziel* on v. 18.

¹⁶ In the extant version of the *Mechilta*, it says, “the Glory descended (the word, אֲדֹנָי, “Throne of,” is absent).

¹⁷ Based on the *Mechilta* on the verse. See *Torat Cohanim*, the *Braita* of “*Yud-gimel middot*,” at the end; *Midrash Tehillim*, “*mizmor*” 18.

¹⁸ Deut. 4:36.

the heavens, and spread them on top of the mountain. And so it says,¹⁹ ‘He bowed the heavens and descended.’”

This is perplexing: On our verse here, “Hashem descended,” Rashi cites *only* the interpretation, “He bent down the heavens.” However, on the verse, “from the heavens,” {to clarify the very same contradiction} Rashi (a) first, gives a different interpretation than he does here; (b) then, as the *second* interpretation, remarks, “He bent down the heavens,” suggesting that this second interpretation {the only interpretation given on our verse} is *not* the primary one, according to the simple meaning of the verse?

Similarly, we need to understand: Concerning the details that Rashi omits in his commentary there: “like a bedcover upon a bed,” “the Throne of Glory descended upon them,” we can explain by positing that Rashi relied upon his commentary here, and therefore, included the interpretation on “from the heavens,” only in general terms.

Still, we need to understand the reason for the *discrepancies* and the *additions* in Rashi’s commentary there, on the second verse:

(a) *Here*, {on the verse, “Hashem descended”} Rashi writes, “the upper and the lower heavens,” whereas later he writes, “the heavens, and the heavens above the heavens.”?

(b) *There*, {on the verse, “from the heavens”} Rashi *also* cites a proof-text, “And so it says, ‘He bowed the heavens and descended.’” Seemingly, if a proof-text was necessary, Rashi should have cited the proof-text the *first* time that he introduced this interpretation?

(c) If Rashi, *there*, {on the verse, “from the heavens”} mentions the interpretation only in general terms, without all the details, as explained above, why does he still mention the detail “and spread them on top of the mountain”?²⁰ Especially, considering that the proof-text just says, “He bowed, כָּרַע, the heavens” – connoting “bent down”²¹ – but it does not mention that He “spread them....”

5.

Hashem’S DESCENT ON THE MOUNTAIN, AND HIS EXALTEDNESS

¹⁹ II Samuel 22:10; Psalms 18:10.

²⁰ Particularly, considering that this detail is not found in the *Mechilta* on this verse.

²¹ As the *Targum* notes on the verse in II Samuel and in Psalms, *ibid*.

The explanation for all this:

The differences between Rashi's two commentaries stem from a fundamental difference between the verses here, and those in the section, "You have seen that from the heavens I have spoken with you":

The passage here goes on to relate how Hashem *descended* upon Mount Sinai in a manifest fashion, visible to everyone, to the extent that *the mountain itself* was sanctified. Hence, it says,²² "Beware of ascending the mountain... No hand shall touch it... The people cannot ascend to Mount Sinai... Set boundaries for the mountain and sanctify it."

[Therefore, Rashi must bring a proof from the verse,² "from the heavens" that Hashem did not actually descend on the mountain; even though Scripture already said earlier "the entire Mount Sinai (only) *smoked*" (as explained in sec. 2).⁵ Because from the continuation of the entire passage here it would appear that He *did* actually descend on the mountain. As such, the verse "The entire Mount Sinai smoked" only creates an uncertainty ("possibly") whether "He actually descended upon it," but the verse lacks sufficient weight to resolve the uncertainty.]

In contrast, the passage, "You have seen that from the heavens I have spoken with you" emphasizes the very opposite. It emphasizes how *exalted* and distant Hashem is from earth. Thus it says,²³ "You shall not make [images of anything that is] with Me," on which Rashi comments, "You shall not make a likeness of my servants who serve Me *on high*."

Consequently, *there*, the first (and the primary) interpretation, according to the simple meaning of Scripture is that "His Glory was in heaven, but (only) His fire and power were manifest on earth." Because according to this interpretation, Hashem's exaltedness over the earth is {likewise} emphasized – His Glory did not descend on Mount Sinai; it remained in heaven.

Whereas according to the interpretation, "He bent down the heavens," the emphasis of the verse, "You have seen that *from the heavens* I have spoken with

²² Ex.. 19:12-13, 23.

²³ Ex.. 20:20.

you”²⁴ is not smooth: Why emphasize that Hashem spoke from an exalted and distant place, if the heavens had descended on the earth, on Mount Sinai?²⁵

6.

THE UPPER & LOWER HEAVENS – THE HEAVENS & THE HEAVENS ABOVE THE HEAVENS

On this basis we can understand why *here* Rashi says, “He bent down *the upper and the lower heavens*,” whereas *there*, Rashi says, “He bent down *the heavens, and the heavens above the heavens*.”

Rashi’s aim *here* is to clarify the import of our entire passage – which depicts Hashem’s *descent upon the mountain* – but to do so in a manner that doesn’t contradict the verses, “from the heavens I have spoken with you” (and “Mount Sinai *smoked*”):

And since the verses here indicate that (a) Hashem Himself, (b) descended on Mount Sinai – it is impossible to say only “He bent the heavens.” For this would suggest that only a single firmament lay between Hashem and Mount Sinai. Therefore, Rashi was compelled to interject that the word “heaven” here denotes all the heavens – “the upper and the lower.”

And since the passage here speaks about a *descent*, Rashi [doesn’t employ the Biblical phrase,²⁶ “the heavens, and the heavens above the heavens,” but] employs an expression appropriate in the context of a descent – “*the upper and the lower*.”

In contrast, Rashi’s intention *there* is to explain the emphasis of the phrase, “*from the heaven*,” but in a manner that doesn’t contradict the verse, “Hashem descended on Mount Sinai.” Therefore, Rashi adds that although Hashem “bent the heavens,” an interpretation that renders the verse, “from the heavens” less emphatic, even so, the act of ‘bending the heavens’ included bending “the heavens, *and the heavens above the heavens*,” magnifying Hashem’s exaltedness. For Hashem spoke from beyond “the heavens *above the heavens*,” as they lay spread upon the mountain.

²⁴ Cf. *Maskil LeDovid*, *ad loc*, who says, too, that the wording “from the heavens” appears less precise, according to this interpretation.

²⁵ Nonetheless, Rashi’s second interpretation is also necessary. Because the first interpretation has two difficulties: (a) The words “Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai,” imply that His Glory also descended; (b) in order for the mountain to have become sanctified, it would not have sufficed for His fire and power to descend. Rather, His Glory would have needed to descend on the mountain, as well.

²⁶ Deut. 10:14, *et al*.

From the continuation of the narrative, it becomes clear that Hashem descended in such a way that the Shechinah’s holiness rested upon the mountain. Consequently, the mountain was sanctified, as explained above. For this reason, the description “He *bent* the heavens” doesn’t suffice, because it describes the descent just in *general terms*. But it doesn’t describe *how* Hashem descended on Mount Sinai in a way that the *mountain* became sanctified.

Therefore, Rashi has to add the phrase, “and He *spread* them upon the mountain” – indicating that the Shechinah rested on the mountain. Moreover, “like a bedcover upon a bed.” A bedcover doesn’t possess any distinct, intrinsic importance; rather, it is part of a bed. So, too, was this the case here. The heavens {after being spread upon the mountain} no longer remained a *distinct* entity from the mountain. Instead, the heavens were transformed into a *bedcover* for the mountain. Thus, the Shechinah’s sanctity came to rest upon the mountain itself.

However, the verse, “from the heavens,” emphasizes that Hashem spoke from heaven, and *not* from earth. So there Rashi cannot say that the aim of this verse is to stress that “(He spread them...) like a bedcover *upon a bed*,” because this would be emphasizing the very *opposite* – that the heavens became subordinate to the mountain (earth).

Nevertheless, there, too, Rashi must add that He *spread* the heavens. Because the phrase, “He bent down the heavens,” by itself, does not resolve the contradiction posed by the verse, “Hashem descended on Mount Sinai,” and, as a result, that His sanctity rested on the mountain itself. Therefore, Rashi is compelled to say also that He *spread* them—viz., the heavens did not remain higher than {and detached from} Mount Sinai, but rather they were “spread *upon* the mountain.”

On this basis, we can understand why Rashi needs to include in his commentary there, a proof from the verse,¹⁹ “He bowed the heavens and descended.” What it proves is that just as this latter verse emphasizes *nothing more* than “He bowed the heavens”—i.e., that “He bent down the heavens,” so, too, “from the heavens” expresses the same idea. These verses do not describe a

situation analogous to “a bedcover upon a bed,”²⁷ a situation when the heavens were no longer heavens – when the heavens (the *bedcover*) became a *part* of the mountain (the lower, earthly realm). Rather, “He spread them” is merely a continuation of the idea conveyed by the phrase, “He bent them” (which is implied by “He bowed”) – Hashem lowered the heavens upon the mountain. But nothing more. Even then the heavens remained an autonomous entity. (Accordingly, the emphasis of verse “You have seen that *from the heavens* I have spoken with you” makes sense.)

8.

THE THRONE OF GLORY DESCENDED

In light of the above, viz., that Rashi’s goal is to clarify how Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai, Rashi’s diction “and *the Throne of Glory* (descended upon them)” is now understandable:

Regarding the exodus from Egypt, the verse says,²⁸ “I will pass through the land of Egypt on this night.” Meaning, that Hashem, in His glory, by Himself,²⁹ descended³⁰ into Egypt, in order to “smite every firstborn in the land of Egypt.” Nonetheless, we aren’t told about the presence of any smoke, etc., during the exodus,³¹ as was the case when Hashem descended on Mount Sinai.

To explain the difference between Hashem’s descent on Mount Sinai {to give the Torah} and Hashem’s descent {into Egypt}³² to free the Jewish nation, Rashi chooses his words very carefully. He says, “the *Throne of Glory* descended upon them.” A *throne* implies something (settled) fixed; it implies the qualities of *greatness* (especially when *throne* is coupled with *glory*), and *majesty*.³³ In other words, when the Torah was given, Hashem revealed Himself at Mount Sinai in a settled and fixed way – gloriously and majestically.³⁴ This brought

²⁷ Rashi’s two commentaries are not contradictory. Rather, in the context of each, Rashi explains what the plain sense of the verse is underscoring: The verse, “Hashem descended onto Mount Sinai” emphasizes the sanctity of the mountain. In *this* respect, the heavens were like “a spread upon a bed.” The verse, “from the heavens,” underscores the heavens as a distinct entity; therefore, Rashi only notes that the heavens were spread on the mountain, but omits the detail “like a bedcover upon a bed.”

²⁸ Ex. 12:12. See also Ex. 11:4.

²⁹ See Rashi, *ad loc.*, (s.v. “will I wreak judgments – I, the Eternal”): “I by Myself and not through a messenger.”

³⁰ Note, also, Gen. 11:5, and Rashi, *ad loc.*; Gen. 18:21, and Rashi, *ad loc.*

³¹ Similarly, during the Splitting of the Reed Sea, “He revealed Himself in His glory to them,” (as Rashi notes on Ex. 15:2, s.v. “this is my Hashem”); nevertheless, the phenomena that ensued at Mt. Sinai did not ensue there.

³² Ex. 3:8.

³³ Rashi’s commentary on Gen. 41:40.

³⁴ Note Rashi’s comments on Gen. 1:2.

about “Hashem descended on Mount Sinai,” with all the particular phenomena mentioned in the Torah portion.

9.

THE CROWN OF ROYALTY VS THE ROYALTY OF CROWN

Among the wondrous matters,³⁵ from the viewpoint of *remez* and *sod*, contained in Rashi’s commentary:

The abovementioned difference between the two verses, and consequently, between Rashi’s two commentaries –

– viz., that *here*, Hashem’s *descent* is underscored, albeit in a way that “He bent down the *heavens*”; whereas *there*, the emphasis is placed on the fact that “from the *heavens*, I spoke with you,” from *above* the earth, but just that the heavens were in a lowered state, “He bent down...” –

– is alluded to by the different chapter and verse numbers of the two verses. The verse, “Hashem descended upon Mount Sinai,” is chapter 19, verse 20, while the verse, “from the heavens,” is chapter 20, verse 19:

When each letter of Hashem’s Name, *Havayah* is itself spelled out (to produce the name of מ"ה), the numeric value of {the additional letters of} its *mil’ui*³⁶ is 19 (as stated in Kabbalah literature). *Milui* means the way in which {each} letter {of a word} is articulated, expressed by *speech*, thus revealing what was concealed. In terms of *sefirot*, this function is characteristic of the *sefirah* of *Malchut*. “The letter כ, {whose numerical value is 20} is (the first letter of), כתר, *Keter*. *Keter* is the spiritual plane that encompasses and transcends the causal-chain of creation.

Now, all *sefirot* are inter-included within one another. Accordingly, the plane of *Keter* also includes the aspect of *Malchut*—referred to as *Malchut-of-Keter*. In other words, there is a level within *Keter* (which is above the world) that is inclined towards revelation below—the level of *Malchut*. Similarly, within the

³⁵ The wording of the *Shelah*, in “*Mesechta Shavuot*,” p. 181a.

³⁶ {Literally, the “filled-in” format of the Name. Thus, יהוה (whose numeric value is 26), when spelled-out “fully,” in one possible variation, becomes יהוה וא"ו וא"ו ה"א (whose numeric value is 45, מ"ה). The numeric value of the additional letters in this spelled-out variation is 19 (26+19=45).}

sefirah of *Malchut*, there is *Keter-of-Malchut*. Meaning, within *Malchut*, the realm of revelation,³⁷ the aspect *Keter* is revealed.

This is the difference between these two verses:³⁸

Chapter 19, verse 20 – the number 20 is subordinate to the number 19 – signifies *Keter-of-Malchut*. Accordingly, the *general* theme of the verse is *descent* – corresponding to *Malchut*. Nonetheless, Rashi, in his commentary, which is “the wine of Torah,”³⁹ discloses how within this descent, there is found *Keter-of-Malchut* – “He spread the *heavens*....”

In contrast, chapter 20, verse 19 – the number 19 is subordinate to the number 20 – signifies *Malchut-of-Keter*. Accordingly, the *general* theme is “from the *heavens*,” the exaltedness of Hashem over the world (consistent with *Keter*). Here, too, Rashi discloses that this is not *Keter* as it is innately concealed, but rather, as expressed in the verse, “He *spread* the heavens” – *Malchut-of-Keter*.

10.

“LIKE A BEDCOVER UPON A BED” – ONLY WITHIN *KETER-OF-MALCHUT*

This is also the deeper explanation for why Rashi, in his commentary on the verse, “Hashem descended,” includes the simile “like a bedcover upon a bed,” whereas on the verse, “from the heavens,” Rashi omits this phrase:

Since *Keter-of-Malchut* is an aspect within the *sefirah* of *Malchut*, which funnels emanations downward, it is feasible that the level of *Keter* within it should also undergo a descent and “enclathment” down below – until it descends “like a bedcover upon a bed,”⁴⁰ as explained above, in section 7.

Malchut-of-Keter, the illumination of *Keter* downward, is different. *Keter* is a light that is essentially beyond the worlds; therefore, even when it shines

³⁷ See *Torah Or*, end of 6d.

³⁸ The discussion regarding the division of Scripture into chapters, and its origins, is well-known. Nonetheless, this division is found in all printed Torah editions, used by Jewish communities world-wide (and by great rabbinical authorities), from its inception, until now, many generations later. And “a Jewish custom is to be considered as {sanctioned by, and therefore, on the same level as} Torah.” Note the remarks of the Rambam (*Hilchot Mamrim*, ch. 1, par. 2-3; ch. 2, par. 2) concerning the force of practices adopted widely in Jewish communities. See *Likutei Sichot*, vol. 5 (p. 57, *et passim*; p. 337, *et passim*) regarding the names of the Torah portions.

³⁹ See *Hayom Yom*, p. 24.

⁴⁰ Furthermore: *Malchut* is called a *bed* (*Pardes*, “Gate 23,” entry, “bed”; *Me’orei Or*, entry, “bed”; cf. *Zohar*, vol. 2, p. 133a, and the glosses of R. Chaim Vital on *Zohar*, vol. 3, 60a): its upper part, the enveloping, etc. corresponds to *Keter-of-Malchut*, which is similar to the spread *on top* of the bed (which is still simultaneously, part of the bed).

downward – Malchut-of-*Keter* – the light is not “enclothed” below. Rather, it descends in its encompassing state⁴¹ – from “heaven.”

From talks delivered on *Shabbos Parshas Yisro* and *Mishpatim*, 5737

⁴¹ See *Torah Or*, end of *parshat Va'Yakhel*.