

Learning

A

Sicha

Vol 27, Vayikra 1

Intention Over Articulation

By Avrohom Aharon HaKohain Lipszyc

Index of Content

- The Sicha:

The Sicha is a lesson in the sicha, filed with notes keeping the flow of the sicha clear, notes marked with an asterisk giving explanations to concepts the Rebbe is using in the sicha, and an organization and layout with brackets and indentions, allowing for the reader to first read the primary flow of the sicha, and returning to see what the Rebbe is enriching the sicha with, as outcomes of what the sicha is creating.

- Footnotes:

The Rebbe's sichas are renowned for its *Footnotes* as well as for its primary text. Often this takes learning the sources the Rebbe cites, and then deep study of what the Rebbe is saying. Here the reader will find explanations to the *Footnotes* that help understand what the Rebbe is seeking to teach with the *Footnote*.

- The Appendix:

The Rebbe is extremely precise as to what is quoted and what isn't quoted into the sicha. However, often, reading the entire source is necessary to fully understand what the teaching is saying, and why is its correlation or extrapolation upon the flow of the sicha.

- Bottomline:

This serves as a flowchart only of the primary stream of the sicha. Questions or details that enforce the steam of the sicha are left out here. After learning the sicha, going through this portion helps to solidify the primary message of the sicha.

- Detailed Flowchart:

This serves as a flowchart of the entire sicha. Doing so in brevity, point by point.

The Sicha

*Footnote numbers correspond with those of the sicha. Missing numbers are cited sources, placed in parentheses within the text. See "SICHA FOOTNOTES" for the footnotes and their explanation

 Note: The sicha deals with a ruling of Maimonides, the reasons commentaries give to the ruling, and then the Rebbe necessitates and gives a deeper additional understanding to the reasoning of the law, by giving a deeper meaning to the argument in the Talmud over the matter. Please refer to the APPENDIXES when needed, in other to see the sources the Rebbe is referring to.

Maimonides, in the *Laws of Ma'asei HaKorbonos* (the doings of offerings) writes (-16:1), "When a person vows² to bring a large animal, but instead brings a small one, he does not fulfill his obligation. [If he vows to bring] a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation. How so? He said, 'I promise [to bring] a lamb (one in the first year of its life) as a burnt-offering,' or '... as a peace-offering,' and he brings a ram (one that is more than one year and one month old), or he vowed a calf (one in the first year of its life) and brought an ox (one in the second year of its life), or a kid (one in the first year of its life) and brought a goat (one in the second year of its life) , he fulfills his obligation."

The *Kesef Mishneh* defines the source of Maimonides as the words of the *Mishna* (-Minochos 1407b), "If one vows (to bring a) large (bull), and he brought a small (bull) --according to all opinions-- he has not fulfilled (his obligation). (But if he vows to bring) a small (bull), and he brought a large (bull) --there is a dispute of opinions: according to the Rabbis,-- he has fulfilled (his obligation), *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He has not fulfilled (his obligation),' and Maimonides rules like "The Rabbis"

And the reasons as to why Maimonides brings the examples of, "a lamb... and he brings a ram... a calf and brought an ox, or a kid and brought a goat," because Maimonides' ruling of, "a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation," is only when the small and the large are of the same species, but not of two different species⁵, as he explicitly emphasizes further throughout the chapter.

Question: How is he fulfilling his obligation of bringing a ram when he vows, "I promise [to bring] a lamb (one in the first year of its life) as a burnt-offering,' or '... as a peace-offering,'" when there is the commandment (-Deuteronomy 23:24), "That which you utter with your lips you shall heed, and you will do as you have promised⁸ (to G-d your L-rd, which you have spoken with your mouth)." Being that he promised, "a small one," as for example, "a lamb," it is upon him to fulfill his promise, "and you will do as you have promised." And when he brings, "a large one," for example, "a ram," in place of, "a lamb⁹," he did not fulfill the, "and you will do as you have promised"?!

And there are two ways to explain this:

(a) From the perspective of the "person", the one who made the vow: When a person vows to bring a small one, it is logical to say that his intention was not that he specifically bring a small animal, and not a big one, but rather, that he not bring less than a small one. His intention was that he bring at the least¹⁰ a small one. And therefore, when he brings a large one, he has fulfilled his vow, for to this too he intended.

(b) From the perspective of the "object": Albeit that one who vows, says and intends for a small one --a lamb and the likes--, however, (-Rashi, Minochos 108b (and the Rebbe cites other sources as well)), "within the many is included the few" --as that of (-Baba Kama 74a (and the Rebbe cites other sources as well)), "there is within 200, 100"-- and therefore his vow was fulfilled, only that he added on to his promise, and thus, his promise was fulfilled.

 *Note: Often the discussion in explaining the deeper dimension of the reasoning to a law the format is to see the concept from two different perspective, (i) that of the person fulfilling the *mitzvah*, meaning the *person's* having to do that which is to be done. and (ii) from the perspective of the object of the *mitzvah*, meaning the *mitzvah* that has to be done.

Note: The Rebbe sets the grounds for the need of an additional layer of explanation.

However, this explanation does not suffice: Before the Mishna that states this dispute, there is a previous Mishna (-Minochos 104b) that states a similar dispute:

"(If one says), 'I specified a meal offering of tenths (of an ephah --Eipha: 22 litres; 20 dry quarts) but I do not know how many (tenths) I specified,' he must bring (a meal offering of) sixty (-tenths of an ephah). *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He brings meal offerings of all sizes, (in increments of tenths of an ephah, ranging) from one-tenth (of an ephah) to sixty (-tenths, for a total of sixty meal offerings with a total volume of 1,830 tenths of an ephah, or 183 ephahs)."

The Talmud (-106b) in given the reason for this dispute, after bringing numerous opinions, states:

"*Rav Ashi* said, 'They disagree with regard to (one who is obligated to bring) a small (offering) and (instead) brings a

large (offering). *The Rabbis hold that if* (one is obligated to bring) *a small* (offering) *and brings a large one* (instead) *he has fulfilled his obligation* --(Rashi: "And this or he did not vow but three tenths and brings five for his vow, he fulfills his obligation"¹⁵.)-- , and *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) *holds he has not fulfilled his obligation.*"

The Talmud questions:

"*But they disagreed about this* (topic) *once? As we learned* 'If one vows to bring a *small* (one) *and he brought a large* (one instead), *he has fulfilled his obligation. Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) *says: He has not fulfilled his obligation.*"

The Talmud answers:

"*It is necessary* (for the dispute to be mentioned with regard to both cases), *as had* (their dispute) *been stated* (only) *with regard to this* (case of one who vows to bring a small meal offering and brings a large one instead, there would be room to reason that it is only) *in this* (case that) *the Rabbis say* (that he has fulfilled his obligation,) *because* (both) *this* (small meal offering) *and that* (large meal offering are identical with regard to the portion of the offering that is sacrificed on the altar; in both cases) *it is a handful. But there,* (in the case of one who vows to bring a small bull but brings a large one,) *since the sacrificial portions are greater,* (i.e., larger, there is room to) *say* (that the Rabbis) *concede to Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi that he has not fulfilled his obligation).

"*And had* (their dispute) *been stated* (only) *in that* (case of one who vows to bring a small bull and brings a big one, there would be room to reason that only in that case) *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) *says* (that the person has not fulfilled his obligation, because the sacrificial portions are larger). *But in this* (case of bringing a large meal offering instead of a small one, there is room to say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi) *concedes to* (the opinion of) *the Rabbis.* (Therefore,) *it is necessary* (for the mishna to teach both cases.)"

Question: (i) (concerning the perspective of the "object") Being that there is an opinion that because of, "*since the sacrificial portions are greater, and we can say that this is not what he vowed*¹⁷," and they do not say the reasoning of, "*included in the many* (the large animal) *is the few* (the small animal)," thus, it is not logical to say that the innovation in the law, "*small and he brought a large,*" is because, "*included in the many is the few*¹⁸!?" And (ii) so too, it is not clear to say that the innovation (concerning the perspective of the "person") that the person, "*so did he vow*" (to be okay to bring the large, just that he not bring less than the small), when this is not what he said?!

Thus, These two reasons do not suffice, and we still need to understand how when, "*small and he brought a large,*" one is fulfilling, "*and you will do as you have promised*"!

Question II: According to the two above-mentioned explanations (i) that the person only limited the minimal amount that he will offer, and (ii) that, "*there is included within the many the few.*" - it is logical to say that when "*one vows a small one*" it is permissible to begin with bring "*a large one.*"

And being that (-Maimonides, Laws of Issurei Mizbeach 7:11), "*one who desires to gain merit for himself, subjugate his evil inclination, and amplify his generosity should bring his sacrifice from the most desirable and superior type of the item he is bringing. For it is written in the Torah* (-Genesis 4:4), '*And Abel brought from his chosen flocks and from the superior ones*'... *And so too it is stated* (-Leviticus 3:16), '*All of the superior quality* (should be given) *to G-d.*" And more than this, concerning offerings it is said that one is to bring (-Deuteronomy 12:11), "*of the choicest of your vow*²⁵."

Now, if we are to accept the two above mentioned reasonings, seemingly the outcome is, that when vowing a small one, one must from the beginning (it be best done so) to bring a large one, and at the least, it is befitting to do so (to bring the large one), due to, "*All of the superior quality* (should be given) *to G-d*²⁶."

However, from the wording of Maimonides, "*small and brought large, he fulfills his obligation*" --(which doesn't even express here as it does by the donation (Laws of Ma'ase Korbonos 16:6, "if he wants he may bring...")-- , as the language of the Mishna (-Minochos 108a), "(if one vows,) *this lamb is* (hereby) *a burnt offering, and it became blemished, if he wishes he may bring a ram with its* (redemption) *money,*" is understood that this is not a law of "from the outset," meaning that "*it be best done so,*" but rather³⁰, one of, "*post facto, in worst scenario,*" if he *already did so*, then he has fulfilled his obligation³¹?!

 Note: The Rebbe will now quote from the *Chinuch* concerning a specific offering, and the Rebbe will then explain why this does not apply to our case.

--[Concerning the "*sacrifice that varies up and down*" that is brought for four specific sins (-see APPENDIX VII) the *Chinuch* states (-Mitzva 123): "...*But if he is poor and he brings a ewe or a female goat, he has not fulfilled his obligation. And the reason is that since G-d, blessed be He, had mercy upon him and exempted him with* [something less expensive], *it is not appropriate that he push himself to bring more than what his hand can reach.*"³⁴

However, this concept does not apply here because, there we are speaking of:

- (i) an offering that is obligatory by the Torah, and thus is to be only performed exactly as prescribed by the Torah, while here we are speaking of a voluntary offering, created but by the person's vow.
- (ii) The *sacrifice that varies up and down*, has different species for the wealthy in his "up" (an animal) of the sacrifice, and for the poor in his "down" (poor: fowl, and very poor: flour) for the sacrifice. And as explained earlier, Maimonides rules that even by a voluntary offering one can change the species of his vow.

Thus, the reasoning of the *Chinuch* for the *sacrifice that varies up and down* cannot be applied to our case of, "small and brought large"]--

And from this is understood that when a "person" vows a *small one* his intentions are not also for a *large one*. And so too concerning the "object" the "large one" is not included within the "small ones". --[And it is understood the difference between this instance and that of, "included in 200 is 100," because in that ruling we are speaking of the essence existence that within 200 coins there are 100 coins. However, in our case, when performing the sacrificial offering of an ox there is not within the ox a existence³⁶ of a calf³⁷.

Thus, the question returns: *What is the reason for the law "one who vows to bring a small one and brings a large one has fulfilled his obligation"?*

 Note: The Rebbe will now explain a different concept, which serves as the introduction to the reason the Rebbe is presenting for the entire dispute between *The Rabbis* and *Rebbi*, and through this the reasoning of Maimonides' ruling.

In order to understand this, we are to first explain the wording of Maimonides in his opening* to the *Laws of Vows*: "To heed the utterances of one's mouth and to carry out one's vow."

There seems to be an unnecessary lengthiness of wording and a duplicity of wording here: (i) "To heed the utterances of one's mouth," and (ii) "and to carry out one's vow"?

 *Note: Maimonides' format in his *Mishneh Torah*, aka *Sefer HaYaD*, is that before he begins the laws on any topic, he will first list the amount of mitzvot, those of the *248 Positive Mitzvot* and those of the *365 Prohibitions*.

For example, by the *Laws of Vows*, Maimonides states (-see Appendix VIII):

"They contain 3 mitzvot: two positive commandments and one negative commandment. They are...."

--[And to point out that in the *Counting of the Mitzvot** (-Positive Mitzvah #94) in the beginning of the *Mishneh Torah*, Maimonides writes only one concept, "For a person to fulfill all which he gives out with his lips (i.e. utters), be it a sacrifice, (a gift to) charity, or the likes, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:2): "What you have given out with your lips (i.e. spoken), take heed and fulfill..." being that there Maimonides's format is to be as brief as possible.]--

 *Note: Maimonides' format in his *Mishneh Torah*, aka *Sefer HaYaD*, is that after his introduction he lists the *613 Mitzvot*, first the *248 Positive Mitzvot* and then the *365 Prohibitions*, quoting by each the verse in the Torah of the mitzva (afterwards, Maimonides lists the *613 Mitzvot* --without their appropriate verse-- as they divide within his 14 Volumes of the *Mishneh Torah*, each mitzvot to their chapters of laws, which them become the "openings" of each set of laws, as mentioned in the previous note.)

Albeit this wording of Maimonides is aligned with the verse, "(i) *That which you utter with your lips you shall heed*, (ii) *and you will do as you have promised*," and the way of Maimonides is to quote the wording of the verse, however, nevertheless, it is a bit hard-pressed to say as such here, if there not be any legal outcome from the lengthiness and duplicity of his wording.

Thus, it is logical to say that this is not just a mere duplicity of wording, but rather, there are two different obligations and laws here:

- (i) That one heed that which his lips uttered ("That which you utter with your lips you shall heed").

(ii) To do that which he promised to do ("and you shall do as you have vowed").

The explanation to this is: In every vow there are two concepts: (i) The words of your mouth - the words that was said by the mouth of the one who vowed. (ii) The content of the vow - the understanding of the vow and its intention.

And these are the two concepts within the verse: (i) "That which you utter with your lips you shall heed," the words spoken by the mouth, and (ii) "That which you utter with your lips you shall heed," the intent of the vow.

 Note: The Rebbe will now explain how these two different concepts within every vow are the reasonings of *The Rabbis* and *Rebbi*, in their disputes.

With this we can explain the dispute between *Rebbi* and *the Rabbis* concerning, "one who vowed a small one and brought a large one," whether (*The Rabbis*) you have fulfilled your obligation, or (*Rebbe*) you have not fulfilled your obligation. The dispute is dependent upon how you categorize the obligation of, "and you shall do as you have vowed."

Rebbe: We consider only with the, "the utterances of your lips," and the content of the vow, "as you have vowed," is defined in accordance with the formulation of the vower, the words of his mouth.

The Rabbis: The primary issue at hand is the, "and you shall do as you vowed," to fulfill the intention of the vow, regardless that this is not all that aligned with the words of his mouth, "the utterances of your lips." Meaning, fulfilling the vow precisely as, "the utterances of your lips," does not hinder.

--[And each, *Rebbi* and *The Rabbis* follow their all-encompassing opinion, as we find in numerous places throughout the Talmud concerning the disputes between *Rebbi* and *the Rabbis*, concerning the language found in the Torah, teachings of our Sages, and even the wording of people (-See APPENDIX X in which the Rebbe brings an example of each, from the different themes of the *Six Orders* of the *Mishna*). In Which the opinion of *Rebbi* is that the intention is as per the practical simple meaning of the wording and all its details, while according to *The Rabbis* is that there is no necessity to accept the practical simple meaning of the wording and all its details, but rather, that it be in accordance to the their general content alone.]--

 Note: The Rebbe will now zoom into their dispute of our case, "one who vows to bring a small one and brings instead a large one."

And so too it is in our case of, "(one who vows to bring) a small (one) and brings (instead) a large (one)... 'Upon me (is to bring)... a lamb and he brought a ram":

From the perspective of, "that which your lips have uttered," thus, he had said, "Upon me (is to bring)... a lamb," which does not include within it a ram, as explained earlier. However, from the perspective of the content of the vow, it is a vow to G-d⁴⁰, upon which we have the commandment, "all the fattest is for G-d," and "the choicest of your vow." Thus, his intention is to give an offering to G-d from the species of sheep. His utterance of his mouth "lamb" was only due to a side issue that he could not afford more, or the likes, however, his intention in saying "a lamb" is that it be from the species of sheep⁴¹.

Therefore: According to the opinion of *Rebbi*, that we consider but the "utterance of your lips" thus, with his bringing a *large one* instead of a *small one*, he did not fulfill his obligation. For his vow was of a *small one*, thus, how can he fulfill the obligation of his vow in bringing a different offering, which is not the "utterance of his lips, but a *large one*?

However according to *The Rabbis* we primarily consider the intent of the vow, "and you shall do as you vowed," and therefore, regardless of that to beginning --in the *best manner* of performing the mitzvah-- we don't tell him to bring a *large one* (a ram in the place of a lamb --albeit the ram is the "fattest is for G-d," and the "choicest of your vow,"), for it is stated in the verse, "the utterance of your lips you shall heed," thus, to begin with --in the *best manner* of performing the mitzvah-- he needs to bring "as the utterance of your lips."

However, when he does bring a *large one*, he fulfills the mitzvah of the Torah⁴², being that the detail of, "the utterance of your lips," does not hinder the fulfillment of, "and you shall do as you(r intention of) have promised."

 Note: The Rebbe will now zoom into Maimonides' ruling in accordance with *The Rabbis*.

In order to explain better Maimonides' ruling in accordance with *The Rabbis* we will need to first explain what

Maimonides writes in *Laws of Vows* (-1:4):

"It is a positive commandment of Scriptural origin for a person to fulfill his oath or vow, whether it be a vow involving prohibitions or a vow of sanctification, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:24), 'that which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised.' And it is stated (-Numbers 30:3), 'As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do.'"

The difference between the two verses that Maimonides quotes here is that the verse, *"that which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised,"* speaks of deals with vows of sanctifications, while the verse, *"As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do,"* deals with vows of prohibitions⁴⁶. We see this within the writing of Maimonides himself, that when he quotes (-Counting of Mitzvot, beginning of Sefer HaYaD) only the verse, *"What you have given out with your lips (i.e. spoken), take heed and fulfill..."*, he writes that, *"For a person to fulfill all which he gives out with his lips (i.e. utters), be it a sacrifice, (a gift to) charity, or the likes,"* but nothing of vows of prohibitions.

And according to what we said prior, it is understood that the difference between to language of the verses, that of the vows of prohibitions it states only, *"As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do,"* while concerning the vows of sanctifications the verse states two details, (i) *that which your lips give out (utter) heed,* (ii) *and do as you have promised."*

The difference between the vow of prohibitions and the vow of sanctification is:

Vow of Prohibition: the prohibition is created only by the words of the person. For, if not for his words, no prohibition would exist. For Example, the vow of, *"I will not drink any wine."* Therefore, the obligation of these vows is to fulfill, *"As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do,"* for it is his words that creates the prohibition.

Vow of Sanctifications: The vow itself causes that the obligation written in the Torah befalls the person. For the obligation itself --once it befalls the person through his words-- is that of an offering to G-d, or that of charity, which are (offerings to G-d and giving charity) obligations of the Torah. Only, being voluntary offerings, the obligation to do so befalls the person only once they make a vow to do so. However, the concept of an offering to G-d can only exist being that it is a (voluntary) obligation of the Torah.

--[As explained in great breadth (-Likkutei Sichos, Vol 29 p. 36-7) the words of Maimonides ant the end of *Laws of Vows* (-13:25), *"Our Sages stated (-Nedarim 22a), 'Anyone who takes a vow is considered as having built a private altar (called a 'bama', which is forbidden since the time that the Holy Temple was built in Jerusalem).' And if he transgressed and took a vow, it is a mitzvah to ask (a sage) to absolve it, so that he will not have an obstacle before him. When does the above apply? With regard to vows involving prohibitions. However, with (regard to) vows involving the consecration of articles, it is a mitzvah to fulfill them and not to ask for them (absolution) only out of being (financially) pressed, as it is stated (-Psalms 116:14), 'I will fulfill my vows to G-d.'"*

That concerning vows of sanctifications, not only does the obligation of the vow befall him, but (once he makes the vow) also the obligation of the Torah befalls him, that of an offering, of charity, and the likes. Thus, here is created an *Object of a Mitzvah*, and thus, *"and not to ask for them (absolution)."]*--

And therefore there exists by the vows of sanctifications --according to Maimonides who rules like *The Rabbis*-- also the law of, *"and you shall do as you vows."* That we fulfill the vow when the intention of the vow is carried out (the offering to G-d, or charity, etc.), even when it is no precisely as the, *"that which your lips uttered."*⁴⁹

 Note: After explaining that the reason for Maimonides' ruling that, *"One who vows to bring a small one and brings a large one... to bring a lamb and instead brings a ram... has fulfilled his obligation,"* is because the primary focus of the vow of sanctifications is the intention of the vow, that the Torah Obligation of the Object of Mitzvah, an offering to G-d is fulfilled, even if it is not precisely as the wording of his vow, the Rebbe is now going to explain this as it is in the *Mystical Teachings*.

It is known that the word *korbon* (קרבן) is from the etymology *korov* (קרוב). The essence of the *korbonos* (offerings) is (-Leviticus 1:2), *"A man, when he brings, from you a korbon to G-d."* That a Jew's closeness to G-d is when he gives over (sacrifices) and brings close his faculties and talents to G-d.

 *Note: In order to understand this, I am bringing here the teaching of the Alter Rebbe taught by the Rebbe in *HaYom Yom* (-12th of Adar II):

"The Torah portion dealing with altar offerings begins: 'A man who offers (yakriv) of you an offering to G-d.' The logical order of the words should be, 'A man of you who offers, etc.'"

"The Torah portion dealing with altar offerings begins: 'A man who offers (yakriv) of you an offering to G-d.' The logical order of the words should be, 'A man of you who offers, etc.'

The Alter Rebbe answers: "A man who offers" - in order that a man become closer to G-d - 'of you an offering to G-d' - he must bring the offering of himself. He must sacrifice his personal 'animal,' the desire for evil that is called the animal soul."

 And this is the difference between bringing offerings and all other Mitzvot: *All other Mitzvot* are "Organs --(-Maimonides, end of his introduction to Sefer HaYaD and to Sefer HaMitzvot), the 248 *Positive Mitzvot* represent the 248 *Organs* of the male body (excluding the female's reproductive organs) *and Sinews* --(-Zohar, Vol I 170b), the 365 *Prohibitions* represent the 365 *Sinews*." Each mitzvah being either an individual Organ or an individual Sinew. And with every other Mitzvah --Mitzvah from the etymology *tzavsa v'chibur - bonding and connecting*-- we connect a specific individual⁵⁴ *Organ* or *Sinew* of ours to G-d.

However, the essence of a *korban* is that the Jew gives himself entirely, and becomes entirely close to G-d.

This is emphasized in the explanation of *Nachmanides* (-Leviticus 1:9) as to why *korbonos* brings atonement (-See APPENDIX XI):

"All these acts are performed in order that when they are done, a person should realize that he has sinned against his G-d with his body and his soul, and that "his" blood should really be spilled and "his" body burned, were it not for the loving-kindness of the Creator... so that its (of the offering) blood should be in place of his blood, its life (of the offering) in place of his life."

More than this, the essence of the *korban* is the concept of *Teshuvah* (*Return; Repentance*), as is understood from the words of the previously quoted *Nachmanides*, the *Teshuvah* is above and beyond *all* Mitzvot, and thus, through *Teshuvah* all blemishes created through the transgression of Prohibitions, and through the neglect of performing Positive Mitzvot are atoned for.

 Note: In explaining that the essence of *korbonos* is the Jew giving himself entirely over, and bringing his entire being close to G-d, the rebbe answers as to why the Torah-portion of *korbonos* begins with voluntary and donation offerings, rather than with obligatory ones.

 And this is one of the reasons as to why the Torah-portion of *korbonos* opens with the ones brought because of promises and donations --as Rashi states in the very beginning of the portion⁵⁷ (-Leviticus 1:2), "When a man from among you brings": (i.e.) *if he wishes to bring. Of voluntary offerings the concept (portion's matter) is speaking*", and only afterwards does the Torah-portion continue with the *Sin-offering* and the *Guilt-offering*, which are obligatory. For, through the *korbonos* the Jew becomes entirely close to G-d, and this does not express itself in obligatory offerings, being that they are obligatory, what is primarily expressed is the commandment of G-d to bring a *Sin-offering* or a *Guilt-offering*, or the likes. Rather, it is specifically in the voluntary offerings that it is more clearly expressed that the Jew is bringing himself close to G-d through the voluntary donation of his heart.

 Note: The Rebbe is not focusing on the *Mystical Dimension* of our specific ruling of, "*If one vowed to bring a small one, and brings a large one instead, he has fulfilled his obligation.*"

 When a Jew vows to bring a *korbon*, his intention is not of a specific individual mitzvah - "*the utterance of your lips observe*," and the likes, - rather, as explained earlier, his intention is to fulfill the all-encompassing concept of offering himself, the absolute giving (devotion; dedication; surrender) of himself to G-d.

As are the words (-see APPENDIX XII) of our *Sages* (-Menochos 104b) concerning (-Leviticus 2:1) the word "*nefesh* (*person; soul*)," found by the portion of the *donation flour offering*: "*The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, 'Whose practice (is it) to bring a meal offering? (It is that of a) poor (person); and I will ascribe him* (credit) as if he offered up his 'nefesh' before Me.*"

 *Note: To understand what the Rebbe is saying here, we will need to know the wording of the teaching for, "*and I will ascribe him*" is, "ma'aleh ani olov - מעלה אני עליו," which in its literal sense means, "*I will elevate upon him*,"

 The intention in addition of the words "ma'aleh ani olov - מעלה אני עליו" ("*I will elevate upon him*") in the teaching is that the person has with this also the giving of a empowerment from Above. Thus, the "*offers (hikriv; korbon) his soul*" is performed in a greater exalted dimension than that of reaching with his own capacity of his faculties and service. Rather, he reaches the level of, "*G-d elevates upon him*."

that the person has with this *also* the giving of a *empowerment from Above*. Thus, the "offers (*hikriv; korb*) his soul" is performed in a greater exalted dimension than that of reaching with his own capacity of his faculties and service. Rather, he reaches the level of, "G-d *elevates upon him*."

Therefore, in fulfilling this specific mitzva (of offering a voluntary *korbon*) it is included within the all-encompassing mitzvah - the all-encompassing *tzavsa v'chibur* bonding of the Jew to G-d through his voluntary donation and offering of the *korbon*.

Therefore, what is primarily considered here is the all-encompassing matter, the absolute devotion of the Jew and his complete getting close to G-d. --Thus, the ruling here is that if he brings a large one instead he fulfills his obligation, for it is the *all-encompassing* matter of his vow, his absolute devotion and his complete getting close to G-d, that is the primary consideration.

 Note: Now the Rebbe is going to zoom in on the deeper mystical dimension of "a small one" and "a big one" in this ruling.

According to this --that we are speaking of the all-encompassing devotion and getting close to G-d dimension of a *korbon*-- we can explain the spiritual dimension of "a small one" and "a large one":

At the onset of a person's spiritual service he is in a state of *small*. However, being that we are speaking here of the spiritual service of *korbonos*, in bringing his entire soul close to G-d, and of surrendering himself, thus, this is the "bringing himself close" and "large" *korbon*. This is *in a likening* to that which is explained* (-Torah Ohr 114d --and the Rebbe cites two other sources, as well) concerning the connection between *Inferior Fear* (*Acceptance of the Yoke; Obedience*) and the *Superior Fear* of G-d.

And therefore, when, "And he brought a large one (instead of his vowed *small one*)" this is mystically saying that this *brings to* the surrender and bringing himself close to G-d in a manner of *large*, that also in a revealed manner, and with all the faculties of his soul (not just in an abstract all-encompassing essence level) he becomes entirely close to G-d.

 *Note: In explaining how, here, concerning the spiritual service of offering a voluntary *korbon* there is that the *small* is connected to the *large*, the Rebbe is going to refer to the different levels of *Fear* and *Awe* of G-d.

There are two primary levels of *Fear of G-d*. There is the *Inferior Fear*, which is the simple fear of retribution, in which our *Fear of Heaven* is the simple drive and self-negation of an *obedience* to fulfill G-d's commandments, and not to transgress any of G-d's prohibitions. Then there is the *Superior Fear*, in which we stand in a total awe and self-negation in the face of G-d's infinite exaltedness and omnipotence.

The correlation the Rebbe is speaking of here is the teaching about the connection between the *Inferior Fear* and the *Superior Awe*, being like that of the connection between the *small* state of one's onset of spiritual service to the *large* all-encompassing state of bringing himself close, and surrendering himself entirely, to G-d, through offering a voluntary *korbon*.

 Note: And now the Rebbe closes the sicha with emphasizing how this matter brings to the imminent coming of Moshiach, the building of the third Holy temples, and offering *korbonos*, in its fullest spiritual state, within it.

And (-see Minochos 110) through engaging with the laws of *korbonos* it is as if we have actually offered the *korbon*, and (-Minochos, *ibid*), "Torah scholars, who engage in (studying) the laws of the (Temple) service, *the verse elevates them* (ascribes them) *as though the Temple was built in their days* (and they are serving in it)."

And from this "as though" it becomes "*Temple was built*," in actuality, with the coming of our Righteous Moshiach, and there it will be the actual, "offer an offering," and more than this, it will be (-Prayers Liturgy), "will bring offerings as the mitzvot of Your will" in the third Holy Temple, may it be built speedily in our days, practically and tangibly so.

Footnotes

The *Footnote* numbers follow the ones in the original.

The missing *Footnotes* here are the ones that are sources to quotes, which are here in the text in parentheses.
Parentheses that remain the font size of the text in italics, are parentheses from the original sicha.

*Footnote 2: "To note that in the portion of korbonos in our Torah-portion begins with voluntary donation korbonos (Rashi's commentary, our Torah-portion 1:2. And see also Rashi's commentary 2:1), and only after this (4:1 and further) come the laws etc. concerning obligatory korbonos [only that in middle of the voluntary korbonos at the end of the Torah-portion concerning meal-offerings, comes also concerning one obligatory meal-offering (2:14-16. And see also Rashi's commentary *ibid* verse 12)] And see further inside (the sicha) seif 8."*

The Rebbe will explain that it is in the *voluntary donation offerings* that we see the absolute surrender and the Jew's getting entirely close to G-d, which is the primary focus of this sicha's explanation of the service of *korbonos*.

Footnote 8: The Rebbe points out, "And Maimonides counts it ("the utterances of your heed, and do as you vowed") in the counting of Positive Mitzvot of the Torah (Laws of Vows Chapter 1, Law 4. Sefer HaMitzvot (and the counting of the Mitzvot in the beginning of Sefer HaYaD) Positive Mitzvah #94)."

*Footnote 9: "See Baba Kama (65b): '(If one) stole a lamb and it (subsequently) became a ram, (or if he stole) a calf and it (subsequently) became a bull, (the stolen item) has undergone a change (while) in (the thief's) possession (and he has therefore acquired it as his own property).' And see Tosfos, Opening Words, 'Ayil', *ibid*."*

Tosfos, Opening Words, 'Ayil': " 'a day-old bull is called a bull': However, definitely concerning a korbon we say that a ram is (not a one-year old, which is called a 'lamb') (only) a two- year-old, being that it is written elsewhere, 'a one year-old lamb.'"

Footnote 15: The sicha said concerning the dispute of one who says "I has vowed a meal-offering of tenths, and I don't know how many I vowed,' (The Rabbis say) he should bring a meal-offering of sixty tenths": "(And this is, 'or also he didn't but three tenths and he brought five tenths he did not fulfilled his obligation'.)"

The Rebbe points out where this quote comes from, and what the conclusion there is: "*Rashi's commentary, *ibid*. And Rashi concludes there, 'And he doesn't have to bring another one (meal-offering of three tenths in order to fulfill his vow)' (and this is, the conclusion of the Talmud - Rabbi Ashi's opinion)."*

*Footnote 17: "And especially according to RGM"H (Rabbeinu Gershon Me'ir HaGolah) *ibid* (106, end of side b) "Which we say that the cow is more than the calf, for there will be for 'Up High' more than he vowed," and not like Rashi's commentary, "And there is to say that not as such did he vow."*

The Rebbe is pointing out that this is especially so according Rabbeinu Gershon who is speaking in the terminology that it is definite so, that this is not (it is more than) what he vowed, while Rashi is speaking in a terminology of, "*It could be said*" that this is not what he vowed.

Footnote 25: After citing the source, the Rebbe tells us, "And see Rashi's commentary to the Mishna, Minochos 108b (Opening Words 'HaGadol'), as to the reason of the law, 'I specified... but I do not know what (animal he consecrated), the largest of them is consecrated.' ' That it is probable that it is the better of them that he sanctified, being that it is written, 'from the choicest of his vow'."

The Rebbe then cites other sources, and directs us to sources in which the Rebbe explains this.

*Footnote 26: Concerning the question that seemingly the person who vowed a *small one*, should to begin with (and not just in *post facto*) to bring a *large one*, or at least, it should be befitting to bring a *large one*, due to, "*al the choicest for G-d,*" the Rebbe notes: *And how definitely so from what the RaSHaSH (and the RASH) writes concerning "The poor Leper who brings a Offering of the Wealthy fulfills his obligation (Negaim Chapter 14, Mishna 12): 'Even to begin with he brings (the wealthy man's offering) and a blessing should come upon him' -- for there he speaks of a korbon that the Torah obligates of it the offering of the wealthy and of the poor."* And see further within the sicha. And the explanation of HaRaY"P of Footnote 10, 34."*

Further in the sicha: the Rebbe explains that this the Chinuch states concerning the sacrifice that varies up and down, that it is inappropriate for the poor to push himself, once G-d has defined compassion upon him that he bring the sacrifice of the poor, does not apply to the voluntary case for two reasons. See inside.

*HaRaY"P Perlow of Footnote 10: concludes that concerning an obligatory sacrifice, even that of "varies up and down," if not for the verse specifically teaching us that the poor who brings the sacrifice of the wealthy fulfills his obligations, we would not allow it even *post facto*, even though the verse tells us that the primary sacrifice is that of the wealthy, and that only, "if he cannot afford..." does he bring the sacrifice of the poor.*

HaRaY"P Perlow of Footnote 34: "And I am well puzzled by R"S of Shantz, z"l, why do we need a verse for the poor man who brought a rich sacrifice, that he fulfilled his obligation (when the RaSHaSH) says upon him, "may a blessing come upon him"? Rather, certainly it is obligatory to say that in the matter of sacrifice this reasoning is not applicable. And if not for the verse revealing it applicable. And if not for the verse revealing it to us, it would be appropriate to say that he did not fulfill his obligation in this, even in 'post facto', And he is obliged to return and bring a poor sacrifice according to its law. And if so, when the verse does reveal to us, it suffices for us to say that he has fulfilled his obligation (only) 'post facto, however, 'to begin with' definitely we should not say that

it is permissible. And for this, reason they did not say in the Miishna of Negaim and in the Gemara there, but only that he has fulfilled his obligation 'post facto'.

*And it seems that this is also the intention of the Chinuch (in Mitzvah #123) that which he wrote, 'And if he is poor and brought and he brought a ewe or a bull, he did not fulfill his obligation. And the reason is that after G-d had mercy on him and exempted him from this, he is not allowed to push himself to bring more than his hand can reach, etc. etc..' And the Mishneh L'Melech asked upon this in his comments from the clear Mishna (last chapter of Negaim, *ibid*). Which taught explicitly that he did fulfill his obligation, see there. Rather, it seems clear that the intention of the Chinuch is not that he will not atone for this. And that he must return and bring a poor sacrifice. Rather, it is to say that he did not fulfill his obligation properly. The Torah did not permit this to begin with. Rather, the verse reveals that 'post facto' he was atoned, and he doesn't have to bring another atonement. And nevertheless, he did not do this according to his commandment and obligation."*

Thus, the Rebbe is pointing out that other than the RaSh (and the Rosh) there are those who are clearly defining that even in a case of the *sacrifice that varies up and down* the poor cannot *to begin with* bring the sacrifice of the wealthy.

Footnote 29: "And as such is it written (in the Mishna and) in Maimonides there concerning the ram, (one who says) This ram is a burnt-offering,' a blemish befell it (rendering it unfit for being an offering), if he wishes he may bring a lamb with its monies (by selling the blemished ram)."

*Footnote 30: The sicha states that the language of Maimonides says that the his fulfilling his obligation is in of 'post facto', and not of 'to being with'. In this Footnote the Rebbe points out that maybe this is not due to Maimonides ruling so, but rather, "Even though that we may say that he (Maimonides) is speaking only concerning the law of the vow and fulfilling it, and not the (additional) law of, 'all the choicest is for G-d' and as is further in Maimonides, *ibid*, Law 4.*

"However, there (Law 4) this is understood from in his wording itself, 'And he is not obligated to bring of the nicest and the fattiest, of which there is no better than it, but rather, he should bring the intermediate one, and if he brings the famine he fulfills with it the obligation of his vow.

"And to point out that here Maimonides writes, 'fulfills his obligation' plainly, and not as he does in Law 2 and Law 4, 'he fulfills with it the obligation of his vow."

*Footnote 31: In this Footnote as well, the Rebbe deals with the same topic of the last Footnote: "And seemingly, we can say that the terminology 'fulfilled his obligation' is because being that he taught in the first segment (of the law) 'he don fulfill his obligation' thus, in the end segment he teaches 'fulfills bis obligation' (As the R"Sh and the RO"Sh (of Footnote 26) concerning the terminology of the Mishna, Negaim, *ibid*). However, seemingly, this (reasoning of the R"Sh and the RO"Sh concerning the Mishna's wording) does not suffice to answer concerning Maimonides, which is a 'latter one' (in comparison to the Mishna) and thus it was upon him to be more explicit, and in particular as it is known his specificity of his wording in his book."*

*Footnote 34: "And they already asked upon him (in the Minchas Chinuch and) the comments of the Mishneh L'Melech to the Chinuch, *ibid* (printed in the end of his book). And see the explanations of RaY" P Perlow, *ibid*, Positive Mitzva 144-145 (p. 388b) who explains the intention of the Chinuch (is not that he didn't fulfill his obligation at all, but rather, that) he did not fulfill his obligation in a befitting manner."*

See Footnote 26 where I quoted this explanation of RaY" P Perlow.

Footnote 36: " See earlier, Footnote 9."

The Rebbe in Footnote 9 directs us to a Talmudic teaching in Baba Kama concerning one who, "a stole a lamb and it (subsequently) became a ram, (or if he stole) a calf and it (subsequently) became a bull, (the stolen item) has undergone a change (while) in (the thief's) possession (and he has therefore acquired it as his own property)."

The Rebbe is doing this to fortify what the Rebbe is saying in the sicha that, "within the ox is not the existence of a calf."

Footnote 37: Concerning the "within the ox is not the existence of a calf," the Rebbe points out, "And the language (of Rashi and of) Rabbi Ovadia Bartenura who writes for the reasoning of The Rabbis, (that the reason is) 'included within the many is the few' (and if you wish to say that the intention is in its simple sense - however see further Footnote 42), maybe we may say that he (Rabbi Ovadia Bartenura) holds that it is also according to the conclusion that the (law of) 'one who vows a small one and brings a large one' is because of the 'since the sacrificial portions are greater.' Not so Maimonides that we may say he holds that it is because of the all-encompassing of the korbon - (that is the law of) a ram in the place of the lamb (and not of) a ram in the place of the lamb (and not because of the sacrificial portions that we offer upon the altar), and of this ('the all-encompassing of the korbon') it does not align (all that much) to say, 'included within the many is the few.'"

In *Footnote 42* the Rebb explains that Rashi's and the Bartenura's intention of the reasoning of, "*Included within the many is the few*" is that, "*and he fulfills with this* (bringing the many, ram, when he vowed the few, the lamb) *the Biblical mitzva, being that the detail of, 'the utterances of your mouth you shall heed' does not hinder.*"

Footnote 41: "Like that of one who vows plain (without detailing a small one or a large one) he brings from the large ones (Maimonides, Laws of Ma'asei Korbonos, Chapter 16, Law 3 - See the Lechem Mishneh there)."

Footnote 42: "And we may say that this is the intention in the words of (Rashi and of) Rabbi Ovadia Bartenura of the opinion of The Rabbis, 'Included within the many is the few.'"

See what I explained earlier on *Footnote 37*.

Footnote 46: "As the simple difference between the Torah-portions of Mattos and Teitzei, ibid. And see RaDVa"Z on Maimonides, ibid. "

The Rebbe is pointing out that the Torah-portions of each of these two verses are speaking precisely of how the Rebbe is explaining the difference between these two verses:

"If a man makes a vow to the L-rd or makes an oath to prohibit himself, he shall not violate his word; according to whatever came out of his mouth ," is in *Mattos*, which speaks of, "*vows of prohibitions.*"

"Observe and do what is emitted from your lips just as you have pledged to the L-rd, your G-d, as a donation, which you have spoken with your mouth," is in *Teitzei*, which speaks of, "*vows of sanctifications.*"

Footnote 49: "And in particular that, 'Promises and vows... If he completes in his heart, but does not utter with his lips of anything, he is obligated (to do) as he had completed in his heart that this is a burnt-offering or to bring an burnt-offering, he is obligated to bring this, as it is stated... concerning donations of the heart he is obligated to bring. And so too, all like this of vows of sanctifications and your vows' (Maimonides, Laws of Ma'asei HaKorbonos, Chapter 14, Law 12)."

The Rebbe is pointing out that we can see that the exacting details of, "*the utterances of your lips (you shall heed)*" does not hinder his fulfilling his obligation, which was in his intention and heart.

Footnote 54: "In addition to the general concept (within a mitzvah) - 'Who has sanctified with His Mitzvot,' - The tzavsa (bonding of the Jew with G-d)."

In stating that every individual mitzvah is but the bonding of an individual organ or sinew of ours to G-d, the Rebbe is pointing the general concept of each and every mitzvah, that each and every individual mitzvah is, "*Who has sanctified with His Mitzvot,' - The tzavsa* (bonding of the Jew with G-d).

Appendix

(i) Maimonides, Laws of Maasei Korbonos 16:1:

"When a person vows to bring a large animal, but instead brings a small one, he does not fulfill his obligation. [If he vows to bring] a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation.

"What is implied? He said: 'I promise [to bring] a lamb as a burnt-offering' or '...as a peace-offering,' and he brings a ram, or he vowed a calf and brought an ox, or a kid and brought a goat, he fulfills his obligation."

(ii) Talmud, Minochois 107b, Mishna:

"If one vows (to bring a) large (bull), and he brought a small (bull), he has not fulfilled (his obligation). (But if he vows to bring) a small (bull), and he brought a large (bull), he has fulfilled (his obligation), Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He has not fulfilled (his obligation)."

(iii) Maimonides, Laws of Maasei Korbonos 16:9:

"If one vowed to bring a burnt-offering from cattle and designated [an animal as a sacrifice to fulfill] his vow and [later] forgot whether he had designated an ox or a calf, he should bring an ox. Similarly, if he designated a sheep and forgot what he designated, he should bring a ram. If he designated a goat and forgot what he designated, he should bring a grown goat. If he forgot the species from which he designated the burnt-offering, he should bring an ox, a ram, and a grown goat."

(iv) Torah Verse of Fulfilling What One Says (-Deuteronomy 23:24):

"(i) Observe and do what is emitted from your lips just (ii) as you have pledged to the Lord, your G-d, as a donation, which you have spoken with your mouth."

(v) Talmud, Minochois 104b, Mishna:

"(If one says), 'I specified a meal offering of tenths (of an ephah --Eipha: 22 litres; 20 dry quarts) but I do not know how many (tenths) I specified,' he must bring (a meal offering of) sixty (-tenths of an ephah). Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He brings meal offerings of all sizes, (in increments of tenths of an ephah, ranging) from one-tenth (of an ephah) to sixty (-tenths, for a total of sixty meal offerings with a total volume of 1,830 tenths of an ephah, or 183 ephahs)."

(vi) Talmud, Minochois 106b:

"Rav Ashi said (that there is alternative explanation of the disagreement between the Rabbis and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi), 'They disagree (with regard to the law of one who is obligated to bring) a small (offering) and (instead brings) a large (offering). The Rabbis hold (that if one is obligated to bring) a small (offering) and brings a large (one instead) he has fulfilled (his obligation), and Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi) holds (that in such a case) he has not fulfilled (his obligation). (Therefore, in the case of the uncertainty in the mishna, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds that by bringing one meal offering of sixty-tenths of an ephah one does not fulfill his obligation if he vowed to bring a smaller offering.)"

"(The Gemara asks:) But didn't they (already) disagree about this (topic) once? As we learned (in a mishna (107b) that if one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring) a small (bull), and he brought a large (bull instead), he has fulfilled (his obligation). Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He has not fulfilled (his obligation)."

"(The Gemara answers:) It is necessary (for the dispute to be mentioned with regard to both cases), as had (their dispute) been stated (only) with regard to this (case of one who vows to bring a small meal offering and brings a large one instead, there would be room to reason that it is only) in this (case that) the Rabbis say (that he has fulfilled his obligation,) because (both) this (small meal offering) and that (large meal offering are identical with regard to the portion of the offering that is sacrificed on the altar; in both cases) it is a handful. But there, (in the case of one who vows to bring a small bull but brings a large one,) since the sacrificial portions are greater, (i.e., larger, there is room to) say (that the Rabbis) concede to Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi that he has not fulfilled his obligation).

"And had (their dispute) been stated (only) in that (case of one who vows to bring a small bull and brings a big one, there would be room to reason that only in that case) Rabbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says (that the person has not fulfilled his obligation, because the sacrificial portions are larger). But in this (case of bringing a large meal offering instead of a small one, there is room to say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi) concedes to (the opinion of) the Rabbis. (Therefore,) it is necessary (for the mishna to teach both cases.)"

(vii) Chinuch, Mitzvah #123:

"(The commandment of the sacrifice that varies up and down: To sacrifice the sacrifice that varies up and down for specific sins — and they are: (i) Impurity of the Temple, meaning to say a man who is impure with a primary source of impurity and enters the Temple inadvertently; (ii) likewise, the impurity of its consecrated [foods], that he is impure and ate consecrated meat inadvertently; (iii) an oath of expression, meaning to say that he swore falsely about a thing to do it or not to do it, and the other known angles of an oath of expression, and he transgresses it inadvertently; (iv) likewise an oath of testimony, meaning to say that he swore to his fellow that he does not have testimony for him [when he actually does], whether inadvertently or volitionally.

"For these sins, a person is obligated to bring a sacrifice that varies up and down — meaning to say, according to the wealth or poverty of a person; as it is explicit in the verse (-Leviticus 5:1), 'And if a soul shall sin and he heard the voice of an oath' — meaning to say the voice of the oath that they swore him to, whether he knows testimony, 'if he does not say, he will carry his iniquity.' And the end of the matter is (-Leviticus 5:6), 'And he shall bring his guilt-offering.' And it is not stated there, 'and it was hidden from him,' to teach that he is liable for the sacrifice, whether [he is] inadvertent or volitional.)"

"...But if he is poor and he brings a ewe or a female goat, he has not fulfilled his obligation. And the reason

is that since G-d, blessed be He, had mercy upon him and exempted him with [something less expensive], it is not appropriate that he push himself to bring more than what his hand can reach. And from this, every understanding person will acquire good counsel: to not make expenditures [that are] more than what is fitting according to his money — as this is a cause to steal from the creatures when he seeks that to which he is accustomed and does not find [it]."

(viii) Maimonides, Opening to Laws of Vows:

"They contain 3 mitzvot: two positive commandments and one negative commandment. They are:

1. To heed the utterances of one's mouth and to carry out one's vow;

2. Not to desecrate one's word;

3. To nullify a vow or an oath; this is the law concerning the nullification of oaths explicitly stated in the Torah.

These mitzvot are explained in the ensuing chapters."

(ix) Maimonides, Counting of the Mitzvot, Positive Commandment 94:

"For a person to fulfill all which he gives out with his lips (i.e. utters), be it a sacrifice, (a gift to) charity, or the likes, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:2): "What you have given out with your lips (i.e. spoken), take heed and fulfill...."

(x) For FOOTNOTE 39: Likkutei Sichos, Vol 17 p. 26. p. 30 and further:

"And we may say that the dispute between Rabbi and the Rabbis go each according to their approach, which we find in many places in a dispute between Rabbi and another, and especially with the Rabbis: Concerning the language of a verse, teaching, (and so too concerning the language of people, as will be stated further) --whether this is to be interpreted specifically (a) in its simple meaning literally, (b) in all the details, or whether it can mean but a part, or one detail.

"...in many places throughout the Talmud. And among them: In the Order of Seeds (Tractate Brochos (-13a)): '(The Rabbis taught (in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis disagreed with regard to the language in which Shema must be recited.)) Shema (must be recited) as it is written (in Hebrew), this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say, '(Shema may be recited) in any language.' Rabbi holds that the obligation of reading Shema, needs to be exactly with all the details, as the portions (of the Shema) are in the Torah, also the detail of 'as it is written'. ('What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion? (The source for his law lies in the emphasis on the word) the verse states 'And these (words, which I command you this day, will be upon your heart)'. 'Will be' means as they are, so shall they be (they should remain unchanged, in their original language)). The Rabbis however hold that it is enough it is enough that it be, 'in any language': we needn't it should also be 'as it is written', but rather it is enough that which it is the content of the concept of reading the Shema....

"In the Order of Seasons (Tractate Sukkah (-3a)): 'Rebbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'Any sukka that does not have (an area of at least) four cubits by four cubits is unfit. And the Rabbis say: Even if it holds (only) his head and most of his (body), it is fit.' In the Torah it states (-Leviticus 23:42), 'In sukkot you shall reside seven days' thus the Talmud (-Sukkah 28b) says that it must be, "Shall you reside' as kind of as you dwell.' Rebbi holds that the, "You shall reside' as kind of as you dwell.' has to be in its simple meaning and in all its details, and therefore, the sukka has to have four cubits by four cubits, 'as you dwell' tangibly as that of a house. The Rabbis hold that it needn't be 'as kind of as you dwell' practically in all its details, but rather it is enough that it be, 'as kind of as you dwell', in the detail that it holds (only) his head and most of his (body) - -a temporary dwelling and it can be there be his residing -- 'you shall reside', however, we don't need that also the structure of the sukka should be, 'as kind of as you dwell'.

"So too we find concerning the language and the mind of people in the Order of Women (-Tractate Gitten 74a): 'Rebbi (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'Anyone who states (when giving the GET a condition employing the language), 'On the condition,' (is) like (one who) states, '(The agreement will take effect retroactively) from now' (even though the condition is fulfilled only later on). And the Rabbis disagree with him.' If one states, for example, 'This is your GET on the condition that you give me 200 zuz' according to Rebbi she is, 'Divorced from now' and according to the Rabbis she becomes divorced only when she gives the 200 zuz. The opinion of Rebbi is that when there is a speaking and an actual action that he is doing now (even though he states with it, 'on the condition that' of a later condition) we take this as its simple meaning and with all the details, that the action he is doing right now, only that he is adding on an, 'on the condition that' that she should later fulfill the action of the condition. And therefore he (Rebbi) says, 'He who saus 'on the condition that' is exactly as if he would have said, 'from now'. The Rabbis hold that he cannot innovate (add on) 'from now' even though that without this innovation the action (of giving the GET) will not be as its simple meaning (that she is now divorced), and therefore, they (the Rabbis) say that the GET is in effect first later when she fulfills the condition.

"This, 'according to their opinions' of Rebbi and the Rabbis we find also by extrapolating one thing from another through a Gezerah Shava ("similar verdicts", an analogy or inference from one verse to another which contain a word common to both) -in the Order of Damages (Tractate Sanhedrin (-84a)): 'One who intentionally performed

a misuse (of consecrated property). *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) says, 'He is punished with death (at the hand of Heaven), and the Rabbis say, '(He is liable only) for (violating) a prohibition. What is the reason of *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi)? *Rabbi Abbahu* says, 'He derives (a verbal analogy: The meaning of the term of) 'sin - אָפֵן' (written with regard to one who intentionally misuses consecrated property (-Leviticus 5:15, "If a person commits a betrayal and sins (הֵאָפֵן) unintentionally against [one] of the things sacred to the Lord") is derived) from (the term of) 'sin - אָפֵן' (written with regard to an impure priest who partakes of) *Teruma* ("offering"; "lift up": the priestly dues or heave offering given to the kohain) (-Leviticus 22:9, "They shall keep My charge and not bear a sin (אָפֵן) by [eating] it [while unclean] and thereby die through it since they will have desecrated it"). Just as there (with regard to *teruma*, the priest is punished) with death (at the hand of Heaven), so too here (one who intentionally misuses consecrated property is punished) with death (at the hand of Heaven). And the Rabbis say, 'The verse states (with regard to *teruma*,) 'Because of it' (they receive death at the hand of Heaven), but not in (the case of the intentional) misuse (of consecrated property).'' According to *Rebbi*, being that the entire law of misuse of consecrated property we extrapolate through the *Gezerah Shava* from *Teruma*, thus we need to accept that the Torah means to teach us by the simple meaning and all its details -also concerning the death penalty; Not so however is the opinion of the Rabbis, that even though also according to them we extrapolate from the 'sin' 'sin' from *Teruma*, and thus there is a prohibition of ', however, being that their opinion is that the extrapolation (through the *Gezerah Shava*) is not necessarily in its simple meaning and with all its details, therefore they hold that finding the exclusion of, 'Because of it' thus we exclude, 'One who intentionally performed a misuse (of consecrated property)' from the death penalty.

"According to this we may say that the above mentioned 'according to their opinion' of *Rebbi* and the Rabbis we find as well when the dispute (of *Rebbi*) is not with the Rabbis, but with an individual is the one disputing with *Rebbi* (in which the opinion of the one disputing with *Rebbi* goes in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis in the above mentioned disputes): In the Order of Sacred Things (Tractate Menochos (-28b)): '(With regard to Temple) service vessels that one fashioned from wood, *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) deems them unfit and *Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehuda*, deems them fit. (According to this baraita, their dispute was with regard to a Candelabrum fashioned from wood, not from metal.) With regard to what (principle) do they disagree? *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) interprets (verses by means of the principle of) generalizations and details, and *Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehuda*, interprets (verses by means of the principle of) amplifications and restrictions. *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) interprets (the verse (-Exodus 25:31), 'And you will make a Candelabrum of pure gold; of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made,' by means of the principle of) generalizations and details. 'And you will make a Candelabrum of' is a generalization, (as the material of the Candelabrum is not specified;) 'pure gold' is a detail, (limiting the material exclusively to gold; and by then stating), 'Of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made,' (the verse then makes) a generalization. (The result is) a generalization and a detail and a generalization, (from which) you may deduce (that the verse is referring) only (to items) similar to the detail ("A generalization followed by an detail and then a second generalization, [in which instance] the law is not extended to apply to situations [beyond the scope of the particular] unless they are similar to that particular"), (leading to this conclusion:) Just as (the item mentioned in) the detail (is clearly) defined (as a type) of metal, so too, all (other types) of metal (may be used in fashioning the Candelabrum). (By contrast,) *Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehuda*, interprets (the verse by means of the principle of) amplifications and restrictions. 'And you will make a Candelabrum of' is an amplification, (as the material of the Candelabrum is not specified;) 'pure gold is a restriction, (limiting the material exclusively to gold; and by then stating,) 'Of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made,' (the verse) repeated and amplified. (There is a hermeneutical principle that when a verse) amplified and (then) restricted and (then) amplified, it amplified (the relevant category to include) everything (except the specific matter excluded in the restriction). And what did (the verse) include? It includes all materials (even wood). And what did (the verse) exclude (with this restriction)? It excluded (a Candelabrum fashioned) from earthenware (which is furthest in quality from gold).' (The restriction is not seen as an explanation of the original amplification, thus it is not restricting everything but the restriction. Thus, the second amplification is including everything, even that which is not similar to the restriction. And the restriction is only restricting one thing, which is the furthest from the restriction.) According to *Rebbi*, who holds that the extrapolation and deduction is (what more) as its simple meaning, and in inclusion of the most details similar to that which we are extrapolating and deducing from, is therefore, interprets generalizations and details, which is deducing, 'similar to the detail' -likened to the detail. *Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehudah*, who goes according to the opinion of the Rabbis of (the disputes with) *Rebbi*, (holds) that also when there is a similarity in one detail, and the likes, it has a correlation, and we can call it as the name of its source (In our case: the Sacrifice of the Woods) he extrapolates amplification and restriction, which is, 'amplifying everything' also that which is not similar to the restriction, and excluding only 'of earthenware' which is, 'least of all vessels and not befitting even for a king of flesh and blood.'

"A matter in Purities (representing the sixth and final Order of Purities, but found in Tractate Eiruvin 30b): 'one who enters the land of the nations, (i.e., any territory outside the Land of Israel, not on foot, but) in a carriage, a crate, or a cupboard, *Rabbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) renders (him ritually) impure. *Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehuda*, renders (him) pure. With regard to what do they disagree? One Sage (*Rebbi* Yehuda HaNasi) holds (that) a moving tent is not called a tent. (The principle is that only something fixed can shield against ritual impurity, but if one is situated inside a portable vessel, the vessel contracts impurity and he becomes impure along with it.) And the other Sage (*Rabbi Yosei*, son of *Rabbi Yehuda*) holds (that) a moving tent is called a tent (and it shields the person inside from contracting ritual impurity).' According to *Rebbi*, in order that a tent should block (shield) against an impurity, in needs to be exactly as a tent (in all its details), which is not movable, then is when it has the law of a tent it has the law to block. Contrary to this is the opinion of *Rabbi Yosei*, the son of *Rabbi Yehudah*, that even though it is not similar in all its details to a tent, however, being that it is similar in this which it is a place for itself, it has the law of a tent, and it blocks before the impurity, and like the opinion of the Rabbis mentioned earlier. And he is pure."

(xi) Nachmanides, Leviticus 1:9:

"It is far more fitting to accept the reason for the offerings which scholars say, namely that since man's deeds are accomplished through thought, speech and action, therefore G-d commanded that when man sins and brings an offering, he should lay his hands upon it in contrast to the (evil) deed (committed). He should confess his sin verbally in contrast to his (evil) speech, and he should burn the inwards and the kidneys (of the offering) in fire because they are the instruments of thought and desire in the human being. He should burn the legs (of the offering) since they correspond to the hands and feet of a person, which do all his work. He should sprinkle the blood upon the altar, which is analogous to the blood in his body. All these acts are performed in order that when they are done, a person should realize that he has sinned against his G-d with his body and his soul, and that "his" blood should really be spilled and "his" body burned, were it not for the loving-kindness of the Creator, Who took from him a substitute and a ransom, namely this offering, so that its blood should be in place of his blood, its life in place of his life, and that the chief limbs of the offering should be in place of the chief parts of his body. The portions (given from the sin-offering to the priests), are in order to support the teachers of the Torah, so that they pray on his behalf. The reason for the Daily public Offering is that it is impossible for the public (as a whole) to continually avoid sin. Now these are words which are worthy to be accepted, appealing to the heart as do words of Agadah (homiletic teachings)"

(xii) Maimonides, Laws of Vows 1:4:

"It is a positive commandment of Scriptural origin for a person to fulfill his oath or vow, whether it be a vow involving prohibitions or a vow of sanctification, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:24), 'that which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised.' And it is stated (-Numbers 30:3), 'As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do.'"

(xiii) Maimonides, Laws of Vows 13:25:

"Our Sages stated (-Nedarim 22a), 'Anyone who takes a vow is considered as having built a private altar (called a 'bama', which is forbidden since the time that the Holy Temple was built in Jerusalem).' And if he transgressed and took a vow, it is a mitzvah to ask (a sage) to absolve it, so that he will not have an obstacle before him. When does the above apply? With regard to vows involving prohibitions. However, with (regard to) vows involving the consecration of articles, it is a mitzvah to fulfill them and not to ask for them (absolution) only out of being (financially) pressed, as it is stated (-Psalms 116:14), 'I will fulfill my vows to G-d.'"

(xiv) Menochos 104b:

"Rabbi Yitzchak says: For what (reason) is the meal-offering different (from other offerings in) that (the term) 'nefesh (person; soul)' is stated with regard to it? The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, 'Whose practice (is it) to bring a meal offering? (It is that of a) poor (person); and I will ascribe him (credit) as if he offered up his 'nefesh' before Me.'"

Bottomline and Detailed Flowchart

Bottomline:

- (i) The reason as to why, "[If he vows to bring] a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation," is neither only because the person had but in mind 'nothing less,' nor, because 'within the big there is the small.'
- (ii) Maimonides in his opening to his Laws of Vows writes, "(They contain 3 mitzvot: two positive commandments and one negative commandment. They are: 1.) To heed the utterances of one's mouth and to fulfill one's vow," because there are two concepts here: (i) "To heed the utterances of one's mouth", and (ii) "to fulfill one's vow".
- (iii) Rebbi holds that the primary issue is that, "To heed the utterances of one's mouth," the actual words that he said, while the Rabbis hold that the primary issue here is, "to fulfill one's vow," the context of his promise. --And this aligns with the ongoing disputes between Rebbi and the Rabbis, in which Rebbi holds that the primary is the simple meaning of the words said (of the verse, teaching, or of people), and all its details, while the Rabbis hold that the primary is the context. And this explains the dispute here concerning, "[If he vows to bring] a small one and brings a large one:" Rebbi holds that he did not fulfill his words, "the utterances of one's mouth," and thus did not fulfill his obligation, while the Rabbis hold that the content of his promise, "one's vow," he fulfilled.
- (iv) This is the meaning behind Maimonides (-Laws of Vows 1:4), "It is a positive commandment of Scriptural origin for a person to fulfill his oath or vow, whether it be a vow involving prohibitions or a vow of sanctification, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:24), 'That which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised.' And it is stated (-Numbers 30:3), 'As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do.'"
- "That which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised," speaks of "vows involving the consecration of articles." This articles of consecration, only that they befall is through the word of man, that there befall upon him the obligation to bring this offering of charity. However, the offering's becoming an "Object of Mitzvah" an existing "Biblical Mitzvah" is not through the word of man.
- "As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do," speaks of "vows involving prohibitions." These prohibitions (i.e. "I won't drink wine...") are created only by the word of man. Thus, there only applies one prohibition, "As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do." --This is the reason behind Maimonides' ruling (-ibid, 13:25), "Our Sages stated (-Nedarim 22a), 'Anyone who takes a vow is considered as having built a private altar (forbidden since the time that the Holy Temple was built in Jerusalem).' And if he transgressed and took a vow, it is a mitzvah to ask (a sage) to absolve it, so that he will not have an obstacle before him. When does the above apply? With regard to vows involving prohibitions. However, with (regard to) vows involving the consecration of articles, it is a mitzvah to fulfill them and not to ask for them (absolution) only out of being (financially) pressed, as it is stated (-Psalms 116:14), 'I will fulfill my vows to G-d.'"
- (v) **Mystically Speaking:** (-Leviticus 1:2), "When a man brings (קריב) - from the etymology: "near") --he must bring the offering: - from you an offering (מקרב לך) to the L-rd." All other mitzvot are "limbs" and "sinews (248 Positive Commandments: 248 organs (of a male's organs, not including the reproductive organs of the female). 365 Prohibitions: 365 Sinews of the human body), each mitzvah being a different organ or sinew of ours that we are bringing near to, and giving to G-d. However, a sacrifice is about one giving themselves over, bringing themselves near, entirely to G-d. --This is emphasized in the teaching of Nachmanides (-Leviticus 1:9) as to why offerings bring atonement, "A person should realize that he has sinned against his G-d with his body and his soul, and that his blood should really be spilled and his body burned, were it not for the loving-kindness of the Creator, Who took from him a substitute and a ransom, namely this offering, so that its blood should be in place of his blood, its life in place of his life, and that the chief limbs of the offering should be in place of the chief parts of his body." More so, the concept of offerings are in their context that of *teshuvah* (Repentance). *Teshuvah* is above all mitzvot, and thus, in can fill any blemish created through sin and negation of a mitzvah.
- (vi) This is also why the Torah begins the portion of offerings with the offerings that are (-Rashi, Leviticus 1:2), "Scripture is speaking here of free — will offerings," and then it goes on to the obligatory offerings. Because the offerings concept of a Jew becoming entirely near to G-d, expresses itself more in the offerings that the Jew brings from the voluntary offering of his heart.
- (vii) This is the mystical meaning behind the, "[If he vows to bring] a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation": When one Vows to bring an offering he intends the all-encompassing bringing his entire self near to G-d --(-Minochos 104b), "For what reason is the meal offering different from other offerings in that the term 'nefesh (lit. a person; soul)' is stated with regard to it? The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: Whose practice is it to bring a meal offering? It is that of a poor individual; and I will (lit. raise upon him) ascribe him credit as if he offered up his soul (nafsho) in front of Me." "I will raise upon him" means that he will also have the to empowerment from above, more than possible from his own strength, he will have G-ds, "Raise upon him." This, through this individual mitzvah he becomes encompassed within the *general Mitzvah* -the all-encompassing 'tzavsa' and oneness of the Jew with G-d. Thus, here is primarily important the content (not just the words) of the offering, that he entirely becomes near, to G-d.
- (viii) This then is the mystical meaning behind "Small" and "Big": A person, at the onset of his service to G-d, he is in a state of "small". However, being that we are speaking of an offering, which is to become in his entirety near to G-d, thus, it is connected with "Big". And, the "Small" "And he brings (to) 'Big,'" also in a revealed manner.
- (ix) And (-See Menochos 110a), "anyone who engages in studying the law of the sin offering is ascribed credit as though he sacrificed a sin offering..." "Torah scholars, who engage in (studying) the laws of the (Temple)

service, *the verse raises upon them* (ascribes them) *as though the Temple was built in their days* (and they are serving in it)." And from this "*as though*" it becomes "*Temple was built,*" in actuality, with the coming of our Righteous Moshiach, and there --in which there will be, "*offer an offering*"-- "*will bring offerings as the mitzvot of Your will*" in the third Holy Temple, may it be built speedily in our days, practically and tangibly so.

*_*_*

Detailed Flowchart:

(a) Maimonides rules like the "*Rabbis*" (-Minochos 107b) concerning, "[If he vows to bring] *a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation,*" and only when speaking of small and large ones within the same species.

(b) How can this be, when one has the biblical obligation (-Deuteronomy 23:24), "*That which your lips utter you are to observe, and you shall do as you have promised*"?

Answers: (i) *From the Person*: We say that his intention was that he will not bring *less than a Small* one. Not that he wouldn't bring a *Large* one. Thus, his intention included the possibility of a *Large* one.

(ii) *From the Object* (animal): The person actually meant a *Small* one, however (-Rashi, Minochos 106b), "*Within the many is the few.*" Thus, he brought the *Small*, and upon it *added*, thus, he fulfilled his promise.

(c) The Talmud (-Minochos 104b), upon a similar argument,

--["(If one says), '*I specified a meal offering of tenths* (of an ephah --Eipha: 22 litres; 20 dry quarts) *but I do not know how many* (tenths) *I specified,*' he must bring (a meal offering of) *sixty* (-tenths of an ephah). *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) *says,* '*He brings meal offerings of all sizes,* (in increments of tenths of an ephah, ranging) *from one-tenth* (of an ephah) *to sixty* (-tenths, for a total of sixty meal offerings with a total volume of 1,830 tenths of an ephah, or 183 ephahs)."]--

explains the reason why both arguments are necessary: "*Had* (their dispute) *been stated* (only) *with regard to this* (case of one who vows to bring a small meal offering and brings a large one instead, there would be room to reason that it is only) *in this* (case that) *the Rabbis say* (that he has fulfilled his obligation,) *because* (both) *this* (small meal offering) *and that* (large meal offering are identical with regard to the portion of the offering that is sacrificed on the altar; in both cases) *it is a handful. But there,* (in the case of one who vows to bring a small bull but brings a large one,) *since the sacrificial portions are greater,* (i.e., larger, there is room to) *say* (that the Rabbis) *concede to Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi that he has not fulfilled his obligation). *And had* (their dispute) *been stated* (only) *in that* (case of one who vows to bring a small bull and brings a big one, there would be room to reason that only in that case) *Rebbi* (Yehuda HaNasi) *says* (that the person has not fulfilled his obligation, because the sacrificial portions are larger). *But in this* (case of bringing a large meal offering instead of a small one, there is room to say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi) *concedes to* (the opinion of) *the Rabbis.* (Therefore,) *it is necessary* (for the mishna to teach both cases.)

(d) Questions: (i) From that answer we see that we do *not* apply the reasoning of, "*Within the many is the few.*" Thus, here too ("[If he vows to bring] *a small one and brings a large one*"), we should not apply this reasoning?

(ii) How can we say, "*his intention was that he will not bring less than a Small one... his intention included the possibility of a Large one,*" when that is not what he actually said?

Thus, we need to still explain the ruling of Maimonides.

(e) Question: If we are to say, (i) "*his intention included the possibility of a Large one,*" and (ii) "*Within the many is the few,*" and the law is (-Maimonides Laws of Prohibitions Upon the Altar 7:11), "one who desires to gain merit for himself, subjugate his evil inclination, and amplify his generosity should bring his sacrifice from the most desirable and superior type of the item he is bringing. For it is written in the Torah (-Genesis 4:4), 'And Abel brought from his chosen flocks and from the superior' And so it is stated (-Leviticus 3:16), "All of the superior quality should be given to G-d," and concerning sacrifices it is (-Deuteronomy 12:11), "*and the choice of vows...*" (-Rashi ibid), "*This teaches that one should bring* (offerings) *from the choicest,*" *thus,* the ruling should not be that he is *allowed* to bring a *Large* one. But Rather, that he *must* bring a *Large* one?! *Thus* we must say that (i) "*his intention included the possibility of a Large one,*" and (ii) "*Within the many is the few,*" is *not* the issue here. Thus, what is the reason for, "[If he vows to bring] *a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation*"?

(f) --[The explanation of the *Chinuch* upon the "*sacrifice that varies up and down,*" that, "*And the reason is that since G-d, blessed be He, had mercy upon him and exempted him with* [something less expensive], *it is not appropriate that he push himself to bring more than what his hand can reach,*" can only apply when (i)

the offering is commanded by G-d, while here we are speaking of voluntary promise. (ii) by that sacrifices, the poor bringing of the rich is his bringing a different species (from flour to fowl or to an animal), which Maimonides rules is not acceptable.]--

- (f) Introduction to Answer: In the opening to the Laws of Vows, when Maimonides lists the mitzvot found in these chapters, he seemingly elaborates unnecessarily, "To heed the utterances of one's mouth and to carry out one's vow." Why the duplicity? Thus, we must say that there are two concepts going on, (i) The words of the promise that were uttered: "To heed the utterances of one's mouth," and (ii) the intent of the promise made: "to carry out one's vow."
- (g) This is what *Rebbi* and *The Rabbis* are arguing over: *Rebbi* is focused on the person keeping his exact words: "To heed the utterances of one's mouth": "[If he vows to bring] a small one." While *The Rabbis* are focused on the person keeping his intention: "to carry out one's vow" (to bring an offering to G-d): "he fulfills his obligation." Nevertheless, *The Rabbis* don't force him to bring the Large, "and the choice... one should bring (offerings) from the choicest," because, the verse states, "To heed the utterances of one's mouth," thus, he should better fulfill his utterance.
- (h) This 'sweetens' why Maimonides brings two verses in his statement (-Laws of Vows 1:4), "It is a positive commandment of Scriptural origin for a person to fulfill his oath or vow, whether it be a vow involving prohibitions or a vow of sanctification, as it is stated (-Deuteronomy 23:24), 'that which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised.' And it is stated (-Numbers 30:3), 'As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do."
- (i) "That which your lips give out (utter) heed, and do as you have promised," speaks of Vows of consecrating things to the Holy Temple, offerings, etc.. Consecrated things, while the obligation of the person is through his mouth, that he do an obligation of the Torah, the actual consecration cannot be through the person, but through the biblical laws of consecration "I shall bring an offering upon the altar," which are the voluntary offerings defined in the Torah.
- (ii) "As all that he gives out from his mouth (utters) he shall do," speaks of prohibitions that are solely the creation of the words of his mouth ("I shall not drink wine... I shall not eat meat...").
- (i) Answer: This is why concerning offerings Maimonides rules that there is also the issue of, "and do as you have promised," meaning the intention of bringing an offering to G-d, and thus, "he fulfills his obligation," even if this is not precisely as, "which your lips give out."
- (j) --[Thus Maimonides states (-Laws of Vows 13:25), "Our Sages stated (-Nedarim 22a), 'Anyone who takes a vow is considered as having built a private altar (called a 'bama', which is forbidden since the time that the Holy Temple was built in Jerusalem).' And if he transgressed and took a vow, it is a mitzvah to ask (a sage) to absolve it, so that he will not have an obstacle before him. When does the above apply? With regard to vows involving prohibitions. However, with (regard to) vows involving the consecration of articles, it is a mitzvah to fulfill them and not to ask for them (absolution) only out of being (financially) pressed, as it is stated (-Psalms 116:14), 'I will fulfill my vows to G-d.'" Being that the, "vows involving the consecration of articles," now entails a biblical law, becoming, "an object of a mitzva," thus, "not to ask for them (absolution)."]--
- (k) Mystically Speaking: An offering, called a *korbon*, is from the etymology of *korov*: *nearby*, and the verse on a mystical level is stating, "When a man wants to give himself over to G-d and get near to G-d" --Then he must bring the offering-- "from you an offering to the L-rd." Thus, while every mitzva is just bringing near to G-d one of our 248 *Organs*, correlating to the 248 *Positive Mitzvot*, or one of our 365 *Sinews*, correlating to the 365 *Prohibitions*, bringing an offering to G-d is to give over and to bring near to G-d our entire being. This is the very intention of bringing a, "When a man wants to yakriv from you a korbon to the L-rd."
- (l) --[And this is the emphasis of Nachmanides on why an offering brings atonement: "All these acts are performed in order that when they are done, a person should realize that he has sinned against his G-d with his body and his soul, and that "his" blood should really be spilled and "his" body burned, were it not for the loving-kindness of the Creator, Who took from him a substitute and a ransom, namely this offering, so that its blood should be in place of his blood, its life in place of his life, and that the chief limbs of the offering should be in place of the chief parts of his body." Being that in an offering a person is giving himself over entirely to G-d.]--
- (m) --[More than this, an offering is about *Teshuvah*, repentance. And *teshuvah* is above all mitzvot, which is why *teshuvah* can fill all the blemishes created by doing a sin or not doing a mitzvah. Thus, while each mitzvah of but one organ, or one sinew, *teshuvah* is above the mitzvot, and fills all organs and sinews, and is the entirety of all if the being.]--
- (n) This explains why the Torah-portion of offerings begins, not with the obligatory offerings, but of (-Rashi, Leviticus 1:2), "Scripture is speaking here of voluntary sacrifices." Being that it is in the person's voluntary

offerings of his heart, in which it is more clearly expressed that the person is giving his entirety to G-d.

(o) Returning to our specific case of, "[If he vows to bring] *a small one and brings a large one, he fulfills his obligation*": When a person Vows to bring an offering, he is not promising to fulfill an individual mitzvah -- mystical meaning of "*that which your lips give out (utter) heed,*" to fulfill an individual mitzvah--, but rather, he is promising the all-encompassing concept of an offering, to offer himself to G-d, his entirety.

(p) --[In the language of our sages (-Minochos 104b): Upon the unique wording of the verse (-Leviticus 2:1), "And a nefesh (lit. *soul*, meaning here, *a person*) *when he brings a meal offering to the L-rd, his offering shall be of fine flour. He shall pour oil over it and place frankincense upon it,*" our Sages explain, "For what (reason) *is the meal-offering different* (from other offerings in) *that* (the term) "*a nefesh*" *is stated with regard to it? The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, 'Whose practice* (is it) *to bring a meal-offering? (It is that of a) poor* (individual; and) *I will elevate* (ascribe to) *him as if he offered up his soul (nafsho) in front of Me.*"

The words, "*I will elevate him,*" is that he will also have an empowerment from Above to "*offer his soul*": '*entirety*' to be more than what he accomplish in this from his own service, there comes that which, "*G-d elevates upon him*"--

(q) Thus, in his fulfilling this individual mitzvah --"*that which your lips give out (utter) heed*"-- of a voluntary offering, he becomes included within the *all-encompassing* mitzvah --mitzva is from the word *tzavsa* '*bonding*'-- the *all-encompassing* bond of a Jew --through a voluntary offering-- with G-d. Thus, here the primarily concern is the *all-encompassing intent and concept* --"*and you shall do as you have promised*"-- that which he is giving himself entirely, and thus becoming entirely closer, to G-d.

(r) With this, we can mystically explain the terms "*Small*" and "*Large*": On the one hand, when a person starts in his service to G-d, he is in a state of "*Small*". Nevertheless, being that this service is that of an offering, in which he gives himself over entirely, his *nefesh*, over to G-d, and becoming entirely close to G-d, thus this is the service of his entirety, '*Large*'.

--[This concept of a service of *Small* being connected to a service of *Large* is as that which is explained in how the *Inferior Fear* --obedience-- is connected to the *Superior Fear* --awe of G-d's exaltedness]--

And therefore, "*And he brought a Large one,*" mystically meaning that his *Small* service of bringing an offering, "*Will bring him to a Largeness.*" It will bring him to giving himself over, and becoming close, to G-d in a manner of *Largeness*. That also in a revealed manner, all the faculties of his *nefesh* will be entirely close to G-d.

(s) Through studying the laws of offerings it is as if we brought the offering, and (-Minochos 110a), "*Torah scholars, who engage in* (studying) *the laws of the* (Temple) *service, the verse elevates them* (ascribes them) *as though the Temple was built in their days* (and they are serving in it)." And from this "*as though*" it becomes "*Temple was built,*" in actuality, with the coming of our Righteous Moshiach, and there --in which there will be, "*offer an offering*"-- "*will bring offerings as the mitzvot of Your will*" in the third Holy Temple, may it be built speedily in our days, practically and tangibly so.