



# Storytelling *the* Rambam

UNCOVERING THE LAYERS IN MISHNEH TORAH



By: Rabbi Mendy Greenberg

of



לע"נ  
ר' יצחק בן ר' יעקב ע"ה  
חנוכה  
גלב"ע ט' אדר שני ה'תשס"ה  
ת"נ צ"ב ה'

נדפס ע"י נכדו  
הרה"ת ר' חיים צבי חזקוני מרת  
חנה ומשפחתם שיחיו  
חנוכה

# Believe the Author!

When the Rebbe introduced the *takkana* of Limmud HaRambam, it faced opposition. Mishneh Torah, in the view of some, was not to be studied from start to finish. As a *sefer* with deep and profound insights, it should be consulted only after first delving into the *sugyas* on which a given halachah is based. Studying the entire Mishneh Torah might lead someone to misconceptions about the final halachah, which in some instances does not follow the Rambam's view.

In the Rebbe's response, he pointed to a simple fact that had been overlooked or ignored for hundreds of years: The Rambam himself had instructed that his *sefer* be studied in order, from start to finish. In fact, later *meforshim* point out that a failure to do so could cause misunderstandings in the Rambam, because his later *seforim* rely on the student's

knowledge of earlier ones.<sup>1</sup> Learning Rambam only for the purpose of deriving *chiddushim*, therefore, goes against the Rambam's very own wishes and his own designation for his *sefer*!<sup>2</sup>

This approach repeats itself as a foundation in the Rebbe's Torah.

A regular Torah student approaches all his Torah learning with more-or-less the same intellectual rigor, whether learning Gemara, a *posuk* in Chumash or a *maamar* Chasidus. The Rebbe, however, adopts a distinct approach for each domain of Torah study, tailoring his method to the particular subject matter. Rashi cannot be evaluated through the same lens as the Rambam, which cannot be evaluated through the same lens as a *sugya* in Gemara.

In this context, a rule that emerges time and again from the Rebbe's Torah is that one needs to take into account the author of the Dvar Torah, and more importantly, to accept his own assertions about his work.

When Rashi writes that he comes to deliver the *pshat*, we need to believe him! Incredibly, some commentaries approach Rashi as a *darshan* and question the "*pshat*-ness" of his commentary—overlooking the simple fact that Rashi, *Rabban Shel Yisrael* himself, declares numerous times that he comes to deliver *pshat*, and *pshat* only!

## From Enosh to Avraham: A Story about Idol Worship

*In the beginning of Hilchos Avodah Zarah, the Rambam—at great length—describes the evolution of idol worship, a story that spans almost two thousand years, from Enosh—Adam's grandson—to Avraham Avinu. Here is an excerpt:*

**"In the days of Enosh, humanity made a grave error. They asserted, 'Since Hashem created the stars and spheres to govern the world, placing them in the lofty heavens, and bestowing honor upon them as His servants who minister before Him — they deserve praise, glory, and honor...' This misguided notion led them to construct temples for the stars, offer sacrifices, extol them verbally, and bow down to them, all in an attempt to fulfill the Creator's will...**

**This marked the inception of idol worship.**

**"As time elapsed, false prophets emerged, proclaiming that the Al-mighty had instructed them to worship specific stars or all the stars. They promoted the bringing of offerings and libations, building temples and crafting images for people to bow down to... They began making images in the temples and under the trees and at the peaks of mountains and hills. Gradually, the revered name of Hashem faded from the collective consciousness.**

**"This continued until the advent of the pillar of the world, our forefather Avraham... As this mighty one was weaned, his mind pondered incessantly. He contemplated**

The Rebbe approached the Rambam with a similar rule. Mishneh Torah was written as a work of Halachah, not Jewish history, philosophy, or anything else. It is straightforward Halachah, and needs to be evaluated as such.

This emerges from the final lines of the Rambam's introduction to Mishneh Torah:

ומפני זה נערתי חצני אני משה בן מימון הספרדי ... לחבר דברים המתבדרים מכל אלו החבורים בענין האסור והמותר הטמא והטהור עם שאר דיני התורה. כלם בלשון ברורה ודרך קצרה ... הלכות הלכות בכל ענין וענין.

*Therefore, I, Moshe ben Maimon, of Spain... girded my loins— to compose a work derived from all these texts regarding the forbidden and the permitted, the impure and the pure, and the rest of the Torah's laws, all in clear and concise terms... Halachos, Halachos.*

In this line, the Rambam— *Moreh Nevuchim* of all generations, an author whose work spans the entire *Torah Shebaal Peh*, a paragon of clarity and coherence—personally sets forth the rule: This is a sefer of Halachah.

This sets the tone for much of the Rebbe's

approach to Rambam. Every line in the Mishneh Torah has Halachic ramifications; the halachos themselves, the *pessukim* opening each sefer, and the moral teachings at each sefer's end—each one teaches, in some way or another, a unique halachah.

The same is true of storytelling. The Rambam, in some 10-20 instances, departs from his usual style to recount a story; sometimes about Moshe Rabbeinu, sometimes about the Beis Hamikdash, and sometimes about world history.

For some commentators, these stories are a fascinating look into the Rambam's view, because they are often far more original than a regular halachah which can be directly sourced in Gemara. For the Rebbe, however, each story also contains a unique halachah—one which can come to light with a proper analysis of the material.

To mark the upcoming **Siyum HaRambam**, we have collected some of the most outstanding examples of this approach; the Rambam's stories with the Rebbe's explanations.

Enjoy storytime with the Rambam.<sup>3</sup>

**day and night, questioning how a sphere could follow a path without guidance. Who turns it? It seemed implausible that it could turn itself.**

**“At the age of forty, Avraham came to know his Creator.”**

It's a fascinating story, no doubt, but seems entirely out of place in the Mishneh Torah. The halachos regarding idol worship are straightforward, as the Rambam delineates in the following chapters: don't bow to idols, don't offer *korbanos* or wine, and so on. What bearing does the evolution of paganism have on the practical observance of these halachos?

The answer, the Rebbe explains, is that this description is key to understanding the fundamental nature of idol worship. Although the *halachos* focus on individual practices, at its essence is the prohibition to believe that any creation—be it an

angel, a celestial body, or anything else—could be a god, associate-god, or even an independent entity. Viewing anything as an intermediary between us



A FRAGMENT OF THE MISHNEH TORAH, IN THE RAMBAM'S HANDWRITING, FOUND IN THE CAIRO GENIZAH ARCHIVE HOUSED IN CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.



and Hashem is—in a most fundamental way—an act of idol worship.

Hilchos Avodah Zarah is not just about an almost-irrelevant and archaic field of ancient pagan practices. It is a current and relevant mitzvah which obligates us to maintain purity of mind; a Yid must always remember that all creatures and creations are fully dependent on the Creator, and that worshipping them makes no sense.

This approach also reflects the Rambam's opening to Mishneh Torah—with the obligation to know the Creator.

The Rambam's description paints the evolution of Avodah Zarah as an *intellectual* mistake, and the reverse—Avraham's recognition of Hashem—as an *intellectual*

triumph. He speaks of Avraham's recognition at forty years old, not at three years of age—an age far too young for intellectual discovery.

In other words, the Rambam's story emphasizes a fundamental principle of Yiddishkeit: in addition to the simple *emunah* and acceptance that we have for Hashem's dictates, we are obligated to make every effort to understand and appreciate G-dliness from an intellectual point of view as well.<sup>4</sup>

But the story offers more. A key line about Avodah Zarah will illuminate another story in Mishneh Torah seven *seforim* later, in Hilchos Beis Habechirah:

## The Mizbe'ach: What Was There Before?

*In the second perek of Hilchos Beis Habechirah, the Rambam writes about the history of the Mizbe'ach. Like the history of Avodah Zarah, it spans all of creation—from Adam Harishon until the building of the Beis Hamikdash:*

**“The location of the Mizbe'ach is exceptionally precise and must never be altered... It is at this site that Yitzchak Avinu was bound as an offering...**

**“It is universally acknowledged that the site where David and Shlomo erected the Mizbe'ach, the threshing floor of Aravna, is the same location where Avraham built the Mizbe'ach and bound Yitzchak. It is the place where Noach constructed a Mizbe'ach upon exiting the teivah, where Kayin and Hevel presented their offerings, and where Adam Harishon offered a sacrifice after he was created. It is also the site of his creation...”**

Why does the Rambam provide such extensive detail about events that occurred at the site of the *Mizbe'ach*?

Some Acharonim understand the Rambam to be implying that the site is holy *because* of those deeds. That is untenable, however; the Torah describes the location as “the place which I *will* choose,”<sup>5</sup> i.e., in the future. The Rambam himself titles these Halachos as Hilchos “*Beis Habechirah*,” the “*Chosen House*,” indicating that the uniqueness of the location lies in the fact that it was *chosen* by Hashem, not in the holy acts already performed there. Furthermore—if that is the uniqueness of the site, why did

the Rambam omit the *Mizbe'ach* built by Yaakov Avinu?

The answer lies in the history of Avodah Zarah. The Rambam writes that idol worshippers began making Avodah Zarah “under the trees and at the peaks of mountains and hills.” The Gemara actually says that every single mountaintop in Eretz Yisrael hosted an Avodah Zarah.<sup>6</sup> Rashi explains that the Emorim would seek out all the high places and consecrate them for pagan rituals.

It follows that Har Hamoriah must have been used for idol worship. How could such a site be suitable for the *Mizbe'ach* of Hashem?

The Rambam addresses this by highlighting that the site where the *Mizbe'ach* was built was *universally* regarded as



SOUTHEAST OF HAR HAMORIAH, PICTURE TAKEN FROM THE KIDRON VALLEY.

sacred, even among non-Jews. It was never used as a site for Avodah Zarah, because it was recognized as a site consecrated for Hashem from the dawn of time. To support his point, he cites the examples of Adam, Noach, Avraham, and Yitzchak, the role models for all of humanity. He omits Yaakov, since his children remained loyal to the Torah, and therefore do not have a direct connection with the rest of mankind.<sup>7</sup>

There is also a deeper dimension.

The fact that a specific location was chosen by

Hashem doesn't indicate that Hashem would not choose another site in the future. In fact, the site of the Mishkan at Shiloh was also called a place "chosen by Hashem." Why is the Rambam so adamant that this location can never be altered?

The answer lies in the history of the location. Adam, Noach and the rest chose the site because they prophetically saw that this was the place to be chosen by Hashem *for all eternity*. The fact that they used this site tells us that Hashem chose this location not only temporarily, but for all time.<sup>8</sup>

## Chanukah: Why Is The Story Different?

*In Hilchos Megillah V'Chanukah, the Rambam makes a rare departure from his usual custom and writes the history of Chanukah—something he doesn't do for Pesach, Shavuos, or even Purim, two chapters earlier. Here is an excerpt:*

**"In the era of the Second Beis Hamikdash, the Greeks issued oppressive decrees against the Jewish people. Prohibitions on Torah study and observance of mitzvos were enforced... Until the sons of Chashmonai, the Kohanim Gedolim, emerged victorious, liberating the Jewish people and choosing a king from among the Kohanim. For over two centuries, the Jewish people enjoyed sovereignty until the destruction of the Second Beis Hamikdash.**

**"The triumph over their adversaries occurred on the twenty-fifth day of Kislev. Upon entering the Heichal, they discovered only one jug of pure oil—enough to kindle the menorah for just a single day. They lit the menorah's lamps, and the oil lasted for eight days... The sages of the time decreed that these eight days, commencing on the night of the twenty-fifth of Kislev, should be marked by joyous celebrations..."**

Why does the Rambam tell the story of Chanukah? This explanation comes not from a *sicha*, but from a *yechidus*.

In 5736, a visiting rav suggested to the Rebbe in

*yechidus* that the Rambam writes the story of Chanukah since it's the only Yom Tov not described in Torah Shebiksav. The Rambam stated in his introduction that in order to master the entire Torah one could study Torah Shebiksav and Mishneh Torah alone. Since Chanukah isn't mentioned in Torah Shebiksav, the Rambam needed to tell its story in Mishneh Torah.

The Rebbe responded that there was a simpler explanation: *Pirumei Nisa*.

The *Pirumei Nisa* aspect of Chanukah renders it unique when compared with the other Yomim Tovim and mitzvos: A core aspect of Chanukah is to spread knowledge of the miracle. Therefore, the Rambam chose to precede these laws with details of the miracle that we are to publicize.

During the *yechidus*, the rav offered support for the Rebbe's approach: mitzvos like Megillah on Purim and Daled Kosos on Pesach also have aspects of *pirumei nissa* to them. Chanukah, however, is unique in that *pirumei nissa* is core to the fulfillment of the mitzvah. One does not fulfill his obligation if he lights the menorah too late at night, or too high to be seen from the street. In no other mitzvah is the need for spreading the miracle so essential to the mitzvah itself. "During the *yechidus*," he writes, "the Rebbe agreed to my explanation."<sup>9</sup>



# What Makes a Marriage?

Before embarking on the halachos of *kiddushin* and *nisuin* in Hilchos Ishus, the Rambam shares some history about the institution of marriage. It wasn't always so formal, with elaborate laws of *kiddushin*, *nisuin* and—when necessary—*gittin*. It was actually quite simple:

**“Prior to the giving of the Torah, a man would meet a woman on the street and if she consented, he would bring her into his home... thereby establishing her as his wife. With the giving of the Torah, the Jewish people were commanded that when a man desires to marry a woman, he must formally perform *kiddushin* in the presence of witnesses. Only afterwards can she become his wife.”**

Why does the Rambam outline the definition of marriage before the giving of the Torah, instead of simply presenting the laws as they apply today?

The Maggid Mishneh suggests that the description is relevant to the status of Bnei Noach; this halachah teaches us that a non-Jewish marriage is defined not by a specific ritual but by the choice to live together as a couple.

However, if it is only relevant to non-Jews, the Rambam should have placed it in Perek Tes of Hilchos Melachim, with the *Sheva Mitzvos Bnei Noach!* This is, in fact, how Hilchos Geirushin is presented: The Rambam begins with the definition of divorce for Jews, and presents the laws of divorce for non-Jews in Hilchos Melachim. Clearly, the Rambam's introduction has direct relevance to the definition of Jewish marriage in our day.

The answer lies in the nature of a *chuppah*.

A *chuppah* represents the act of *nisuin*, the final stage of the marriage ceremony (while the ring represents the *kiddushin*, the “pre-marriage” state in which a woman is

not yet married to her husband, but is forbidden to the rest of the world).

When does *nisuin* actually take effect? Is it under the *chuppah*, in the *cheder yichud*, or when the couple enters their home? There are a variety of opinions, but the Rambam writes that it is when “he brings her into his house and is secluded with her...”<sup>10</sup>

It seems that according to the Rambam, the act of *nisuin* for a Jew and for a non-Jew is the same; there are some technical differences, and we may have elaborate celebrations and rituals surrounding those differences, but the basic point is that husband and wife dwell together in their own home.

Is that indeed the Rambam's opinion?

Looking back at the story-introduction, the Rambam can clearly be read as introducing exactly this Halachic principle—that Jewish and non-Jewish *nisuin* are fundamentally the same, while the contribution of Torah is the concept of *kiddushin*. Throughout history, the Rambam says, marriage was simply the act of *nisuin* (and that has basically remained the same for both Jews and non-Jews to this very day). However, *Matan Torah* introduced a new concept for the Jewish people, a pre-*nisuin* phase called *kiddushin*, when a woman is removed from her status as a *penayah* but is not yet fully married to her husband.<sup>11</sup>

In Hilchos Geirushin, there is no resemblance between a *get* and a non-Jewish divorce. But in marriage, the Rambam wants us to know, there are both similarities and differences: our *kiddushin* is unique, while our *nisuin* is not. That's why he tells us the story.

# Can I Make a Model Mishkan?

In the beginning of Hilchos Beis Habechirah, the Rambam gives us a short history lesson about the Mishkan: who made it and what happened to it:

**“It is a positive commandment to construct a House for Hashem... as it is said: “And they shall make for Me a *Mikdash*.” The Torah has already provided a detailed account of the Mishkan built by Moshe Rabbeinu, for**

temporary use...

**“Upon entering the Land, they set up the Mishkan at Gilgal during the fourteen years of conquering and dividing the Land. Then they came to Shiloh, where they constructed a stone structure covered with tapestries but without a solid roof; it stood for 369 years. Following the demise of Eli the Kohen Gadol, it was destroyed.**

Subsequently, they moved to Nov, constructing a *Mikdash* there. After the passing of Shmuel Hanavi, it too was destroyed, leading them to Givon, where they built another *Mikdash*. From Givon, they came to the Eternal Temple.”

Why does the Rambam teach us the history of the Mishkan? What halachic relevance does the story have?

In truth, the same question can be asked regarding the Torah’s lengthy description of the Mishkan. If it was a temporary structure, and a mitzvah that lasted for only a short period, why is it described in such detail?

The answer lies in the fact that the Rambam derives the mitzvah from the *possuk*, “ועשו לי, מקדש,” said regarding the Mishkan (and not from the *possuk* he cites elsewhere,<sup>12</sup> “לשכנו תדרשו ובאת, שמה,”<sup>13</sup> which refers more specifically to the Beis Hamikdash in Yerushalayim). Clearly, the Rambam understood this verse not as a one-time commandment relating only to the Mishkan, but rather as an eternal mitzvah for all future generations. There is a constant obligation to build a *Mikdash*.

To emphasize this continuity, the Rambam draws a direct line from Moshe’s Mishkan to the Beis Hamikdash, all a fulfillment of one continuous mitzvah.

A practical halachic ramification emerges from this:

It is forbidden to imitate the design of the Beis Hamikdash. Some *poskim* say that this prohibition does not apply to the design of the Mishkan, but according to the Rambam’s approach, this would include the Mishkan as well.<sup>14</sup>



ILLUSTRATION OF THE PROCEDURE TO PREPARE THE ASHES OF THE PARAH ADUMAH.

This idea—that the Rambam uses a broad historical description to make a halachic point—is expressed in another halachah as well:

## The History of Eifer Parah

*At the end of Perek Gimmel in Hilchos Parah Adumah, the Rambam writes that a portion of every Parah Adumah must be hidden away and preserved. He then takes a detour into story-telling:*

**“Nine parah adumahs were prepared from the time it was commanded until the destruction of the second Beis Hamikdash. Moshe Rabbeinu**

**prepared the first, followed by Ezra who prepared the second. The subsequent seven were prepared during the period from Ezra to the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash. The tenth will be prepared by the Melech haMoshiach, may he be revealed swiftly—amen, so may it be His will.”**

This halachah is based on a Mishnah where





there is an argument about the total amount of *parah adumahs* ever prepared. The Rambam concurs with the opinion of the Chachamim that it was a total of nine.

Why, however, did the Rambam need to include it in the first place?

The Rambam cites this history following his statement that the ashes were always split into three equal parts. One part was used by the kohanim to purify themselves, the second was used to purify the Jewish people, the third was placed in the *cheil* “prepared and hidden away.”

Here the Rambam is presenting a *chiddush*. He seems to indicate that the ashes weren’t just preserved for future use,

but that there was a specific mitzvah for them to exist, as the *possuk* says, *Imishmeres*—there is a specific obligation for ashes of the *parah adumah* to remain for future generations.

After stating this novel idea, the Rambam provides support for his opinion. He draws a direct line from the *parah adumah* of Moshe Rabeinu until the time of the *churban*, clarifying that the ashes of a *parah adumah* were always present. This explains why—unlike the Mishnah—the Rambam specifically names Moshe Rabeinu and Ezra; Moshe Rabeinu embodied the idea of eternity,<sup>15</sup> and Ezra<sup>16</sup> is compared to Moshe.<sup>17</sup>

## Moshe Rabbeinu’s Enthusiasm for a Mitzvah

*When the Rambam introduces the Arei Miklat in Perek Ches of Hilchos Rotzeach U’Shmiras Hanefesh, he makes sure to inform us who designated them and why:*

**“It is a mitzvah to designate cities of refuge, and these cities are exclusively within the borders of Eretz Yisrael, as it states: ‘Three cities you shall set aside for you.’ There were a total of six: three allocated by Moshe Rabbeinu in Transjordan, and another three designated by Yehoshua in Eretz K’naan.**

**“The provision of refuge in any of these cities only becomes effective when all have been officially designated... Why, then, did Moshe set them aside [if they would not afford refuge until long after his passing]? He said: ‘Since the mitzvah has come to my hand, I will fulfill it.’”**

Rashi makes a similar statement about the same incident; in his words, Moshe Rabbeinu said, “Any mitzvah that is possible to fulfill, I will fulfill.”<sup>18</sup>

The slight difference in their terminology seems to indicate a distinction of *gavra* and *cheftza*, the focus on the individual or the object, because Moshe Rabbeinu’s act could be understood in two ways:

1. It was only a *hechsher mitzvah*; although the mitzvah could not yet be carried out, Moshe designated the cities out of personal piety. In other words, it was for the *gavra*.

2. Moshe’s actions were the beginning of the actual *kiyum hamitzvah*; when Yehoshua later designated the cities in Eretz Yisrael, the cities in the Transjordan automatically became a haven. Thus, his act actually impacted the *cheftza*.

Rashi says, “Any mitzvah that is possible to fulfill, I will fulfill,” implying that the mitzvah (the *cheftza*) was actually being fulfilled; Moshe’s actions effectively designated the cities that would later serve as havens.

The Rambam takes a different approach.

In the beginning of the halachah, the Rambam emphasizes that the core mitzvah of *Ir Miklat* is fulfilled with the three cities inside of Eretz Yisrael; the cities on the other side of the Jordan River were secondary.

One might argue that the fact that Moshe designated the three Transjordanian cities flies in the face of this approach; what could be more effective than the actions of Moshe Rabbeinu himself?! The Rambam therefore brings the story of Moshe and carefully says that although Moshe was enthusiastic to participate in the mitzvah, it didn’t affect the *cheftza* of the mitzvah, only the *gavra*.

Moshe’s designation did not create the actual entity of *Arei Miklat*, but was rather about his personal association with the mitzvah. He couldn’t actually fulfill the mitzvah, but still chose to occupy himself with it.<sup>19</sup>

# Where Did The Aron Go? Nowhere!

*In the fourth Perek of Hilchos Beis Habechirah, the Rambam introduces the Aron. But then, we get a bit lost in the tunnels under Har Habayis...*

**“When Shlomo built the Beis Hamikdash, knowing that it would eventually be destroyed, he built a place for the Aron to be hidden away, down below, in deep, winding tunnels; King Yoshiyahu commanded that they hide it in the place built by Shlomo...”**

**“Along with it were hidden Aharon’s staff, the jar of Mon, and the anointing oil; none of these returned in the Second Beis Hamikdash. Also, the Urim v’Tumim in the Second Beis Hamikdash—would not respond with ruach hakodesh...”**

What halachic ramifications are there from the description of the Aron’s hiding place?

This can be understood by examining a halachah in the first perek of Hilchos Beis Habechirah:

While enumerating the *keilim* of the Beis Hamikdash, the Rambam omits the Aron, discussing it instead in Perek Daled, along with the design and layout of the Beis Hamikdash.

This implies that the Aron is not just one of the vessels in the Beis Hamikdash, it is also an integral part of its structure. This is because the Aron draws down Hashem’s presence, transforming the Beis Hamikdash into a House for Hashem. In other words, the other vessels are *in* the Beis Hamikdash. The Aron, on the other hand, is *part of the Beis*

*Hamikdash itself.*

This implies, however, that the second Beis Hamikdash was fundamentally lacking. A core part of the structure was absent!

It is this point that the Rambam addresses in our halachah.

In reviewing the history of the Aron, he explains that the alternate location for the Aron was not just a secure hiding space; rather, from the outset, Shlomo Hamelech built two places appropriate for the Aron. The first was in the revealed *Kodesh Hakodashim*, and the second within the tunnels, which were considered a part of the *Kodesh Hakodashim* as well! When the Aron is in either location, the Beis Hamikdash is complete.

This teaches us a unique lesson about the Beis Hamikdash: The first Beis Hamikdash is commonly seen as a structure that lasted only temporarily, but in truth, it included a component which was eternal—the chamber with the Aron. This means that all three Batei Mikdash are essentially one; the second and third are not new structures, but reiterations of the first, which never truly ceased to exist.<sup>20</sup>

Most importantly, it means that to this very day, the Beis Hamikdash remains in existence—even as we daven for its complete rebuilding, may it be speedily in our day. **T**

---

<p>1. See Yad Malachi.</p> <p>2. The Rebbe spoke about this issue on several occasions, most notably Purim and Lag Baomer 5745.</p> <p>3. Some of the content in this article is based on the work of Rambam Pardes Hamelech. The citations from Rambam are adapted for clarity and brevity, and are not meant to be a word-for-word translation. The sichos are likewise adaptations; the original sichos should be consulted</p>	<p>for additional clarity.</p> <p>4. Likkutei Sichos vol. 18 pg. 184, vol. 20 pg. 15.</p> <p>5. Re'eh 11:12.</p> <p>6. Avodah Zarah 45a.</p> <p>7. Devarim 5739. Sichos Kodesh vol. 3 pg. 445.</p> <p>8. Likkutei Sichos vol. 19 pg. 140.</p> <p>9. Be'eros Noson p. 41. More explanation is found in Sichos Kodesh 5740 vol. 1 pg. 710.</p>	<p>10. Hilchos Ishus Perek 10 Halacha 1.</p> <p>11. Likkutei Sichos vol. 39 pg. 33.</p> <p>12. Beginning of Hilchos Melachim.</p> <p>13. Re'eh 12:5.</p> <p>14. Likkutei Sichos vol. 21 pg. 148.</p> <p>15. Sotah 9a.</p> <p>16. Sanhedrin 21b.</p> <p>17. Likkutei Sichos vol. 28 pg. 131.</p> <p>18. Va'eschanan 4:41.</p> <p>19. Likkutei Sichos vol. 39 pg. 18.</p> <p>20. Likkutei Sichos vol. 21 pg. 156.</p>
--	--	---

