

R' Y"m Morgenstern: Shiurim on Taanis (30b)

Furthermore, see the commentary of the Eifah Shleimah on Otzros Chaim (3c) who brings down in the name the Yeso"ד that it is clear from the writings of the Arizal that when it comes to the sefirah of yesod- aside from the fact that it receives the light of all of the sefiros above it (meaning- the sefirah of yesod receives the five chassadim from chesed, gevurah, tifferes, netzach and hod, which is why the sefirah of yesod is referred to as 'kol' etc.) the sefirah of yesod also contains a general light of its own. The analogy for this is that we find tremendous Tzadikim who serve as a vehicle for the light of yesod referring to their seforim as Likkutim, or 'Collections'. For example, Likkutei Amarim of the Maggid of Mezeritch; Likkutei Amarim of the Baal HaTanya; and Likkutei Moharan of Rebbe Nachman of Breslov. The reason for this is that since these Tzadikim are vehicles for the light of yesod- the light of yesod is referred to as the 'collecting' (melakeit) of the lights that precede it, as if it contains nothing of its own, like the Tanna Rebbe Elazar HaGadol who said that "he had never said anything that he did not receive from his teachers" (Succah, 28a).

However, we have already explained elsewhere that these words should not be interpreted at face value, for in truth there is no benefit in saying that one has never said anything new, and there is no benefit in simply reviewing what one has heard from their teachers- especially when we have explicit proof throughout the words of Chazal that this was not the case regarding Rebbe Elazar HaGadol, like it says in Avos d'Rebbe Nosson (chap. 6) that they praised Rebbe Elazar for sitting and teaching 'things that no ear had ever heard before'.

Rather, the inner explanation of this matter is that Rebbe Elazar HaGadol was a vehicle for the light of yesod, which externally appears as if it is simply 'collecting' (melakeit) from the lights that precede it. But in truth the sefirah of yesod contains within itself a deep grasp of individuality, which is an inner point so profoundly deep that it has the ability to draw into its own individualized grasp all of the lights and sefiros that preceded it. For one that is lacking it's ownmost sense of individuality in its depth is incapable of truly 'collecting' (melakeit) the lights that precede it. This is what we mean when we say that the great Tzadikim, like the Magid of Mezeritch, the Baal HaTanya and Rebbe Nachman were capable of collecting (melakeit) the lights that preceded them as a result of their profound and lofty status, applying the particular hue of the light of yesod which ascends up to keser to the teachings which they 'collected'.

We also find this in the kavaanos of the Siddur, by the kavaanah of “koneih hakol”, that one must have in mind the ascent up to the level of ‘arich anpin’- the level of Keser- in order to disclose the level of yesod. Meaning to say that yesod must include within itself a root power that is even higher than Keser, and it is specifically Yosef HaTzadik- of whom it is said that there was no one wiser or more intelligent than he- who has the ability to ‘collect’ (va’yilakeit Yosef).

According to this we can add an additional point for those proficient in chochmas hanistar, for there is a need for clarification that emerges out of the kavanaah we mentioned above. In the kavaanos of the Siddur we find that by the intention of ‘koneih hakol’ there is a specific kavaanah regarding the individual chesed of yesod (like we said in the name of the Eifah Shleimah earlier)- meaning to say that by the kavaanos we find two moments of drawing down the chassadim, once for the essence and once for the expression that shines below. By the kavaanos of the expression of chassadim that shines below, we find a specific intention for the sefirah of yesod; but when it comes the essence of the chassadim we do not find a specific intention of the sefirah of yesod.

The matter can be explained based on the analogy of R’ Chaim Brisker’s chiddushim on the Rambam, where he asks a kasha on the Rambam and then continues to explain the intention of the Rambam. At times- however- after hearing the novelty of R’ Chaim Brisker, the reader may ask what exactly was novel about R’ Chaim’s explanation since it is written explicitly in the words of the Rambam themselves, almost as if R’ Chaim added nothing novel at all. However, this question itself reveals that the reader understood the chiddush properly. For when a person feels that after understanding the chiddush of R’ Chaim that it is as if R’ Chaim added nothing at all to what is explicitly stated in the words of the Rambam it reveals that the chiddush is a true chiddush in the words of the Rambam.

So too when it comes to the sefirah of yesod, for in truth it contains its own individualized light, yet nevertheless when this essential power draws into itself the lights that preceded it, it appears as if it has no individualized light of its own, as if it added nothing new. Therefore, when focusing on the kavaanah of drawing down the essence of the chassadim, there is no particular kavaanah for the individualized light of yesod.