

*The Honest Employee*  
-by Rabbi Avrohom Lipszyc



Introduction: (i) The separation and order of laws tells us if we are speaking of the same law or not. Thus, when two laws that are seemingly details of the same law are separated into two separate laws, they are not details of one law. Thus, when one codifier separates laws and another doesn't, they are each seeing the laws very differently. In this sicha this is the case:

Maimonides:

-*Laws of Sechirus, Law 6:*

*"A worker may not, however, perform work at night and then hire himself out during the day, or work with his ox in the evening and then rent it out in the morning. Similarly, he should not starve and aggrieve himself and give his food to his sons, because this leads to stealing from the work due his employer, for his energy will be sapped and his thinking unclear, and he will not be able to perform his work robustly."*

-*Ibid, Law 7:*

*"Just as the employer is warned not to steal the wage of the poor person or to withhold it from him, the poor person is forewarned not to steal from the work due his employer and neglect his work slightly here and there, spending the entire day in deceit. Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time. The importance of such preciseness is indicated by our Sages' ruling that workers should not recite the fourth blessing of grace, so as not to neglect their work. Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength, for Jacob the righteous man said (-Genesis 31:7), 'I served your father with all my strength.' Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world, as it is stated (-ibid. 30:43), 'And the man became prodigiously wealthy.'"*

Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Liadi, the *Alter Rebbe*:

-*Choshen Mishpat, Laws of She'alo v'sechiros, v'chasimah, Seif 20:*

*"Just as the employer is cautioned not to steal the wage of his poor worker, nor to delay payment of it, the poor worker is similarly cautioned not to neglect the work due his employer and tarry slightly here and there, [thus] spending the entire day in deceit. Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time. The importance of such preciseness is indicated by our Sages' ruling that workers not recite the fourth blessing of Grace, so as not to neglect their employers' work. Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his might, as the righteous Yaakov said, 'I served your father with all my strength.' Indeed, due to this, he was granted his reward even in this world, as indicated by the verse, 'And the man became prodigiously wealthy.' Therefore a worker may not perform work at night and then hire himself out [to another employer] during the day. Similarly, one may not work with his animal at night and then hire [the animal] out by day. Also, a worker should not starve and afflict himself, because [by doing so] his energy will be sapped and he will not be able to perform his work robustly."*

Maimonides separates the laws into two laws, seeing them as two different issues. While the *Alter Rebbe* sees all of these laws as details of one law.

(ii) Often the Rebbe shows us the difference between the "*cheftzah - object*" of the mitzva and the "*gavrah - person*" of mitzva. In other words, there is the obligation upon the *person*, that he do the mitzvah. Then there is the obligation of the *object* being done. In our case, when one is hired to do a job, the conversation here is whether there is (a) the obligation of the *object*, the *job* that needs to be done. (b) Then there is the obligation of the *person* that *he* is committed to his employer until the job is done.

Thus the question whether: (1) "*A worker may not, however, perform work at night and then hire himself out during the day... he should not starve and aggrieve himself... because this leads to stealing from the work due his employer, for his energy will be sapped and his thinking unclear, and he will not be able to perform his work robustly*" is a law of the "*cheftzah - object*," or of the "*gavrah - person*"? (2) So too concerning the, "*Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength.*" Is this the same category of *cheftza/gavra - object/person* as the previous law or is it not? (3) Do Maimonides and the *Alter Rebbe* agree on the answers to (1) and (2)?

☞ Let us see how the Rebbe leads us into all of this:

\* \* \*

At the end of the *Laws of Sechirus* (-13:7) Maimonides rules:

*"Just as the employer is warned not to steal the wage of the poor person or to withhold it from him, the poor person is forewarned not to steal from the work due his employer and neglect his work slightly here and there, spending the entire day in deceit. Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength, for Jacob the righteous man said (-Genesis 31:7), 'I served your father with all my strength.' Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world, as it is*

stated (-ibid. 30:43), 'And the man became prodigiously wealthy.'"

We find this law also brought in the *Alter Rebbe's Code of Jewish Law* (-Choshen Mishpat, *Laws of She'alo v'sechiros, v'chasimah, Seif 20*):

"Just as the employer is cautioned not to steal the wage of his poor worker, nor to delay payment of it, the poor worker is similarly cautioned not to neglect the work due his employer and tarry slightly here and there, [thus] spending the entire day in deceit. Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his might, as the righteous Yaakov said, 'I served your father with all my strength.' Indeed, due to this, he was granted his reward even in this world, as indicated by the verse, 'And the man became prodigiously wealthy.'"

Seemingly, the *Alter Rebbe* is simply quoting Maimonides (with minute changes). However, when one is meticulous he will see that there is a primary difference within the *Alter Rebbe's Code of Jewish Law*: After bringing the teaching from Jacob, our patriarch, The *Alter Rebbe* continues with, "Therefore a worker may not perform work at night and then hire himself out [to another employer] during the day. Similarly, one may not work with his animal at night and then hire [the animal] out by day. Also, a worker should not starve and afflict himself, because [by doing so] his energy will be sapped and he will not be able to perform his work robustly."

Now, the laws of, "A worker may not," is also brought in Maimonides. Only that in Maimonides it is brought in a previous law, before he states, "Just as the employer is warned not to steal..."

\* \* \*

☞ The Rebbe, before explaining an innovation will first refute another possible explanation to the difference between Maimonides and the *Alter Rebbe*:

*Possible Explanation*: Maimonides wrote his book of laws to be one of (-Maimonides' Introduction to his *Sefer HaYad*), "Laws, laws," without the reasons for the laws. However, the *Alter Rebbe* wrote his *Code of Jewish Law* specifically as (-"Introduction of the rabbis, sons of the genius the author, of blessed memory"), "Laws with their reasons."

Therefore: The *Alter Rebbe* organizes the laws in a manner in which the reason and parameters of the laws are brought forth. Thus, he brings all the details within the same law, after a general introduction to them all: "Just as the employer is cautioned... similarly cautioned not to neglect the work due his employer," which is the general definition of all these laws. And within the law, he first puts the warning and the obligation, "He is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his might." Then he writes the prohibition that comes from this also concerning the hours of the work (that he not cause that he should not be able to give his full effort in the hours of the work), "Therefore a worker may not perform work at night and then hire himself out [to another employer] during the day."

However, Maimonides's primary focus is to give forth the legal ruling, and therefore, he organizes the laws in chronological order: First comes the laws concerning the time prior to the hours of the actual work, "A worker may not, however, perform work at night and then hire himself out during the day". Thereafter comes the warnings concerning the actual hours of work, "he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength."

--[The Rebbe points out that in Maimonides, *thematically*, the law of "A worker may not, however, perform work at night," which is Law 6, is a matter of "deceit" which seemingly an employee is allowed to do ("the workers may dip their bread in brine (which will create thirst) so they will eat many grape (of their employer while working in his vineyard)"), and for this, Maimonides continues the laws of Law 6 with, "However, a worker may not." After which, in Law 7 he continues with the laws of, "he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength."]-

*Rebuttal*: In our case, this difference between Maimonides' book of laws and the *Later Rebbe's Code of Jewish Law* is not suffice to explain their differences:

Maimonides begins his concluding law with, "Just as the employer is warned not to steal the wage of the poor person... Similarly the poor person is forewarned not to steal from the work due his employer." Maimonides puts this introduction is even though he already stated in the previous law that the worker is forbidden to, "stealing from the work due his employer." Thus, we must say that with this introduction of, "Just as the employer... Similarly the poor person," Maimonides is speaking not just of the same issue, but of different hours and actions of the forbidden (the night before the job, working for someone else or starve and aggrive himself), but rather, here he is speaking of a different category of what the employee's obligation is and what he is forbidden to do.

Meaning: According to the *Alter Rebbe* the law of "a worker may not perform..." is a direct continuation of "to work with all his strength" ("Therefore a worker may not perform..."). The "a worker may not perform..." is an outcome of the, "to work with all his strength." --The Rebbe cites that the law of "a worker may not perform..." being connected with the "to work with all his strength" is clearly stated in the SMa"G (-Positive Commandments, End of Mitzva 91).

However, according to Maimonides, who has the laws of "a worker may not perform..." in a previous law, thus it is a separate law and prohibition of its own --and not an outcome of "to work with all his strength".

However, this will need an explanation, as to why there are the two opinions: (i) (*Alter Rebbe*): The "a worker may not perform..." is an outcome of the, "to work with all his strength", and (ii) (Maimonides): the "a worker may not perform..." is a law and category of its own?!

\* \* \*

☞ The Rebbe will introduce his own innovation of the difference between Maimonides and the *Alter Rebbe* with first asking a slew of question on Maimonides' wording. Only to then show how the innovation will answer all of these questions:

Upon Maimonides study from Jacob, "Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength, for Jacob the righteous man said (-Genesis 31:7), 'I served your father with all my strength.' Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world, as it is stated (-ibid. 30:43), 'And the man became prodigiously wealthy,'" there are questions:

(i) Maimonides is specifically a book of (-Maimonides' Introduction to his *Sefer HaYad*), "Laws, laws." Thus, why is it relevant to conclude the law with "Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world"?

--[And it is difficult to say that Maimonides does this in order (-RaM"A, end of Simpon 138), "to conclude with a positive concept," because --in addition to the fact that Maimonides doesn't conclude his entire 83 Laws of his *Sefer HaYaD* with a "positive concept"-- this wording ("Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world") is also brought in the *TUR* and in the *Code of Jewish Law* in conclusion of this law. More than this, in the *Alter Rebbe's Code of Jewish Law* it is brought in the middle of the paragraph.]--

(ii) Maimonides is contradicting himself with this conclusion. First Maimonides brings a proof from Jacob, "for Jacob the righteous man said (-Genesis 31:7), 'I served your father with all my strength,'" that it is obligatory that "a worker is obligated to work with all his strength." However, with the words "Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world" he is seemingly nullifying --or at least weakening-- the proof. For this brings out that this was not a obligation, but a specific righteous behavior by Jacob, for which there is a specific reward, "Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world."

(iii) Why does Maimonides use the wording "for (*Jacob the righteous man...*)," rather than the usual wording "for it is stated" or "as it is stated"?

(iv) The wording "(*Jacob*) the righteous" which is not a usual language as a adjective in Maimonides. At least Maimonides should have said "*Jacob, our patriarch*," and in particular that this (adjective "the righteous") weakens the proof, being that this adjective states that this is a specific behavior of a "(*Jacob*) the righteous"?

\* \* \*

☞ The Rebbe eliminates an explanation, before presenting his own innovation:

--[Seemingly, we could say that with all these terminologies Maimonides is forewarning a question (-Sdei Chemed, Klolim, Mareches Ha'Aleph, Klal 321): "We do not extrapolate from Pre-Giving of the Torah," thus how can we learn a law in the *Laws of Hiring* (*Sechiros*) from the behavior of Jacob of "Pre-Giving of the Torah"?

Therefore Maimonides does not state the usual wording of "for it is stated" when bringing a proof. For we actually do not extrapolate the law from Jacob. Rather, it is only a kind of reference (or only as "a thing's revelation") to bring forth the greatness of the concept, as we see by Jacob, our patriarch, "said, 'I served with all my strength...' Therefore, he will be granted a reward even in this world."

However, to say this is a great imposition, for we find in numerous times, including within Maimonides itself, in previous laws, that we extrapolate also from "Pre-Giving of the Torah" --as we find (-Laws of Ishus, 10:14) also in this Torah-portion (*Parshas Vayeitzei*) "Even on Chol HaMo'ed weddings are not held, as we have explained, for one celebration should not be mixed with another, as it is stated (-Genesis 29:27), --concerning Jacob marrying Rachel after marrying Leah-- 'Complete the week of celebration of this one and then I will give you this other one.'"-- And this is not a contradiction to the rule "We do not extrapolate from Pre-Giving of the Torah" as explained with the different answers and categories involved, as explained by the different commentaries.

And it is obvious that in our case, where it is not a specific law, but rather, only a general behavior of the way of an employee's work according to the discussions and agreements of people, which we can definitely extrapolate *from Pre-Giving of the Torah*.

More than this, we find within our matter itself, concerning Jacob's working for Laban, that we extrapolate from Jacob, as the Talmud states (-Baba Metzia 93b), "To what extent is a paid bailee obligated to safeguard? (He is obligated) to the extent (that Jacob said to Laban) (-Genesis 31:40), 'Thus I was: In the day

*the drought consumed me, and the frost by night.”]--*

\* \* \*

*The Explanation:* With the proof, “for Jacob the righteous man said (-Genesis 31:7), ‘I served your father with all my strength.’ Therefore, he will be granted a...” Maimonides is defining the category of the obligation “to work with all his strength.” First Maimonides states, “Just as the employer is warned not to steal the wage of the poor... the poor person is forewarned not to steal from the work due his employer and neglect his work slightly here and there, spending the entire day in deceit. Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time...,” and then Maimonides continues with, “Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his strength.”

Now, seemingly, we could say that the obligation “to be precise with regard to his time” is connected with, “not to steal from the work due his employer.” However, the obligation of, “a worker is obligated to work with all his strength” is not --that much-- connected with the work for the employer --to the point that we say that when he does not work as such he is not fulfilling the, “not to steal from the work due his employer.”-- rather, it is connected only with the person himself, the employee and his trustworthiness, that he has to be committed to his work to the point of, “to work with all his strength.” Meaning that this --“to work with all his strength”-- is not of the category of obligations “between a man and his peer,” between the employee and employer, but rather, this is in kind as the category of obligations “between man and G-d,” between the employee and G-d.

To negate this, Maimonides brings the proof of, “I served your father with all my strength.” The proof is not only from the beginning of Jacob’s words\*, but rather, the primary proof is from the continuation of Jacob’s words, “Therefore, he took this reward (and in a manner of) ‘And the man became prodigiously wealthy....’”

\*Note: For, to the contrary, from these words we can say that Jacob was emphasizing that he had behaved in a manner of beyond the law, a work in which he was not obligated, in which, this would then be a proof to the contrary, that one is not obligated to work for his employer with all his strength.

The accomplishment with this --that the primary proof is from the “Therefore, he took this reward (and in a manner of) ‘And the man became prodigiously wealthy’-- is not in as much that Jacob “a reward even in this world” --in contrast to the reward for other mitzvot are only in the *World to Come*--, but that he received “he took this reward” the reward for his work: Meaning: the “Specify your wages” that Laban promised Jacob was what actually brought about the “And the man became prodigiously wealthy,” a reward appropriate with Jacob’s work being one of, “I served your father with all my strength” --even though Laban was continuously trying to fool Jacob. Thus, Maimonides is showing us that the “to work with all his strength” is not only a matter of the obligation of the “person”, the employee when he is “with himself”, but with his work for his employer, and thus, Jacob received his reward in this world.

\* \* \*

With this we can answer two of our earlier questions:

- (i) Maimonides doesn’t use the usual terminology of “as it is stated” but rather “for...” because the proof of the law is not only from the verse, but primarily from the whole continuation of “Therefore, he took this reward...”
- (ii) Maimonides doesn’t use the adjective “Jacob, our patriarch,” but “Jacob, the righteous.” Maimonides, in his *Sefer HaYaD* sees the title “righteous” not as beyond the letter of the law, but as (-Laws of De’os 1:6), “In a similar manner, the prophets called G-d... ‘Righteous’... They did so to inform us that these are good and just paths. A person is obligated to accustom himself to these paths,” concerning the behaviors of (-ibid, law 4), “The straight path, this involves discovering the midpoint temperament.” While, one who “A person who carefully examines his behavior, and therefore deviates slightly from the mean to either side is called pious.” Thus, Maimonides, by using the title “righteous” for Jacob is emphasizing that that Jacob’s behavior of, “I served your father with all my strength” is not an attribute of piety, but rather, this is the obligatory manner of an employee, of every employee for his work for his employer.

\* \* \*

☞ After defining Maimonides’ emphases that the obligation of “a worker is obligated to work with all his strength” is part-and-parcel of the employee’s obligation of his work for his employer, an obligation between “man/man” between the employee and the employer, the Rebbe now takes this to the next level, in subdividing this into two paradigms on how to see this obligation of the employee to his employer in his work commitment to the employer.

This innovation that the obligation of “a worker is obligated to work with all his strength” is connected --not only with general trustworthiness of the employee, but rather-- with the work that he is doing for the employer, can be perceived in one of two manners:

- (i) It --“a worker is obligated to work with all his strength”-- is connected with the work, however, it is additional to the work itself for the employer. It is a separate obligation from the employee to the employer.

This is Maimonides' opinion. Thus, Maimonides separates the laws of "steal from the work due his employer" in two separate laws: In Law 6 Maimonides states the laws of "A worker may not, however, perform work at... because this leads to stealing from the work due his employer, for his energy will be... and he will not be able to perform his work robustly." And then, in the next law, Law 7, Maimonides begins with, "Just as the employer is warned not to steal the wage of the poor person... the poor person is forewarned not to steal from the work due his employer and neglect his work slightly here... Instead, he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... a worker is obligated to work with all his strength."

Because, according to Maimonides these are two different categories: (a) One obligation is the obligation of the employee needs to do his work with strength. (b) A separate obligation is the obligation to "to be precise with regard to his time... a worker is obligated to work with all his strength."

The difference between the two obligations is to do one's work with strength is a concept in the very definition of work. When there is missing the doing work with strength there is a lacking in its to bore the title "work". However, the obligation of "to work with all his strength" is not because without it there is missing in the definition of work, but rather, it is connected with the particular obligation to this particular employer.

In other words: The general "work with strength" is connected with the "object" of work, and the obligation of "to work with all his strength" is related to the "person" between the employee and the employer, in which a worker, his body is in acquisition to the employer.

☞ In the above, the Rebbe is not speaking of the difference between the "object" and the "person" as he did in the onset of the sicha, in which the "person" is more of an obligation of the "between man and G-d". Rather, it is within the obligation "between man and man" itself, there is the obligation of the "object" of the work, in which the work needs to be done. Then there is the obligation of the "person", in which the employee himself, his body, has an obligation, and is in acquisition, to his present employer.

In Footnote 43 the Rebbe presents the case in which a very strong employee can get the job done without his working "with all his strength." From the perspective of the obligation to the work, the work can be done without all his strength. However, from the perspective of the obligation of the employee's body being in acquisition to his employer, the "he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... a worker is obligated to work with all his strength," still needs to be done.

\* \* \*

(ii) The two laws of "to work with strength" and "to work with all his strength" are not two different laws, but rather, they are one law. It is all one category, all connected to the "work for his employer".

This is the opinion of the Alter Rebbe, who has both concepts listed in the same law, with the "A worker may not perform..." being in continuation to the introduction of "Just as the employer is cautioned... the poor worker is similarly cautioned not to neglect the work due his employer... he is obligated to be precise with regard to his time... Similarly, a worker is obligated to work with all his might." As the Alter Rebbe writes of the, "Therefore a worker may not perform..."

☞ In Footnote 44 the Rebbe clarifies that according to Maimonides only the "to work with all his strength" is because the employee's body is in acquisition to his employer. But the "to work with strength" is only as the definition of "work". According to the Alter Rebbe, even the "to work with all his strength" is because of the employee's body being in acquisition to his employer.

In the Note on the Margin of this Footnote the Rebbe brings proof to the Alter Rebbe being of this opinion from a different law concerning an employee's category concerning the prohibition of (-Leviticus 25:55), "For the children of Israel are servants to Me; they are My servants," of which our Sages state (-Baba Metzia 10a), "They are My servants, and not servants to servants," which is the prohibition of one voluntarily selling himself as a servant. Thus, being that the employee's body is in acquisition to the employer (in a manner, this is like being a servant), thus, there are opinions that one should go into contract of being an employee to an employer for more than three years, for with this, he leaves the realm of being a Hired Worker and enters into the realm of being a Servant.

\* \* \*

☞ With this innovation of the Rebbe in the Alter Rebbe's opinion, the Rebbe will not explain certain slight variations the Alter Rebbe makes from the wording of Maimonides:

(i) At the end of the first law (Law 6), where Maimonides explains the reason for the laws of "A worker may not, however, perform work at night... not starve and aggrieve himself..." he states "because this leads to stealing from the work due his employer, for his energy will be sapped and his thinking unclear, and he will not perform his work robustly." The Alter Rebbe, however, changes: (a) leaves out the words "because this leads to stealing from the work due his employer." (b) Instead of writing "and he will not perform his work robustly" The Alter Rebbe writes "he will not be able to perform his work." (c) Instead of Maimonides' wording "his work" the Alter Rebbe writes "the work due

his employer."

According to what we previously explained, the explanation to these differences is: According to Maimonides the fault is one of "and he will not perform his work robustly". Meaning, the fault is in the very definition of work. Therefore, the moment that the places himself in the situation of "and he will not perform his work robustly" this becomes an issue of "stealing from the work due his employer" --because he is not worthy of being a an employer, being that his work is not work.

Not so according to the *Alter Rebbe*. According to the *Alter Rebbe* the fault is "and he will not be able to perform the work due his employer" from the perspective of his obligation (acquisition) to his employer. Meaning that the prohibition of "a worker may not perform work at night" and the likes, according to the *Alter Rebbe* is not of the category of "stealing from the work due his employer". --This is just a "cause" of an outcome of "and he will not be able to perform the work due his employer", that afterwards when he actually does the work it will not done proficiently.-- The direct issue is in the employee causing an issue in his body being in an acquisition to his employer, and not just a mere issue of the proficiency of his work for his employer! Thus, the *Alter Rebbe* states clearly, changing the wording of Maimonides, that the issue here is not one of "and he will not perform his work robustly" --the "object" of the "work"--, but of "and he will not be able to perform the work due his employer" --the "person" of the "employee" being an acquisition of the employer.

(ii) Concerning the proof from Jacob, the wording of Maimonides is "Therefore, he took this reward". However, the *Alter Rebbe* writes, "Therefore, he took his reward."

Maimonides' opinion is that that the reward for "to work with all his strength" ("person" commitment; acquisition of body to the employer) is an additional concept upon the reward for the employee's actual work itself ("to perform his work robustly"; "object" commitment) for the employer. While the reward for the "to work with all his strength" is connected with the "work itself," however, with this, it is an additional concept to the work itself. This is why Maimonides emphasizes is "Therefore, he took this reward" meaning "this" a special reward for the "to work with all his strength."

However, the *Alter Rebbe* emphasizes "Therefore, he took his reward" because his opinion is that they ("to perform his work robustly" and "to work with all his strength") are not two separate concepts, but one category, and therefore the reward for "to work with all his strength" is the same "his reward" of the "to perform his work robustly".

\* \* \*

*The Lesson in Service to G-d: Jews are the Employees, who have to do the work for the Employer, G-d.*

The reason why we extrapolate the obligation to "to work with all his strength" from the work of Jacob while he lived in Laban's house in *Charan* (outside of the Land of Israel) is because the work that a Jew must do (with all of his strength) for G-d is similar to the work of Jacob in the house of Laban. The work that Jacob did in the house of Laban was not "within the four cubits" of the Torah-study hall of *Shem* (Noah's son) and *Ever* (Shem's grandson). It was not even in the Land of Israel, in his father Isaac's home. Which were it to be in one of these, all Jacob's work would have been within the realm of holiness. Rather, Jacob's work was *In Charan* (lit. this name means *Anger*), upon which our Sages state that it was the place (in which their behavior made it) of the *Charon-Af* - the *Anger of G-d*. And Jacob's work was to transform the world (outside of the realm of holiness) into an "Abode for Him (G-d), blessed be He."

So too, is the work of every Jew as an employee of G-d. This which the soul serves G-d when it is in the upper spiritual realms --before it descends here below, into this world and clothes itself within a body, but-- in the dimension of (-Kings I 17:1), "(As the Eternal lives, the G-d of Israel) whom I stood --past tense, mystically referring to before he was born, and his soul stood in the upper spiritual realms-- before Him" is all extremely superior, both in the soul's intellectual understanding of G-d, and in the soul's emotional service of loving and fearing G-d. However, this is all its, the soul's service. It is specifically when the soul descends into this physical world, and within this world, it is not confined always only "Within the Four Cubits" of Torah-study and prayer, but rather, the person occupies himself with the "Service of Rectification" of the "G-dly Sparks" in this world, in order to transform the *Inferior Realm*, of which (-Tanya, Chapter 36), "There is none more inferior that it," into "An abode for Him, blessed be He," this is where he is an employee of G-d, and this is where there is his work for *Employer* -the Hebrew word used for an employer is *Master of the House*.

And upon this work comes the teaching from Jacob, that this work must be done "with all his strength." Meaning, that not only must it be done with, "to be precise with regard to his time,"

--[For if, "neglect his work slightly here and there," he makes a calculation that it doesn't matter if he postpones his work for his Employer, and in the meanwhile, he will grab onto doing concepts that are connected with his (soul's) wholeness --such as "fill his stomach" with more Torah-knowledge-- and this will cause that "spending the entire day --the (-Deuteronomy 7:11), "Today is for to do them (mitzvot)"-- in deceit."--]

but more than this, "obligated to work with all his strength," with all the faculties of the soul.

One can think that when he is still in the "Four Cubits of Torah-study and Prayer" that is when his work is connected with his intellectual faculties, to study Torah with understanding and perceiving, and then is when his work is connected with his emotional faculties, to pray with love and fear (-Ta'anis 2a), "Which is the service of the heart? This is Prayer." However, when leaves to the *outside*, and the work is to transform the world into "an Abode for Him, blessed be He," there the primary need is the faculty of *doing*, a service connected to *obedience* --without any need for the intellectual and emotional faculties of the soul.

Thus comes the lesson that in the work of, "Making an Abode for Him, blessed be He, in the inferior realm" one "is obligated to work with all his strength.", not only with his lower faculties (*Action; Obedience*) but also with his more internal faculties of *Intellect* and *Emotions*, and also with his *Encompassing Faculties* of *Will* and *Pleasure*.

Now, one can think that this is but a matter of "Beyond the Letter of the Law", for in essence, in the service of "Making an Abode for Him, blessed be He, in the inferior realm" primarily it is only the faculty of *Action* that is necessary, thus, we have the ruling that it is a complete obligation, which without it is, "stealing (negating it from being) his work for the employer"!

The "Name (definition of) *Work*" --of "Making an Abode for Him, blessed be He, in the inferior realm"-- might be (according to Maimonides) even if one does his work only with his faculty of *Action*. However, for it to be "*Work for his Employer*," the work must be "with all his strength."

By a Jew there must be the feeling within all of him that his entire concept is to fulfill his mission from G-d, "Making an Abode for Him, blessed be He, in the inferior realm," and that as an employee his body is in acquisition to Employer; G-d, and thus, it is automatic that he is doing his work for his Employer with all his strength.

And it is through this that a Jew fulfills his work with all the faculties of his soul that he "Takes his reward in this world," and in the manner of, "And the man became prodigiously wealthy" -the literal verse is, "And the man burst forth exceedingly, exceedingly - מְאֹד מְאֹד הָאִישׁ הָאֵלֶּיךָ מְאֹד מְאֹד," twice the word "exceedingly - מְאֹד," mystically meaning, truly beyond limitations, that it is specifically through the service in this physical world that we take the "true exceedingly".