



The "Wholeness" of a Jew

-by Rabbi Avrohom Lipszyc

☞ *Sicha's Innovation:* According to Rashi's opinion the "Simple Meaning of the Scriptures," can never be that the verse is just telling you that G-d kept His promise. Thus, the verse must be talking about receiving something beyond just what G-d had promised you.

Upon the verse (-33:18) "And Jacob came whole (*sholeim* - שָׁלֵם; unimpaired) [to] the city of Shechem" our Sages teach (-Shabbos 33b), and Rashi quotes this in his commentary on the Torah (-on the verse) explain that with "whole/unimpaired" the verse means "whole in his body, whole in his financing, and whole in his Torah."

The necessity to say "whole in his body, whole in his financing" is as explained in the Midrash (-Bereishis Rabba Portion 79:5), "Because it is written (-Genesis 32:32), 'He was limping because of his hip'... in his wealth, although... for nine years our patriarch Jacob would give Esau that same gift." Rashi as well states, "whole in his body, for he was cured of his limp and whole with his money. He did not lose anything because of that entire gift that he had given Esau." However, concerning the "whole in his Torah" we find in the Midrash no explanation for the need to say this. More than this, we find a contradiction in Rashi: (i) In his commentary on the Talmud (-Shabbos 33b), "Since he did not forget his learning on account of the toil of the road." (ii) in his commentary on the Torah (-33:18), "for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house."

☞ *Questions:* (i) What is the reason for the change in Rashi's comments? (ii) Seemingly, logic is of the contrary: In his commentary on the Torah, where his focus is the "simple meaning of the Scripture" it would have been specifically more aligned to have said "of the toil of the road" and not "in Laban's house"! For the verse states, "And Jacob came whole [to] the city of Shechem," which in the "simple meaning of the Scripture" the "whole" is a novelty to Jacob's arriving to the city of Shechem*.

*Note: In *Footnote 11* the Rebbe questions the comment of the *Maskil Dovid* (Rabbi David Pardo, 1719-1792, a commentary on Rashi's commentary: [Link](#)) that concerning all of them (body, money, and Torah) the being whole was immediate, for he healed from his limp caused by the angle, "and a miracle happened for him, that nothing was missing from his financing even after he gave the gifts to Esau." For, if so, why doesn't the verse say that the "whole" was in the place "Sukkos" where he arrived after the above events 18 months before he arrived to Shechem?! Thus, the Rebbe is emphasizing that the "whole" is connected to his travels to arriving in Shechem.

This note is concerning Rashi's comment (*Maskil Dovid* is a commentary on Rashi). The following is concerning the Midrash. The Rebbe will be focusing on Rashi, and therefore is now going to point out that this isn't concerning the Midrash:

--[The Midrash (-Bereishis Rabba, Portion 78:5) states Jacob was immediately healed through the (-Genesis 32:32), "And the sun rose for him." So too, concerning the gifts (-Tanchuma Bober, Vayishlach 11), "The Holy One, blessed be He filled what was lacking, and returned to him everything immediately." (The Rebbe in *Footnote 15* defines the proof of the verse "Ans Jacob arrived to Sholem" means that when he arrived to Shechem he was already "whole", however, it happened "immediately"). Thus, he was already, "whole in his body, whole in his financing" arriving in Sukkos more than 18 months prior to arriving to Shechem.

However, according to the simple meaning all of this happened within the realm of nature --both, that of the healing of his hip and the filling in what was lacking in his financing from his gifts to Esau-- and this is the innovation of the verse "" that arriving in Shechem, because then is when he first became --naturally-- completely* healed bodily and he became refilled --naturally-- the lacking from his giving gifts with the "and he had prolific animals": They were fruitful and multiplied more than other animals."

*Note: In *Footnote 18* The Rebbe explains that this --that Jacob was limping for 18 months, from when the angel hit him until he arrived in Shechem-- would better explain that which the next verse continues with (-verse 33), "Therefore, the children of Israel --simply referring to Jacob's sons and daughters at the time-- may not eat the displaced tendon, which is on the socket of the hip, until this day, for he touched the socket of Jacob's hip, in the hip sinew." For if it was just a momentary limp which was miraculous immediately healed, which his children would not have even seen being that the "And the sun rose for him" was "when he passed Penuel" where he met the angel when he was alone, then why would his children have accepted upon themselves "not eat the displaced tendon"? However, in a *Note on the Margin* on this *Footnote* the Rebbe points out that the *Baal HaTurim* (-Rabbi Jacob ben Asher, c. 1270-1340. [Link](#)) explains the reason for the "Therefore, the children of Israel may not eat the displaced tendon" was because Jacob was only hit at the hip, and that the angel did not kill Jacob, which would not make a difference in how long Jacob was limping.]--

Now, regarding the explanation of "on account of the toil of the road" it makes sense to say that arriving in Shechem (where he settles, "And he bought the part of the field where he had pitched his tent") he was "whole in his Torah" even though "the toil of the road" that he lived through in his arriving to Shechem. However, according to the explanation of "in Laban's house" there is no connection between the "whole in his Torah" and his arriving in Shechem, being that the wholeness" was already in his leaving the "Laban's house".

Thus the question: Why is Rashi in his commentary on the Torah --"Simple meaning of the Scripture"-- "In Laban's house"?

☞ The Rebbe now explains that the question is not on the altogether issue of the verse's "whole" meaning also the "whole in his Torah" being "in Laban's house." But only of why Rashi chooses to specifically define the "whole in his Torah" being of "In Laban's House" when you can simply explain it to be of when "arrived to Shechem":

--[The question is not how can we altogether say such an explanation of "for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house" when the verse explicitly states, "And Jacob came whole [to] the city of Shechem", for the verse itself does not state "whole --only-- in his Torah" only "whole" plain. Thus, we can say that the intention of the verse is that only when Jacob arrived in Shechem was he completely "whole" in all three things (body, money, and Torah), even though the "whole in his Torah" itself was already earlier.

However, the question is: Being that we can simply explain that the "whole in his Torah" is connected with his arriving to Shechem ("on account of the toil of the road") why does Rashi specifically choose in his commentary on the Torah that we are specifically speaking of "In Laban's House"?]

More Questions On Rashi: The Midrash in its explanation of the "whole" lists also a fourth thing: "Whole in his children, because it is written in his regard (-Genesis 32:9), 'If Esau will come upon the one camp, and smite it, the remaining camp will survive,' nevertheless, here, intact in his children."

Now, seemingly, the explanation of "whole in his children" is also a matter of "simple meaning of the Scripture", and not just of a homiletic teaching of the Midrash*. Thus, why does Rashi quote specifically the teaching of the Talmud where there is no mention of the "whole in his children," rather than the Midrash where it is mentioned?

*Note: In Footnote 24 the Rebbe quotes the explanation of the *Yefas Toar* (-Rabbi Shmuel Yafeh Ashkenazi, d. late 16th century. [Link](#)) to the difference between the Talmud and the Midrash: The Talmud excludes the "Whole in sons" "Being that Esau showed a kind face to Jacob, and thus Jacob's fear was removed... "and thus why would be the need to say 'whole in sons' when it is simple that he would not touch them... The opinion of the Midrash is aligned with Nachmanides' opinion... for until Jacob arrived to the Land of Israel his heart feared the anger of Esau." And therefore, until he arrived to Shechem there was a concern for a lacking in (murder of) his sons. Based on this explanation for the stating or not stating of the "whole in his sons" Rashi is of the opinion that Jacob was afraid of Esau, as Rashi states concerning Jacob's arriving to Shechem, "Like a person who says to his companion, 'So-and-so came out from between the teeth of lions and returned safely.'" So too, we see Rashi's opinion that Jacob remained afraid of Esau after their meeting, as Rashi explains (-33:14), "'until I come to my master, to Seir': He told him of a longer journey, although he intended to go only as far as Succoth. He said [to himself], 'If he intends to harm me, he will wait until I come to him,' but he did not go."

The question becomes even greater: At the beginning of Torah-portion *Lech Lecha* (-12:2) where G-d's blessings to Abraham is stated, "And I will make you into a great nation...", Rashi comments, "Since traveling causes three things: It diminishes procreation, it diminishes money, and it diminishes fame, therefore, he required these three blessings, namely that He blessed him concerning children...." Thus, we see that a blessing for children is a primary issue which needs to be forewarned when it is possible that there be a diminishment there in -- "on account of the toil of the road"! Therefore, by the verse of "And Jacob came whole [to] the city of Shechem" seemingly Rashi should have explained "whole" to also mean "whole in sons"?

* * *

Introduction to Explanation: Seemingly, the simple primary meaning of the verse "And Jacob came whole [to] the city of Shechem" is in simplicity speaking of Jacob's arriving whole, surviving his experiences with Laban and Esau. As Rashi himself immediately comments, "'When he came from Padan-aram': Like a person who says to his companion, 'So-and-so came out from between the teeth of lions and returned safely.' Here too, he came whole from Padan-aram, from Laban and from Esau, who had come to attack him on the way." Nevertheless, Rashi says in the "simple meaning of the Scripture" that the "And Jacob came whole" is --not associated to the rescue from the danger of Laban and Esau, but rather,-- but of a general "wholeness" of travels, associated with body, money, and Torah? And more than this, from where is this --"general wholeness"-- extrapolated?

Within this itself is the question that the "whole in body" is not of the danger of his life, but of a specific "healed from his limp"!?

☞ The Rebbe negates the answer that the word "whole" would only apply specifically to something that was definitely lacking and then was restored to wholeness:

--[We can't say that the word *whole* only applies to a situation in which there actually was a damage that cause a *lacking (and only a lacking*, and not a total destruction) to which it was afterwards restored to wholeness, because --(i) in the comment afterwards Rashi clearly states, "Like a person who says to his companion, 'So-and-so came out from between the teeth of lions and returned safely.'", in which he was never actually lacking, but only in the danger of thereof, and (ii)-- in this very comment itself Rashi explains, "whole with his Torah, for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies," which means there was no actual lacking that was restored, but that he was to begin with protected from a potential lacking! Thus, we could have likewise said that the "whole" was simply his salvation from the potential dangers of Laban and Esau?]

* * *

Explanation: Immediately after Jacob left Charan (going to Laban's House) G-d had promised Jacob (-Genesis 28:15), "And behold, I am with you, and I will guard you wherever you go." Meaning --in the *Simple meaning of the Scripture*- first and foremost the protection from Laban and Esau, as Rashi himself explains there, "(G-d promised Jacob this) *because he was afraid of Esau and Laban.*" Thus, the verse does not need to emphasize that G-d's promise actualized, and that Jacob arrived "whole" to Shechem from his dealings with Laban and Esau. This is self-understood! --Just like concerning G-d's promise to Abraham, "And I will make you into a great nation...", that the did not cause a diminishment in the three areas that G-d promised him, we don't find a specific verse telling us that G-d kept his promise! Thus, why would there be a verse to tell us this concerning G-d's promises to Jacob? There wouldn't be such a verse! Thus, Rashi is forced to explain the verse to be speaking only of things that were not included with G-d's original promise to Jacob of, "And behold, I am with you, and I will guard you wherever you go." The verse "And Jacob arrived whole" can only be speaking of specific situations that could have caused Jacob's not arriving "whole", regardless of G-d's fulfilled promise. And upon these specific situations the verse tells us that nevertheless, "And Jacob arrived whole." And being that the verse says "whole" plainly and not in a one specific thing, thus we know that the verse is speaking not of an one specific area, but of a simple "wholeness" in all of his details, which subdivide in the three areas that Rashi enumerates:

- (i) "Whole in his body, for he was cured of his limp": That which Jacob was "limping on his thigh" was an outcome of his war with "prince --guardian angel-- of Esau," an angel, a messenger from G-d. Being that this was done to Jacob --for whatever reason there may be to this --The Rebbe explains in *Footnote 38*: "Simply speaking --in order that it (the guardian angel of Esau) should admit to him (Jacob) concerning the blessings (that Jacob tricked Isaac into giving to him instead of to Esau)"-- through an angel of G-d, it is thus understood, that this is not included, and is not forewarned, in that which was promised, "and I will protect you," from Laban and Esau.
- (ii) "Whole with his money. He did not lose anything because of that entire gift that he had given Esau": Even after Jacob's giving Esau "that entire gift" there remained a great wealth by Jacob, as understood from the simple verses (-30:43) "And the man became exceedingly wealthy...", an amount far greater than the gifts Jacob gave to Esau. Thus, even if G-d would not had restored the gifts that Jacob gave to Esau this would not have diminished in the fulfillment of G-d's promise to Jacob, "I will guard you... for I will not forsake you." And nevertheless, G-d restored for him the entire lacking that was caused, "of that entire gift."
- (iii) "Whole with his Torah, for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house": The possibility of Jacob's forgetting his studies in Laban's house was not because of any influence upon Jacob in his being together with the wicked Laban.

--For this Jacob had already prayed (-ibid, verse 21, and in Rashi's commentary), "And if I return in peace to my father's house: Perfect from sin, that I will not learn from the ways of Laban", which was fulfilled, as Jacob said to Esau(-ibid, 32:5, and in Rashi's commentary), "I have sojourned with Laban: but I kept the 613 commandments, and I did not learn from his evil deeds."--

Rather, it was due to Jacob's great integrity and commitment to his work that he was hired to do for Laban as a shepherd of livestock, as it needs to be done according to the Torah --Footnote 46: "To the point that we learn from Jacob's behavior concerning the obligation of an employee". As Jacob said (-Genesis, 31:6), "with all my might I served your father," and (-ibid :40), "I was [in the field] by day when the heat consumed me, and the frost at night, and my sleep wandered from my eye." And in this manner Jacob worked for (-ibid, 38:41), "Twenty years". Thus, it is understood the gigantic novelty, that with out paying attention to all of this, there was the, "for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house"!

And this novelty is not connected with G-d's promise of "behold, I am with you, and I will guard you wherever you go", being that even were Jacob to have remained home in the Land of Canaan and would occupy himself with such a hired job, working in such a manner, he would have still needed a special blessing that he not forget his studies.

And this is the novelty within the verse, "And Jacob arrived whole," "whole in his Torah" that "He did not forget his studies in house of Laban."

* * *

According to this the above asked two questions on Rashi's comment fall away automatically:

Rashi cannot bring the concept of "*whole in his sons*", that Esau would not touch Jacob's sons, for this is included in G-d's promise, "*And I will guard you...*" and the verse doesn't need to tell us that G-d's promise was fulfilled.

And for the same reason Rashi cannot explain in his commentary on the Torah* that "*whole in his Torah*" means "*not forget his learning on account of the toil of the road*," because also this concept is included in G-d's promise, "*behold, I am with you, and I will guard you wherever you go*" likened to G-d's blessings to Abraham that "*the toil of the road*" will not diminish of the "*three things*" (money, fame, and children) that are *naturally* diminished from "*the toil of the road*."

*Note: The Rebbe explains in *Footnote 50* that not so in his commentary on the Talmud, where Rashi explains it to be "*of the toil of the road*" because this would be aligned more with the time of "*and Jacob arrived whole*". Additionally, this would be more in alignment with the story told there in the Talmud of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai, which was more an issue of "*of the toil of the road*," than that of "*In Laban's House*."

--The story of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai: "*Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai and his son, Rabbi Elazar... They went and they hid in a cave... They sat in the cave for twelve years... A Divine Voice emerged and said to them... 'Return to your cave'. They again went and sat there for twelve months... A Divine Voice emerged and said to them, 'Emerge from your cave.' They emerged... Rabbi Pinechas ben Ya'ir, Rabbi Shimon's son-in-law, heard and went out to greet him. He brought him into the bathhouse and began tending to his flesh. He saw that Rabbi Shimon had cracks in the skin on his body. He was crying, and the tears fell from his eyes and caused Rabbi Shimon pain. Rabbi Pinechas said to Rabbi Shimon, his father-in-law: Woe is me, that I have seen you like this. Rabbi Shimon said to him: Happy are you that you have seen me like this, as had you not seen me like this, you would not have found in me this prominence in Torah: At first, when Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai would raise a difficulty, Rabbi Pinechas ben Ya'ir would respond to his question with twelve answers. Ultimately, when Rabbi Pinechas ben Ya'ir would raise a difficulty, Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai would respond with twenty-four answers.*"

* * *

Wine of Torah (mystical teachings) *within Rashi*: Jacob's going to Charan alludes to his children, the Children of Israel, going into exile, "*Actions of the (fore)fathers are signs (empowerment) for the(ir) children*". The verse states, "*And Jacob came whole [to] the city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Padan aram*": G-d promises every Jew that G-d will bring him back whole from exile.

Rashi explains, and adds on, that this which Laban and Esau of their own cannot touch a Jew, and he (Jacob) arrives "*whole*" to the Land of Israel, this is self-understood. Not this is the novelty of the "*And Jacob arrived whole*". For this G-d had promised even before the Jew went into exile, "*And behold, I am with you, and I will guard you wherever you go.*" Thus, no one has the power to touch a Jew. The novelty is that even concerning the areas in which seemingly --according to the order that was aligned from Above-- there is the possibility that exile should effect a lacking by a Jew (as it was by Jacob), comes the verse and states "*And Jacob arrived whole*", that the damage is not real. It is only temporary. However, ultimately, the lacking is nullified and "*And Jacob arrived whole*." And these are the three things that Rashi lists:

- (i) "*Whole in his body, for he was cured of his limp*": One of the virtues in the service of the times of exile is the service of self-sacrifice. This is the reason behind all the suffering of exile, as a test (challenge) (-Deuteronomy 13:4), "*for the L-rd, your G-d, is testing you*," in order to bring forth by the Jew the concept of self-sacrifice. This is the concept of that which "*guardian angel of Esau*"s "*he touched the socket of his hip*." As Nachmanides (-Rabbi Moses ben Nachman, 1195-1270. [Link](#)) on the verse explains the words of the Midrash on the verse (-Bereishis Rabba, Portion 77:3), "*Touched all the future righteous ones that will come forth from him (Jacob), this is the generation of religious persecution.*" Meaning that this is alluding to the suffering of exile in the worst manner (*Footnote 60*: "See Nachmanides, *ibid*. And he concludes: 'And all this we suffered and passed upon us (meaning that we survive it all) as it is alluded, 'and Jacob arrived whole.'") which all of this suffering is but to awaken within the Jew their self-sacrifice.

Thus, one can think that being that this suffering ultimately comes not from the physical Esau here below, but from the "*guardian angel of Esau*", the suffering comes from Above in order to bring forth by a Jew his self-sacrifice (*Footnote 62*: "*To point out the teaching of our Sages (-Baba Basra 16a) 'Satan (in his tempting people) and Penina (in her taunting Chana for being barren) for the sake of Heaven intended (Satan in bringing forth the self-sacrifice of the Jew; Penina in getting Chana to pray deeply for children).'*"), and therefore they --the sufferings-- are a true existence that has a survival, thus the verse comes to tell us "*Whole in his body, for he was cured of his limp*" - that after we fulfill the service of exile --self-sacrifice-- the sufferings are completely negated, "*he was cured of his limp*" in a manner that he is whole. (*Footnote 63*: "A healing that uproots the ailment from its beginning... that even in

its name it doesn't lack (--meaning that-- there is not --lasting-- markings).") For from its --the suffering's-- onset it is not a true existence, but a test (In Footnote 64 the Rebbe directs us to a teaching that a test is not a *true existence* of its own. Rather, it is only a *virtual reality* in order to conceal and withhold the true reality. As that of the teaching of our Sages concerning Abraham's test in binding Isaac upon the altar. --The midrash states that Satan created a river for Abraham not to be able to travel to the mountain that G-d showed him where to bind Isaac upon the altar. Abraham walked into the river up to his nostrils. G-d then commanded Satan to remove the river, and it then became apparent that the river was only a *mirage*, and not a real river.) in order to reveal the strength of self-sacrifice of a Jew.

- (ii) "Whole with his money. He did not lose anything because of that entire gift that he had given Esau": The purpose of exile is not only that the Jew himself should making it out whole. Rather, that the Jew should also transform the objects of exile, and to make of them "*his money*", transforming them to holiness. As that of Jacob, that not only was he himself saved from Laban and Esau, but that he took with Laban such a great magnitude of possessions that Laban said (-Genesis 31:42), "*All that you see are mine.*" (Footnote 66: "To which Jacob didn't respond" --meaning that Laban was right!) Likewise, Jacob had accomplished the transformation of Esau himself, that instead of Esau's wanting to kill Jacob, what happened was (-ibid, 33:4), "*And Esau ran toward him and embraced him, and he fell on his neck and kissed him, and they wept.*" To the point that Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai's opinion is (-Rashi on the verse), "*he kissed him wholeheartedly*" even though "*It is a well known tradition that Esau hated Jacob.*"

--[And this is the preparation (Footnote 70: "For even according to Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai this --that Esau kissed Jacob with all his heart-- was only 'at that moment'." to the era of (-Obadiah 1:21), "*And saviors shall ascend Mt. Zion to judge the mountain of Esau, and the L-rd shall have the kingdom**" that not only will there be the "*to judge... Esau*" but rather, "*and the L-rd shall have the kingdom*" that Esau will acknowledge the sovereignty of G-d. In the language of Maimonides (-Laws of Kings 11:4), "*He --Moshiach-- will then improve the entire world, motivating all the nations to serve G-d together, as it is stated (-Zephaniah 3:9), 'I will transform the peoples... so that they all will call upon the name of G-d.'*"]--

*Note: The Rebbe in Footnote 71 builds upon, and explains the wording of Rashi in accordance to this that Jacob's impact of transformation of Esau was only a *preparation* for what Moshiach will do, "*And saviors shall ascend Mt. Zion to judge the mountain of Esau, and the L-rd shall have the kingdom.*" However, in order to understand this beautiful Footnote let us make an introduction:

- (a) Rashi comments (-Genesis 33:14), "*Now, let my master go ahead before his servant, and I will move [at] my own slow pace, according to the pace of the work that is before me and according to the pace of the children, until I come to my master, to Seir,*" that "'Until I come to my master, to Seir': He told him of a longer journey, although he intended to go only as far as Succoth. He said [to himself], 'If he intends to harm me, he will wait until I come to him,' but he did not go [to Seir]. So when will he go? In the days of the Messiah, as it is said (-Obadiah 1:21), '*And saviors shall ascend Mt. Zion to judge the mountain of Esau.*'"
- (b) When Rashi quotes a verse he is precise in (1) the words that he does quote, (2) the words he doesn't quote, and (3) If he rites "*etc.*" in which he is telling you that the further words are applicable, but not necessary. Thus, here, Rashi is quoting his proof that Jacob will fulfill his words and will one day come meet Esau at Mt. Seir, and that this will be when Moshiach comes, as the Prophet Obadiah prophesized.
- (c) This leads to a huge problem into the way Rashi quotes the verse, for from the words that Rashi does quote, there is no proof that Jacob "*and saviors*" will ever actually go to "*Mountain of Esau*," when the words Rashi quoted explicitly say to the contrary, "*And saviors shall ascend Mt. Zion*" and from there he will, "*judge the mountain of Esau.*" The primary proof that Jacob will ascend to Mt. Seir is actually from the words that Rashi purposely did not quote: "*and the L-rd shall have the kingdom*" which proves that Jacob (Children of Israel) shall rule over Seir, that they will actually go there!

--[(c1) In a *Note on the Margin* the Rebbe presents a simple answer that Rashi himself had previously (-Genesis 11:5) stated, "*to teach judges not to condemn a defendant until they see*". So automatically we know that for Jacob to "*judge the mountain of Esau*," he legally needs to actually go to Mt. Seir. But, yet the Rebbe moves forward for the simple meaning as to why Rashi would not quote the seemingly primary words of the verse that prove his point.]--

Thus, the Rebbe explains that the reason why Rashi does not quote the second half of the verse is specifically because the complete transformation of Esau, in the manner of, "*and the L-rd shall have the kingdom*" will only be revealed in the *Time to Come* by Moshiach, while Jacob's effect on Esau is only temporarily, of just one of subjugation and not one of transformation, which is the dimension of "*to judge.*" Therefore, only this part of the verse applies to Jacob's conversation with Esau.

And just as Jacob accomplished this through "gifts" (after first praying) that he sent to Esau, so too, it is with every Jew, that in order to refine and transform the objects of the world (Esau: In Footnote 74 the Rebbe directs us to the teaching that Jacob and Esau made a division that the *World to Come* belongs to Jacob, while this world belongs to Jacob. Thus, the "*objects of this world*" is the lot of Esau) to holiness, and especially during the times of exile, he has to (after first praying) utilize his money and the likes as a "gift", giving from his time to *plow, sew, and "work that you shall do"* the prerequisite to (-Deuteronomy 15:18), "*and the L-rd, your G-d, will bless you in all that you shall do,*" --which should have been time of Torah-study, and thus there now becomes the question of (-Brochos 35b), "*what will become of Torah?*"-- just in order to rectify the world (Esau). Meaning that the Jew descends into the world and occupies himself with worldly matters --In the known vernacular of Chassidus: "*to clothe himself in the garments of the object to be rectified*"-- in order to be able to have an effect upon the world.

Thus, the question can be asked: Being that this work is --not in the manner of a *test*, which is not a true existence, but-- a dimension of rectifying the world, to transform the world --and not to negate a *virtual reality*-- thus, this is a true existence, and thus there is here a true lacking "*in his money*" --in order for him to be able to accomplish the rectification of the real existing world. Meaning, that the *descent* of his energy and time in the physical world is G-d-forbid an everlasting reality.

Therefore, the verse forewarns concerning this lacking and descent that it is only a temporary one, and that ultimately the Jew becomes and remains "*whole*" even in "*his money*". At the time when we will go to the redemption we will also take with us the physicality and the possessions of the Jew, in a manner that the Jew becomes "*whole*" completely so, elevated, and included within holiness.

- (iii) "*Whole with his Torah, for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house*": Wholeness in Torah-study demands an isolation from the world. Just as we find by Jacob that he was a (-Genesis 25:27) "*dweller in the tents*" (of Shem, son of Noach, and of Eiver, grandson of Shem, who both taught Torah) and he was hidden in the study-hall of (after Shem died, it was only) *Eiver* for 14 years. A Jew therefore states that being that he has to occupy himself with the work of rectification of the world of exile, and in the place of exile, thus, it is not possible for him to at the time remain in his elevated state of Torah! Therefore we tell him, "*he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house.*"

The difference is that concerning the other two areas, body and money, there can be an actual temporary lacking, only that afterwards this too becomes paid up. However, concerning the Torah there cannot be even to begin with a lacking by Jacob! For as my father-in-law the Rebbe (the Rebbe is referring to the Previous Rebbe, Rabbi Yoseph Yitzchok of Lubavitch, 1880-1950. [Link](#)) said (-Talk of 3rd of Tammuz, 1927, in the name of his father, Rabbi Sholom DovBer of Lubavitch, 1860-1920. [Link](#)) "*Only our body were given over in exile to subjugations of sovereignties. However, our soul were not driven into exile, and to a subjugation of sovereignties they were not given over.*" The intention of this is not only in the dimension of exile in the simple meaning of exile, that sovereignties have no rulership over a soul. Rather, more than this, that even our work with the exile does not touch the --interior dimension of the-- soul, which in itself is higher than exile. The descent of the person into exile in order to rectify the objects of exile, is only concerning the exterior dimension of the soul. However, of the soul itself, which is, "*were not driven into exile,*" it is not possible to have any descent, G-d-forbid.

And therefore, "*for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies in Laban's house*", the Torah that Jacob learned while he was "*hidden*" in an isolation from the world, remained by him *whole* even when he in *Laban's House*.

And the "*Actions of the (fore)fathers are signs (empowerment) for the(ir) children*", that every Jew has the empowerment from Jacob --that not only he himself to remain "*whole*" when he goes into exile, but also-- that even when he finds himself in "*Laban's house*" he can still remain in the level of "*for he had not forgotten [any of] his studies*", that his spirituality remains complete, "*whole in his Torah*"