

## פרשת וישלח

§

Sometimes, underlying themes in a Parsha may be ignored because there are other themes that loom large and block our awareness. When that happens, we lose valuable learning opportunities.

A case in point is our Parshas Vayishlach that has a large number of very visible themes.

When we study our Parsha we focus upon the confrontation between Yaakov Ovinu and Eisav. We examine the confrontation between the angel and Yaakov. We contemplate who was right and who was wrong in the episode of Shechem. Rochel's death and childbirth strikes us emotionally. We deal with the problematic behavior of Reuven with his father after the death of Rochel I'meinu, and there, too, we contemplate who was right and who was wrong. And there is more.

Yet, there are often themes though they are not stated explicitly but, nevertheless provide a framework for one or more the subjects that involve us as we learn the Parsha.

One sub-theme of our Parshas Vayishlach is money and wealth.

Let us first examine where that subject arises and then seek understanding as to what the Torah wishes us to learn this week.

In his message of appeasement to Eisav, Yaakov instructs his messengers to declare (B'reishis Perek 32/Posuk 6):

וַיְהִי לִי שׁוֹר וְחֹמּוֹר צֹאן וְעֶבֶד וְשִׁפְחָה וְאֲשֻׁלְחָה לְהַגִּיד לְאֲדֹנָי לְמַצָּא חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ:

I have oxen and donkeys, sheep, male-servants and maidservants; I was sent to tell my master to find favor in your eyes.

Yaakov's riches are noted at the very beginning of the Parsha.

Then, we learn of the gifts that Yaakov presented to his older brother. The Torah writes (ibid. P'sukim 14-20):

וַיִּלֶן שָׁם בְּלֵילָה הַהוּא וַיִּקַּח מִן הַבָּא בְיָדוֹ מִנְחָה לַעֲשׂוֹ אָחִיו: עֲדִים מְאֹתִים וַתִּישִׁים עֲשָׂרִים רְחִלִים מְאֹתִים וְאֵילִים עֲשָׂרִים: גַּמְלִים מִיִּנְיֹקוֹת וּבְנֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשִׁים פְּרוֹת אַרְבָּעִים

וּפְרִים עֶשְׂרֵה אֲתֹנֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְעֵיִרִם עֶשְׂרֵה: וַיִּתֵּן בְּיַד עֶבְדָּיו עֵדֶר עֵדֶר לְבָדוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל עֶבְדָּיו עֲבְרוּ לִפְנֵי וְרוּחַ תְּשִׁימוּ בֵּין עֵדֶר וּבֵין עֵדֶר: וַיֵּצֵא אֶת הָרֵאשׁוֹן לֵאמֹר כִּי יִפְגְּשֶׁךָ עֶשׂוֹ אַחִי וּשְׂאֵלְךָ לֵאמֹר לְמִי אַתָּה וְאָנֹכִי תִלְךָ וּלְמִי אֵלֶּה לְפָנֶיךָ: וְאָמַרְתָּ לְעֶבְדְּךָ לֵיעֲקֹב מִנְחָה הוּא שְׁלוּחָה לְאֲדֹנָי לַעֲשׂוֹ וְהִנֵּה גַם הוּא אַחֲרֵינוּ: וַיֵּצֵא גַם אֶת הַשְּׂנִי גַם אֶת הַשְּׂלִישִׁי גַם אֶת כָּל הַהֲלָכִים אַחֲרֵי הָעֵדְרִים לֵאמֹר כַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה תִּדְבְּרוּן אֶל עֶשׂוֹ בְּמִצְאָכֶם אֹתוֹ:

Yaakov slept there on that night and he took from that which came in his hand a gift for Eisav his brother: 200 goats and 20 male goats; 200 sheep and 20 rams. Nursing camels and their offspring 30, 40 cows and 10 bullocks; 20 she-donkeys and 10 male donkeys.

And he placed in the hands of his servants each flock separately and Yaakov said to his servants, 'Pass before me and leave space between each and every flock.'

Yaakov commanded the first servant saying 'When Eisav my brother will meet you and will ask you saying, "To whom do these belong and to whom are these that are before you intended?" You shall say, "they belong to your servant Yaakov, it is a gift sent to my master, to Eisav, and behold Yaakov is following us." Yaakov commanded also the second and also the third and also all those who were going after the flocks to say, 'Like this word you shall speak to Eisav when you find him.'

And, prior to sending this expansive gift to Eisav, Yaakov Ovinu mentioned his wealth in his prayer to Hashem.

He said, (ibid. Posuk 11):

קִטְנֹתִי מִכָּל הַחֲסָדִים וּמִכָּל הָאֱמֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ אֶת עֶבְדְּךָ כִּי בְּמִקְלִי עָבַרְתִּי אֶת הַיַּרְדֵּן  
הַזֶּה וְעַתָּה הֵייתִי לְשְׁנֵי מַחֲנֹת:

I am undeserving of all of the kindnesses and all of the truth that You Hashem have done for Your servant because with my staff I crossed this Jordan River and now I have become two camps.

As Rashi explains:

כי במקלי - לא היה עמי לא כסף ולא זהב ולא מקנה אלא מקלי לבדו.

Because with my staff – I did not have silver or gold or cattle with me – only my staff.

Yaakov emphasizes that his wealth and possessions have gone from nothing to a huge amount of wealth.

And monetary issues serve as a background for Yaakov's fight with the angel.

We read (ibid. P'sukim 23-25):

וַיָּקָם בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא וַיִּקַּח אֶת שְׁתֵּי נָשָׁיו וְאֶת שְׁתֵּי שִׁפְחֹתָיו וְאֶת אֶחָד עֶשֶׂר יְלָדָיו וַיַּעֲבֹר  
אֶת מַעְבַּר יַבֶּק: וַיִּקְחֵם וַיַּעֲבִרֵם אֶת הַנָּחַל וַיַּעֲבֹר אֶת אֲשֶׁר לוֹ: וַיֹּתֵר יַעֲקֹב לְבַדּוֹ וַיֵּאבֶּק  
אִישׁ עִמּוֹ עַד עֲלוֹת הַשָּׁחַר:

Yaakov arose that night and he took his two wives and his two maidservants and his eleven children and he brought them across the *Yabok* Pass. He took them and he brought them across the river and he brought across all that he had. Yaakov remained there by himself and a man wrestled with him until dawn.

We would expect that after assuring safe passage for his family that Yaakov would surely join them. Why was he left by himself? Rashi explains:

ויותר יעקב - שכח פכים קטנים וחזר עליהם:

*Yaakov remained* – He forgot small vessels and he returned to retrieve them.

It is puzzling. Yaakov's immense wealth is clearly apparent. Why would he expend energy to retrieve items that were practically useless<sup>1</sup>?

Finally, when Yaakov and Eisav do meet, the issue of wealth and possessions becomes part of their dialogue.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sifsei Chachamim explains that such is the implication of the verse itself as well as the term *pachim*.

In terms of the verse itself, the Torah just told us that he brought all that was his across the river – thus that which was left was unimportant.

The astute reader will wonder regarding this question. Chazal in Masseches Chullin ask this question and supply us with an answer!

We will see that Gemara soon.

When Yaakov tells Eisav that the vast herds and flocks of cattle, sheep and other animals are his gift to him, Eisav replies (ibid. Perek 33/Posuk 9):

וַיֹּאמֶר עֵשָׂו יֵשׁ לִי רַב אַחִי יְהִי לְךָ אֲשֶׁר לְךָ:

Eisav said, 'I have an abundance; my brother, that which is yours should be yours.

Yaakov urges Eisav to accept his gift and says (ibid. Posuk 11):

קַח נָא אֶת בְּרִכְתִּי אֲשֶׁר הֵבֵאתָ לָּךְ כִּי חֲנַנִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכִי יֵשׁ לִי כָל וַיִּפְצַר בּוֹ וַיִּקַּח:

Please take my give that was brought to you because G-d has favored me and I have everything; Yaakov urged Eisav and Eisav took it.

Let us begin our analysis with these last two passages. When we read the words of Eisav and Yaakov – who sounds better to us?

Eisav says that he doesn't need anything and Yaakov says he has everything. Isn't it that Eisav is saying that he has plenty and doesn't need any more and Yaakov says he possesses it all. Would it not seem that Yaakov's seems to be bragging too much? After all, who has it all?

On the other hand when we look beyond their words, when we look at their actions, the roles seemed to be reversed.

Yaakov who says he has everything gives away very expensive gifts in a most expansive manner. With such largesse, shouldn't Yaakov words have been 'I *had* everything'? He certainly has far less now than he previously had. Yet, he continues to say 'I have all'.

Eisav said that he had an abundance. He said that he had more than enough. So we would expect him to say that he has nothing to do with the vast flocks that Yaakov sent. But at the end didn't he accept the bounty that Yaakov presented to him? Did he now have an abundant abundance?

Let us see what Rashi teaches here.

יש לי כל - כל ספוקי, ועשו דבר בלשון גאווה יש לי רב, יותר ויותר מכדי צרכי:

*I have all* – [I Yaakov have all of my needs.] Eisav spoke with conceit. I have an abundance – far more than what I need.

Rashi intimates that Yaakov Ovinu was fulfilling the words of the Mishnah in Masseches Ovos (Perek 4/Mishnah 1) that writes:

בן זומא אומר איזהו עשיר השמח בחלקו שנאמר (תהלים קכח/ב) יגיע כפיך כי תאכל  
אשריך וטוב לך אשריך בעולם הזה וטוב לך לעולם הבא:

Ben Zoma says, 'Who is a rich person? One who is happy with his portion as it says, "When you eat the weariness of your palms, you are happy and it is good for you." *You are happy* – in this world, and *it will be good for you* – in the world to come.'

Eisav, Rashi intimates, was fulfilling the words of Shlomo HaMelech who wrote in his Sefer Koheles (Perek 5/Posuk 9):

אֱהָב כֶּסֶף לֹא יִשְׂבַע כֶּסֶף וְיָמִי אֶהָב בְּהִמּוֹן לֹא תִבּוֹאָה גַם זֶה הַבֶּל:

One who loves money will not be sated with his money; one who loves masses, not grain – that, too, is vanity and emptiness.

The proof of the validity of these respective citations for Yaakov and Eisav each is precisely what their actions teach us. We can only understand the true meaning of their words when we view their actions.

Yaakov, after having given away a fortune, still had 'כל', everything.

Eisav, despite having 'רב', more than enough, still did not have enough. If you love money you can never have enough. That is the lesson that Eisav unwittingly taught us when he was 'willing' to take in the riches that Yaakov gave him.

However, if Yaakov Ovinu had it all, as he said, we must investigate what occurred on that night when he was left alone and became embattled with the angel.

First, the Gemara in Masseches Chulin (91 a) teaches:

תלמיד חכם לא יצא יחידי בלילה

A Talmid Chacham should not go out alone at night<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> We learn there:

ויאבק איש עמו עד עלות השחר אמר רבי יצחק: מכאן לתלמיד חכם שלא יצא יחידי בלילה; רבי אבא בר כהנא אמר מהכא (רות ג/ב) הנה הוא זורה את גורן השעורים; רבי אבהו אמר מהכא:

Why did Yaakov violate that principle?

Furthermore, and more significantly, we must investigate why it was at that particular moment why the angel attacked him. It is not enough to say that the angel, שרו של עשו, wanted to attack Yaakov when no one else was around.

This heavenly being that was created to look out for Eisav's best interests certainly chose a strategic moment when Yaakov was most vulnerable. It was not merely a tactical decision that he undertook<sup>3</sup>, taking advantage of no one being around to interfere.

---

(בראשית כב/ג) וישכם אברהם בבקר ויחבוש את וגו'; ורבנן אמרי מהכא: (שם לז/ז) לך נא ראה את שלום אחיך ואת שלום וגו'; רב אמר מהכא: (שם לב/לב) ויזרח לו השמש.

*A man struggled with him until dawn* – Rabi Yitzchak says from here we learn that a Talmid Chacham should not go out alone at night. Rabi Abba bar Kahana said, 'we learn it from this verse – "Boaz was winnowing the barley in the silo". Rabi Avahu says, 'we learn it from this verse, "Avraham arose in the morning and saddled his donkey". The Rabbanan said, 'we learn it from this verse, "Yaakov said to Yosef – go please and see the welfare of your brothers and the welfare of the sheep". Rav says, 'we learn it from this verse, "The sun shone for Yaakov".

Thus, there are multiple sources that teach the same principle. And thus we must know what overwhelming reason Yaakov Ovinu had to violate it.

<sup>3</sup> As is well-known, there is an ongoing dispute between Rambam and Ramban regarding many of the events that the Torah discusses, particularly those involving meta-natural events such as our subject and the snake in Gan Eden, to mention only two.

Rambam says that those two events, and others, did not take place in the physical world. That is, had a camera been in place filming Chava or Yaakov, it would have recorded nothing out of the usual. Those events, Rambam says, were ones of מראה נבואה, a prophetic vision that felt fully life-like to their participants, but did not occur in the physical world.

Ramban vociferously disagrees and argues that those events occurred in the real world and an operating camera would have filmed for posterity the dust kicked up by Yaakov and the angel.

Certainly according to Rambam we need to justify the situation and circumstance in which the angel attacked Yaakov since he could have had that מראה נבואה in any circumstance

We learned above that Yaakov returned, and thus was left alone, because he had left behind פכים קטנים. The commentators point out that these were items were of the type that were usually discarded and had no particular value.

Had Yaakov taken those unimportant items with him from the start we would have given no mention to it. He took all of the possessions of his immediate and extended family and he moved them all. That would have included the פכים קטנים.

But he did not take them with him, probably because things get left behind, and the unaware observer might surmise that Yaakov's return and giving such expended effort for items of such little value may indicate a fault in the *middos* of Yaakov Ovinu.

Rambam writes at the beginning of Hilchos Deios (Perek 1/Halachah 1):

דעות הרבה יש לכל אחד ואחד מבני אדם וזו משונה מזו ורחוקה ממנו ביותר, יש אדם שהוא בעל חמה כועס תמיד ויש אדם שדעתו מיושבת עליו ואינו כועס כלל ואם יכעס יכעס כעס מעט בכמה שנים...ויש בעל נפש רחבה שלא תשבע נפשו מכל ממון העולם, כענין שנאמר אוהב כסף לא ישבע כסף, ויש מקצר נפשו שדיו אפילו דבר מעט שלא יספיק לו ולא ירדוף להשיג כל צרכו, ויש שהוא מסגף עצמו ברעב וקובץ על ידו ואינו אוכל פרוטה משלו אלא בצער גדול, ויש שהוא מאבד כל ממונו בידו לדעתו...

There are many different temperaments among each and every person, each one different from the other and some extremely different.

There is a person who is hot-headed and always angry and there is a person who is very settled and never gets angry and if he gets angry it would be only a little and once in many years.

---

However, even according to Ramban an explanation of the circumstance that the angel chose to make his attack is required. The fact that Yaakov was alone would be an acceptable explanation for a human attacker; an attack by an angelic foe requires more thought.

To see what they have written, see, for example, Rambam in Moreh Nevuchim Chelek I/Perek 4 and Ramban to our Parshas Vayishlach (Perek 35/Posuk 13).

There is a person who wants all the pleasures and his soul will not be satisfied with all of the money in the world as it says, 'one who loves money will not be satisfied with money.

And there is a person who limits himself and is satisfied even with a very little that is insufficient for him and he will not pursue all of his needs.

There is a person who flagellates himself with hunger and hoards his money and won't even spend a penny for himself – and then only with great pain and there is a person who will lose any money that ever comes to his hand.

The angel of Eisav presumed that what he saw in Yaakov's return for the פכים קטנים a violation of the appropriate temperaments that Rambam said one should have. Yaakov's behavior that seemed to indicate righteousness was only a cover for a person with improper middos! Perhaps he was miserly; the type of person who needed to hoard money just for its own sake and not for any particular purpose. And thus, such an instance was a ripe time for attack.

When Yaakov Ovinu displayed such poor middos, the angel thought, he would be particularly vulnerable.

And so we must ask - why did he return for these items that were usually discarded? Was there a fault to attribute to him?

Chazal give us the answer.

ויותר יעקב לבדו - אמר רבי אלעזר: שנשתייר על פכין קטנים, מכאן לצדיקים שחביב עליהם ממונם יותר מגופם וכל כך למה - לפי שאין פושטין ידיהן בגזל.

*Yaakov remained by himself* – He remained for small vessels. From here we learn that the righteous love their money more than themselves. Why so much? Because they do not extend their hands in thievery.

That is, the truly righteous are most careful about all of their actions, whether they related directly to their relationship with the Ribbono Shel Olom or indirectly to Him in their relationship to others.

We saw the care that Yaakov took to avoid even arousing suspicion that he took or kept animals that were not his from Lovon. The Torah made that evidently clear in



Parshas Vayetze. Not only does Yaakov proclaim that fact, the narrative of the Torah attests to his honesty.

Because that honesty is so much a part of his righteousness, the Tzaddik views the money that he earns, his wealth, as being imbued with Mitzvos because that money has no taint to it.

The Tzaddik 'loves' his money just like he would love any other Mitzvah that he performed. Thus, even those פכים קטנים had a value far beyond their purchase price or the amount for which they could be sold.

Those פכים קטנים were imbued with the spiritual value of the care and utmost concern that the funds used for their purchase or acquisition would be attained in a manner perfectly conforming to Torah and Mitzvos.

There was no miserliness involved whatsoever. The return for the פכים קטנים was particularly appropriate and consistent with Yaakov's righteousness.

But the angel of Eisav perceives the actions of Yaakov Ovinu differently. The angel of Eisav supported Eisav's undertakings, his vile and reprehensible actions. The outlook of Eisav and his angel was one of distrust and avoidance of moral and ethical behavior.

The angel of Eisav saw Yaakov's return for those materially unimportant items as a crack in his armor of righteousness.

If Yaakov truly felt he had כל, everything, why should he bother to make such a trip in the darkness of night, violating the principle that a Talmid Chacham does not go out alone?

If Yaakov truly felt that he had כל, everything, why did he return for such unimportant items when, presumably, his first care and concern was to protect his loved ones from the war that might befall them on the morrow?

Now we know that Yaakov's return for those materially unimportant items did not contradict his overriding concern for his family's welfare. Since the פכים קטנים represented Mitzvah items they were valuable reminders of the merits that Yaakov had that would hopefully save him and his family from destruction.

But, the angel of Eisav did not perceive that. He only saw Yaakov acting like a miser, not willing to let go of any possession.

This was surely not the behavior of a Tzaddik, Eisav's angel thought. At that moment, the angel of Eisav concluded that Yaakov was particularly vulnerable<sup>4</sup> and he chose that time to make his attack.

Of course, the angel erred. Being the angel of Eisav, he only saw the actions as they occurred. He could not fathom the underlying motivation that led Yaakov Ovinu to undertake that particular behavior.

Thus, the moment of attack was when the angel of Eisav perceived that Yaakov was without spiritual protection.

And he was wrong.

Thus, we can also understand the plea of release with which the angel beseeched Yaakov Ovinu, as Rashi explains it, as well as the entire exchange that ensued.

We read in this section (P'sukim 27-29):

וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁלַחֲנִי כִּי עֹלָה הַשָּׁחַר וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁלְּחֶךָ כִּי אִם בְּרַכְתָּנִי: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו מַה שְּׁמֶךָ  
וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב: וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא יַעֲקֹב יֵאמָר עוֹד שְׁמֶךָ כִּי אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי שְׂרִיתָ עִמָּךְ... לְקִיָּם  
וְעַם אַנְשֵׁים וְתוֹכָל:

The angel said, 'Send me away because it is becoming dawn.' Yaakov said, 'I will not send you away unless you bless me.' The angel said to him, 'What is your name?' He said, 'Yaakov.' The angel said, 'It will no longer be said that your name is Yaakov, but Yisroel because you have sought superiority with G-d and men and you were able.'

Rashi writes:

כי עלה השחר - וצריך אני לומר שירה ביום:  
ברכתני - הודה לי על הברכות שברכני אבי, שעשו מערער עליהם:

---

<sup>4</sup> It is true that Yaakov was somewhat vulnerable. That is why Yaakov was temporarily injured by the angel. The perception of dishonesty on Yaakov's part in his relationship with Eisav, whether truly justified or not, allowed the angel to have some power over him, even though it was most limited.

לא יעקב - לא יאמר עוד שהברכות באו לך בעקבה וברמיה כי אם בשררה ובגלוי פנים,

ועם אנשים - עשו ולבן:

*Because it has become dawn* – And I have to recite *shira* to Hashem in the daytime.

*Bless me* – Admit to me regarding the blessings that my father blessed me; the blessings that Eisav contests.

*Not Yaakov* – It will no longer be said that the blessings came to you with underhandedness and deceit, rather with superiority and in the open.

*With men* – with Eisav and Lovon.

Why is the prayer of the angel intertwined with this epic battle with Yaakov? The answer is that the praise of G-d is to praise יעקב...א, as we recite those words daily. How could the angel praise G-d, the G-d of Yaakov, while at the same time accusing him of deceit and falsehood?

The *teshuvah*, as it were, of the angel was to recant his charges. To publicly acknowledge that Yaakov deserved the blessings and that they were his right. Without such a declaration, how could the angel praise G-d? Would the angel praise G-d as the G-d of a thief?

And this approach gains support from Rashi's explanation of the word 'men'. Seemingly, the angel of Eisav is there to support Eisav alone. He is *his* angel. Why then does the angel of Eisav mention Lovon? Why is Lovon relevant for the dispute of the angel of Eisav?

The answer is that such was part of the terms of the angel's release that Yaakov Ovinu established.

There had to be a declaration that recognized that the above-board and visible honesty and scrupulousness with which Yaakov acted with Lovon was no different, at its outcome, than Yaakov's interactions with Eisav.

That was the declaration that the angel of Eisav was forced to pronounce!

Yaakov is beyond reproach. Just like his interactions with Lovon were honest and honorable, so were his actions with Eisav!

I believe that the *Ben Ish Chai* in his *Ben Yehoyoda* commentary on Aggados Chazal, provides us with a finishing perspective on this important, yet 'hidden', theme of our Parsha.

We read in our Parsha regarding Yaakov's encampment near Shechem (Perek 33/Posuk 18):

וַיָּבֹא יַעֲקֹב שָׁלֵם עִיר שְׁכֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן בָּבֹאוּ מִפְּדַן אֲרָם וַיַּחֲנוּ אֶת פְּנֵי הָעִיר:

Yaakov came whole to the city of Shechem in the Land of Canaan, when he came from *Padan Aram*, and he encamped there before the city.

We learn in Masseches Shabbos (33 b):

ויחן את פני העיר אמר רב: מטבע תיקן להם:

*He encamped there before the city* – Rav said, 'He enacted a particular type of coin for them.'

That is, we read the following Posuk there in our Parsha:

וַיִּקְנוּ אֶת חֲלֻקַּת הַשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר נָטָה שָׁם אָהֳלוֹ מִיַּד בְּנֵי חָמוֹר אָבִי שְׁכֶם בְּמָאָה קֶשֶׁטָה:

Yaakov acquired the parcel of the field that he set us is tent there from the sons of Chamor, the father of Shechem, for 100 *kesita*.

Rav teaches that the *kesita* coin was something new that Yaakov introduced to the people of Shechem.

The *Ben Ish Chai* there in Masseches Shabbos questions this Aggadah. Certainly the people of Shechem had other coins. Why was it necessary for Yaakov to introduce a new monetary instrument?

His response is that the coins that were used in Shechem were square; Yaakov introduced round coins.

Why was the shape of the coins so significant that Yaakov was required to produce a new monetary instrument?

The response of Ben Ish Chai is that round coins remind us that the world is an ongoing process, like a wheel as Chazal teach us (Masseches Nedarim 37 b):

## גלגל חוזר בעולם

Wealth is never absolute. That which we have today we may not have tomorrow; that which we do not have today – we may have tomorrow.

That was the lesson that Yaakov taught. That was the only coinage that he was willing to use. The monetary instrument itself had to contain a *Mussar* teaching.

I have it all. I have it all today and tomorrow, whatever I will have, I will still have it all.

We are not defined by our wealth and our possessions. We are defined by the people who we are.

Yaakov Ovinu knew that and wanted all of his monetary dealings to reflect that principle.

That is the underlying theme of Parshas Vayishlach and its lesson and implications may be the most important thoughts that we can gain this week – and throughout our lifetimes.

Shabbat Shalom

Rabbi Pollock