

Prayer reiterates our conviction in God's existence: He is all-knowing - Omniscience. He has control over the entire universe - Omnipotence. Prayer means that God is a reality - He is the One with Whom we converse. God relates to man via knowledge. Relate to Him through knowledge. If what we request goes unanswered, it is a great lesson, and we should be as thankful when unanswered as when answered. This divine silence teaches that perhaps our requests are not in line with God's plan for us. Learn the Torah to determine for what we should pray.

ESTD
1997

JewishTimes

Dedicated to Scriptural and Rabbinic Verification
of Authentic Jewish Beliefs and Practices

Volume II, No. 8...Nov. 22, 2002

WWW.MESORA.ORG/JEWISHTIMES.PDF

Download and Print Free

IN THIS ISSUE:

PARSHAS VAYISHLACH	1, 4
INSIGHT INTO PRAYER	1, 2
SEDER: NOT FOR UNCIRCUMCISED	3
FREE WILL VS GOD	3
PRAYER MAY BE INAPPROPRIATE	3
VAYISHLACH: MASTER OF POLITICS	5

SUGGESTED READINGS:

SEE THESE AND OTHER ARTICLES AT OUR SITE

Maimonides' 13 PRINCIPLES

FOUNDATIONS WHICH ALL JEWS
MUST KNOW AS TRUE.www.mesora.org/13principles.html

God's Existence Belief or Proof?

www.mesora.org/belieforproof.html

God's Land Without God?

OPEN LETTER TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY:
www.mesora.org/openletter/openletter2.html

Parshas Vayishlach

RABBI BERNARD FOX

"Save me now from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esav. For I fear him. Lest he come and strike me – even mother and children." (Beresheit 32:12)

Yaakov travels back to his father's home. He must pass near the land of Edom and encounter Esav. Yaakov fears this encounter. He prays to Hashem to deliver him from the hands of Esav, his brother. In our

(continued on page 4)

Insight into Prayer

RABBI MOSHE BEN-CHAIM

We find in the Torah (Gen, 30:2), Rashi states when Rachel desired children, having none, she asked her husband Jacob that he should have prayed for her. When Jacob responded, according to Rashi, "God has withheld children from you and not me", he was not acting viciously. He meant to say, "You have the need, not me, and God has not answered you. You must then be the one to pray, as prayer enables one to reflect on their own needs, hopefully directing you to your flaws, repenting from character traits preventing you from childbearing."

The institution of prayer, "tefila", contains numerous ideas and insights. The very word "tefila" contains the root "pi-lale", which means to judge. One is judging their needs as they pray. One is to come before God, with ordered and previously judged requests. "Are my supplications deemed valuable in God's eyes?" Such a question is appropriately addressed prior to presenting one's prayers to God. If one wishes something, he or she must first determine it is a good as defined by God, and this we can determine only through study of His Torah system.

Another concept is the one praying attests that "God knows my thoughts". Via this realization, that all man's thoughts are revealed to God, man is enabled, and coerced in



a way, to be completely honest with himself, as there is no 'fooling God'. Man must realize, "whatever I think, God knows". Therefore I must be honest in what I actually value, be it good or bad. God knows me. This might be a subtle point, but feel it is so essential to realize. It is a central component of prayer, albeit rarely enunciated. Standing before God requesting our needs normally obscures the fine points which we must ponder. If we do realize that God knows us, this very standing before God prompts us to reflect on what it is we come to request before God. Then, hopefully, the one praying will question his very requests. He may analyze whether his desires fit into God's plan for mankind. This is the vital role of prayer - it motivates man to come to terms with his needs, questioning, analyzing, and updating his former requests with only those filtered and approved by Torah standards.

So many people complain that God doesn't answer us. But God does know each man's thoughts. God created our minds, He surely knows each one of our thoughts. We say this on Yom Kippur. Therefore, if what one requests goes unanswered, it is a great lesson, and man should be as thankful when unanswered as when answered. This divine silence teaches that perhaps our requests are not in line with God's plan for man. Meaning, the request is harmful. What should be our response? We should immediately reflect on what might be corrupt in our requests. We should talk it over honestly with a wise man, a rabbi, or a teacher, someone well versed in Torah, and human psychology. He, more than anyone else, is able to determine where you veer from Torah values. He will explain the correct values, and you may learn how to improve your life. This is why the Talmud

(continued on page 2)

says, "If one is sick, go to a wise man." The Talmud doesn't say "go and get a bracho", a blessing. Why a wise man? As we said, only he can look carefully at your life and analyze your character and your desires. He can then see what flaw exists in your nature, leaving you either unprotected or deserving of punishment by God, causing illness to befall you. Then you may incorporate this knowledge into your life and save yourself. So too in all areas, not just illness. Don't wait until you are ill to analyze introspect - do so now.

What else do we learn from the institution of prayer? It also reminds us that God is the One who created the system of morality. Therefore, we come to Him alone to ask forgiveness. This is one of the 13 requests in our Shemona Esray prayer. How do we learn that God created morality? It is via our request for forgiveness from only Him. Isaiah 43:25, "I, I erase your willful sin for My sake, and your sins I will not recall." His ability to forgive means He governs man, on earth, and in the next world where retribution might meet us. We are reminded of His omniscience, as He says He will not recall one's sins when one repents.

He alone sets the standards of good and evil, so from Him alone do we request forgiveness. Only He can forgive, because only He determines morality. Only He has the ability to wipe away our sins, as

unnaturally, as knowledge is only in proportion of one's studies. But here, this once, God granted a man knowledge other than by natural means. My deduction is that God would not give King Solomon knowledge without his request. Why would God not give something without a request? Perhaps this teaches that man must approach God for his needs. This act of request imprints on man the idea that man's good can only be a good, if man realizes his fortune as emanating from God. Only a request from God will teach man this essential concept. Had good befallen man with no prior request, he may not attribute his good fate to God. Prayer teaches that man's fate comes from God. God therefore requested that King Solomon think into his request, and then he gave him that gift of knowledge afterwards. This taught two lessons to King Solomon: 1) Knowledge comes from God alone. God said, "Ask what I (can) give to you". What "I" shall give, and no other. 2) One must think into his requests prior to prayer. For this reason, God did not initially reveal what he was offering King Solomon. He required him to examine himself, and only then respond.

Also, King Solomon was directed to asking for knowledge per se, as God intimated that He was offering something that only He could provide. Physical objects can be obtained by man, but knowledge, only through God. King Solomon took God's dream message and



only He can hold man accountable. Nothing aside from God can punish.

We learn our halachic formulation of prayer from Channa, when she prayed for a child. She moved her lips with no emanating voice. We see that prayer requires a concretization of our wishes, otherwise left in the realm of blurred thoughts. This concretization in the form of articulation transfers our abstract thoughts into a solidified reality, and we are confronted more clearly with our own wishes, allowing us to examine desires otherwise left unnoticed. Again, we see how useful prayer is. Our self examination is enabled by converting inner, silent feelings into articulated structures of our lips. This very act brings our thoughts into a perceptible light, from their normally, hidden state.

Prayer means that God is a reality - He is the One with Whom we converse. This is so vital, as most of our days may be spent intercouring with our fellow man. We forget the reality of God's existence as a truth. Do we think of Him as real as our friend? Our friend responds when we talk. In prayer, although we do not hear a response, this in no way alters the truth of God's knowledge and interaction in our lives. By praying, we admit His participation in our dialogue of prayer. There is a Recipient of our prayers.

When King Solomon became king at 12 years of age, God spoke with him in a dream saying, (Kings I, 3:5) "Ask what I (can) give to you." God was referring to advancing Solomon's knowledge

used his knowledge to deduce what God was offering. We see once again, that God causes man to use his mind when relating to God. Perhaps this is how God relates in all cases. He causes man not to simply hear something, but in a dialogue initiated by God, prophecy, God demands man's mind be engaged, and this is achieved via a certain raw form of information where the prophet must engage his thinking. In prophecy, man is not simply hearing a clear message - he must engage in an analysis of God's words. As God holds all knowledge, His word is not as man's - completely understandable. This is impossible. God gives prophecy to man in a raw form, and man must 'study' God's word, not just listen to it. This must be, as the One of infinite wisdom is speaking. Maimonides teaches that each prophet receives his visions from God in a language suitable specifically for him. We learn from this that man can only relate to God on the plain of intelligence. Many fools believe they can "be in touch with God" via their feelings, or other nonsensical notions. Torah teaches otherwise.

Prayer reiterates our conviction in God's existence. He is all-knowing; Omniscience. He has control over the entire universe; Omnipotence. God relates to man via knowledge.

Relate to Him through knowledge. Maimonides said, "In accordance with one's knowledge is his love of God." So too, in accordance with one's knowledge, does God relate to man. ■

Seder:

Not for the

Uncircumcised

RABBI MOSHE BEN-CHAIM


Reader: Something troubling came up in a recent discussion. It was suggested that a "proper" Seder must not have non-Jews present. Is there really such a prohibition? If so, where does it come from, and how prevalent is this practice?

Mesora: A Seder must not have one uncircumcised present eating of the paschal Lamb, as is stated in our Torah, (Exod. 12:48) "Kol arale lo yochal bo", "any uncircumcised may not eat of it." The first, Egyptian Seder was the act where those adhering to God's laws were saved by the fulfillment of that command.

80% of Jews in Egypt perished in the plague of darkness. But why were the 20% saved? It was because they were not steeped in idolatry. They demonstrated this by sacrificing the very animal worshiped by the Egyptians. In order for God to give His Torah 50 days later on Sinai, the Jews back then had to demonstrate their acceptance of the true God, otherwise, their acceptance would be worthless, thinking God was in fact the Egyptian deity. Sacrificing the lamb demonstrated their belief that the lamb was nothing, and that the true God, Who commanded them in this sacrifice, must be followed. By following this command, they attested to God's existence. One only follows the command if they truly feel the commander is real, and must be followed.

God's Torah lifestyle places wisdom as the ultimate goal. Circumcision is a minimalization of the attachment to the physical. Maimonides teaches that both a man and woman have less enjoyment in the sexual act when

the man is circumcised. He says that one object of circumcision is to limit intercourse so that intercourse is moderate. God created the organ sufficiently and for procreation, the foreskin is removed so that it helps perfect man's moral shortcomings and counteracts "excessive" lusts. Excessive lusts were the practices of the idolatrous nations. The woman doesn't know she is having less enjoyment unless she been with an uncircumcised man. The man doesn't know he is having less enjoyment either, unless he has been uncircumcised as an adult.

So two conditions must be met; 1) Acceptance of the One true God - expressed via destruction of the Egyptian God, and 2) Following God's lifestyle of adherence to wisdom and minimalization from lusts, demonstrated via circumcision. 


Free Will vs God

RABBI MOSHE BEN-CHAIM

Reader: How can we understand the fact that on the one hand everything that happens is G-d's will and yet man has free will? If a person's home, G-d forbid, burns down because he was careless, is it his fault or is it merely the will of G-d? Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions.

Mesora: The Talmud says, "Kol biday shamayim, chutz m'yiras shamayim." All is in God's hands except fear of God. This teaches that man's free will is the one area where God does no determination. God has knowledge of our actions, but does not interfere. His will is that man alone is the sole cause of his own decisions. One's house will burn down if he is careless.


And this is not God's doing, just as one's own drunkenness is his own doing. But, God may decide his house to burn down as a punishment, and this is well within God's hands, even if he wasn't careless. But if man lit the match, it was not God's doing.

When tragedy occurs, we should introspect, perhaps the tragedy was a message from God, and perhaps we can learn a lesson. However, we can never say when something was or wasn't the work of God, unless it is an outright miracle, or a prophet declared so. Nowadays as prophecy has ceased, we have no way to determine if God did or didn't do something, unless it was a miracle. 

Prayer

May be Innappropriate

RABBI RUEVEN MANN

Certain divine intervention is dependent on the level of the people. Thus, Moshe (or the people) would need to daven in order to effectuate the change in their level that would "trigger" the hashgacha. However, as Hashem explained to Moshe, ("lama titzak aylay?" , "why cry unto me?") there are certain instances of divine intervention that have nothing to do with the people. It is Hashem's will that they occur, and they will occur regardless of the level of the people. Kriyas Yam Suf was one such instance. Other examples would be the creation of the world, and the coming of Moshiach (although we can hasten the coming of Moshiach by doing teshuva, but by a certain point in time Moshiach will come regardless). 

ELEGANT HOME LIGHTING
www.homelightingfixture.com

CALL US TOLL FREE FOR BIG DISCOUNTS
1.866.223.4514

Public Companies Seeking Funding
Salamon Brothers
Email: salamon.brothers@verizon.net

Computer Specialties
Professional Solutions
Networking
EDI Consulting
Maintenance
Service Work
Professional Systems
Server Set Up
718.435.0002

**Marketing
Print Design
Web Design**
Developers of the
JewishTimes
and Mesora.org

welcome to
NYDesign.com

Parshas Vayishlach

RABBI BERNARD FOX

□
(continued from page 1)

passage, there is a superfluous phrase. Yaakov beseeches Hashem to save him "from the hand of my bother, from the hand of Esav." It would have been sufficient for Yaakov to refer to his adversary with one of these descriptions. He could have simply referred to him as Esav or as his brother. Why does Yaakov use both descriptions? Although this is a minor problem, it provides an important insight into Yaakov's concerns. Rashi comments that Yaakov is noting that Esav is his brother. But he does not treat him as a brother. Instead, he behaves towards Yaakov as Esav the wicked. These comments are helpful. However, they do not provide a complete explanation of Yaakov's intentions.

Yaakov is praying to Hashem for rescue. Why does he stress Esav's lack of brotherly love? Ohr HaChayim offers a number of explanations of Rashi's comments. A simple explanation is that Yaakov is appealing to the Almighty on two grounds. First, Yaakov is praying that Hashem consider the assurances He had given him. Hashem had told Yaakov that He would bless him. Second, he is appealing to the Almighty to not allow the wicked to succeed. In our pasuk, Yaakov is appealing to Hashem on this second basis. This appeal requires Yaakov stress the evil of Esav. In our pasuk, Yaakov outlines two aspects of Esav's wickedness. He asks to be saved from Esav. Esav is a name associated with evil. Through this name, Yaakov refers to Esav's various immoral behaviors. Furthermore, he asks to be saved from his brother. This phrase makes reference to an additional aspect of Esav's corruption. Even an evil individual identifies with and has compassion for family members. But Esav seeks to commit fratricide. Yaakov is describing Esav's wickedness. He beseeches Hashem not to allow such evil to triumph.

Bais HaLeyve – Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik Ztl – offers another explanation of our passage. He begins by noting that actually the passage contains two superfluous phrases. The passage describes Yaakov's adversary as his brother and as Esav. The pasuk also uses the phrase "from the hand of" twice. This is a second redundancy in the passage.

Bais HaLeyve explains our pasuk through analyzing the entire encounter between Yaakov and Esav. Yaakov succeeds in appeasing Esav. Esav is overcome with brotherly compassion. He abandons any desire to destroy his brother. Instead, Esav offers to accompany Yaakov to their father's home. Yaakov resists this suggestion. Eventually, he convinces Esav to allow him to proceed alone. Why did Yaakov resist Esav's offer of assistance? One explanation is that Yaakov was afraid Esav might experience a change of heart. He was not certain that Esav's brotherly behavior would last. He felt it was best to distance himself from Esav. His brother might reconsider his kindness. Rashi suggests this explanation. Bais HaLeyve suggests an alternative explanation for Yaakov's resistance. He explains that Yaakov had two fears regarding Esav. The first was that Esav would treat him as an enemy and try to destroy him. The second was that Esav would treat him as a brother and try to develop a relationship between their families. Esav's camaraderie was as threatening as his anger. Yaakov recognized Esav's corruption. He knew that this immorality could influence his own family. He wanted to insulate his family from this influence. Therefore, he was eager to avoid any unnecessary contact with Esav. This explains our passage. The use of the phrase, "from the hand of" twice in the pasuk indicates that Yaakov was praying for salvation from two evils. One evil is expressed in the name Esav. Esav hated Yaakov and was eager to destroy him. Yaakov asked to be saved from Esav's aggression. Second, Yaakov prayed to be saved from his brother. This description refers to a second threat. Esav may act towards Yaakov as a brother. This also presents a danger. Yaakov asked Hashem to be saved from both perils.

"And he gave each individual flock into the hands of his servants. And he said to his servants, 'Pass before me. And place a distance between the flock.'" (Beresheit 32:17)

Yaakov travels back to his father's home. He approaches an encounter with Esav. He had fled his home many years earlier to escape Esav. He knows that he must appease his brother's anger. He prepares an elaborate and impressive gift for Esav. The gift is composed of flocks of various animals. Each flock includes both males and females. The proportions

are determined by the breeding requirements for each species. For example, the flock of goats included two hundred males and twenty females. For the forty cows, Yaakov provided ten males. The number of males was designed to maximize the growth of the herd. Yaakov provided his servants with detailed instructions for the delivery of the gift. He told the servants to place a distance between the flocks of the various species. Yaakov was very concerned with this instruction. He actually required the shepherds, guiding the various flocks, to pass before him. This allowed him to personally monitor the distance between the flocks. Why was Yaakov concerned with the distance between the flocks? The commentaries offer various explanations. However, their comments share a common theme.

Yaakov designed his gift to impress Esav. He needed to placate Esav's anger. He did not want to neglect any aspect of the gift's design or presentation. Rashi maintains that Yaakov separated the flocks to increase the perception of size. How did the separation create this impression? An impression of size can be created in two ways. The first is to design a large gift. This approach has a disadvantage. The recipient of the gift may evaluate the size differently than the person giving the gift. The second approach is to design a gift that is too large for the recipient to see and evaluate. This approach does not depend upon the recipient's evaluation of the size. The recipient cannot begin to evaluate the gift. Yaakov adopted this second approach. Yaakov did not want Esav to be able to observe the entire gift in one glance. In other words, the procession extended beyond the limit of Esav's vision. Sforno offers another explanation. Yaakov had been careful to provide a specific ratio of males to females for each species. This was done to assure maximum breeding and growth of the flock. This attention to detail would only be of value if recognized by Esav. Yaakov did not want the flocks to intermingle. He wanted Esav to be able to observe the detailed planning of the gift. Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra notes another element of the presentation that Yaakov carefully planned. He explains that Yaakov was concerned with the impression made by his servants. He knew that Esav was jealous of Yaakov and felt threatened. The servants could inadvertently heighten these insecurities.

These servants were loyal to Yaakov. They might be reluctant to pay homage to a stranger hostile to their master. Therefore, Yaakov carefully communicated to his servants that he, himself, regarded Esav as his master. He hoped that the servants would duplicate the attitude of their master.

There is an additional issue that should be considered. Yaakov told his servants to refer to the gift as a mincha. This term is also used for the grain offerings sacrificed in the Temple. Sefer HaChinuch explains that the term mincha means a small gift. Most offerings in the Bait HaMikdash consisted of animals. Compared to these sacrifices, the grain offering is a modest gift. Therefore, it is called a mincha. Why would Yaakov tell his servants to describe his gift as a mincha? His gift was large and elaborate. It seems that Yaakov was communicating a message to Esav. True, the gift was large and elaborate. Nonetheless, the gift was a modest present. Yaakov was telling Esav that he held him in great esteem. Relative to his high regard for Esav, the offering was only a modest token. We can see from all of these precautions and directions an aspect of Yaakov's greatness. In order to succeed in his plan, he could not be deterred by personal pride. He needed to appeal to Esav's ego. He could not do anything that might awaken Esav's insecurities and jealousy. Most people could not carry out such a plan. Our personal pride and ego would not allow us to act subservient. Only a person who is very secure can succeed in such circumstances. A secure person knows that one's self-worth is not determined by the perceptions of others. It is a consequence of our real substance. Yaakov had this security. This quality allowed him to develop and carry out a successful strategy. □

Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer Beresheit 32:12. Rabbaynu Chaim ibn Atar, Commentary Ohr HaChayim on Sefer Beresheit 32:12. Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer Beresheit 33:14. Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik, Bais HaLeyve – Commentary on the Torah, Parshat VaYishlach. Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer Beresheit 32:15. Rabbaynu Levi ben Gershon (Ralbag / Gershonides), Commentary on Sefer Beresheit, (Mosad HaRav Kook, 1994), p 202. Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer Beresheit 32:17. Rabbaynu Ovadia Sforno, Commentary on Sefer Beresheit, 32:17. Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Sefer Beresheit, 32:5. Rav Ahron HaLeyve, Sefer HaChinuch, Mitzvah 116.

- VAYISHLACH -

THE MASTER OF POLITICS

RABBI ISRAEL CHAIT

Transcribed by students

Chazal say that from parshat Vayishlach, specifically Yaakov's interactions with Eisav, we can learn how to deal with the other nations of the world, and we can gain an understanding of the concepts underlying anti-Semitism. The gemara emphasizes this point by noting that one of the Tanaaim would carefully study this parsha before visiting Rome and meeting with the Caesar. Vayishlach is a parsha of political insight conveying the narrative of Eisav's hatred for Yaakov, carefully describing how Yaakov precisely calculated how to confront his brother's hatred, avoiding contention and potential destruction by the great army of Eisav.

Yaakov was a true master of politics; this is made clear from his dealings with Lavan. Even from the first encounter with Lavan's household Yaakov demonstrates his political savvy as Vayeitzei 29:12 reads: "Yaakov told Rachel that he was a relative of her father..." whereupon Rashi comments that the Midrashic interpretation of this verse is that Yaakov's implication was: "If he [Lavan] intends to be deceitful then I, too, am his brother in deception..."

In this light let us examine Yaakov's message to Eisav at the beginning of Vayishlach: "Yaakov sent messengers ahead of him to Eisav, his brother, to the and of Seir, to the field of Edom. He commanded them saying, this is what you should say to my master, Eisav. 'Your servant Yaakov says, with Lavan I lived, and was delayed until now.'" (Vayishlach 32:4-5) Rashi commenting on the words "with Lavan I lived" states that Yaakov was implying to Eisav that he "did not become an officer or anyone of importance but remained solely a transient guest. It is not worthy of you to hate me on account of your father's blessings, 'Be master over your brother for it has not been fulfilled in me..." Rashi is emphasizing the extent to which Yaakov acted to avoid battle with his brother. Yaakov diminished his own stature, allowing Eisav to feel superior, in order to foster peace.

While there is much to be discussed regarding this type of political strategy, surely we can see the logic behind this approach, especially when it comes to saving Jewish lives. What is more difficult to understand is the second interpretation of Rashi regarding the words "with

Lavan I lived." Rashi writes: "the gimatria [numerical value] of garti [lived] is 613; as if to say, I have resided with the wicked Lavan and yet have kept the 613 commandments and have not learnt from his wicked deeds." What does Eisav, the wicked, the rejecter of Torah values, care if Yaakov kept the 613 commandments while he lived with Lavan? Furthermore, it seems this message could only antagonize Eisav.

Chazal say, quotes the Rambam in his Igeret Teyman, that the reason the mountain from which the Torah was given was called Sinai, was because from this same mountain came down sinah [hatred] to the other nations of the world. Meaning to say that the very source of the hatred that the other nations harbor toward the Jews is the Torah itself. What then did Yaakov intend to accomplish by implying to Eisav that he kept the Torah, when this very Torah was the source of Eisav's hatred for Yaakov?

Before answering these questions, a psychological principle of hatred must be understood; a distinction must be made between the cause of an individual's hatred and the action of expressing that hatred. The gemara (Pesachim 48b) tells us that the hatred of an ignorant Jew toward the Torah scholar is greater than the hatred the idolaters have for the Jewish nation. This is indeed a perplexing gemara and must be understood in its own light. For the purposes of our discussion, however, it is interesting to note that these same ignorant Jews, whose hatred for the Torah scholar, according to Chazal, is greater than the hatred of an Eisav for Yaakov, are very often the greatest Torah supporters. The emotion of hate is powerful and complex and is disguises itself in many ways. One part of an individual's psyche may possess great hatred for the Torah scholar while another part of an individual's nature causes him to overcome this hatred and be the Torah scholar's greatest ally. Thus we see that the cause of an individual's hatred for another person does not translate into that individual acting upon that hatred. The question remains, however, why the expression of hatred might at times remains dormant, kept at bay in the unconscious of the human psyche, and why in other instances hatred will manifest itself in its full assertion.

There is one further principle underlying the

emotion of hatred, namely, the aggressive expression of one's hatred toward another person always seeks out a justification from reality. The Koran, which expresses great hatred toward the Jews on numerous occasions, often points out that the Jews transgressed their commandments and are therefore lowly people. Sura 2:63 writes: "And well you know there were those among you that transgressed the Sabbath, and We said to them, 'Be you apes, miserable slinking!' And we made it a punishment exemplary for all the former times and for the latter, and an admonition to such as are God-fearing." The Koran claims that the Jews did not adhere to the tenets of their own law and thus according to their Torah the Jews are despicable people. In this way Mohammed tried to justify the expression of his hatred toward the Jews in the Koran. We can now begin to understand Yaakov's implied message to Eisav. While the source of Eisav's hatred was the Torah itself, this did not mean that Yaakov's adherence to the Torah would antagonize Eisav to destroy Yaakov. As explained, the cause of an individual's hatred does not directly translate into the action of expressing that hatred. Furthermore, by Yaakov's implication to Eisav that he merely lived with Lavan and, rather than learning from his evil ways, kept the 613 commandments, Yaakov would not permit Eisav the justification to act upon his anger and destroy Yaakov. Yaakov did not afford Eisav the opportunity to find fault with him and in this way Eisav could in no way assuage his guilt and justify acting upon his hatred toward his brother.

There is an amazing Rashi in support of this idea in Toldos regarding the blessing Yitzchak gave to Eisav. Toldos 27:38-40: "Yitzchak, his [Eisav's] father replied and said to him..... you shall live by your sword, and you shall serve your brother. When you have cause to be grieved, you will throw off his yoke from your neck." And on the words "when you have caused to be grieved," Rashi writes, "... meaning to say, when the Israelites will transgress the Torah and you will have justification to grieve over the blessings which he took, [then] you will throw off his yoke." And so in parshat Vayishlach Yaakov makes it very clear to Eisav, his brother and enemy, that this time had yet to come. ■