

"And Yaakov went out from Be'er Sheva and (he) went toward Charan." (28:10)

Rashi notes the *Torah's* emphasis upon Yaakov's departure. He explains that a *tzaddik's* departure from a community creates a noticeable impact, for he is the glory, splendor and crown of a community. We may wonder why the *Torah* chooses to emphasize the *tzaddik's* positive influence upon a community only after he has left. Doesn't his stay within the community also create its glory and splendor?

Responding to this question, *Horav Elchanan Sorotzkin z.l.* opines that the *Torah* is regrettably alluding to the obvious; it is only when a *tzaddik* leaves the community that people appreciate his contribution. On the contrary, when the *tzaddik* is an active member of the community he usually becomes the scapegoat for everyone's complaints. How often do we hear that everything that goes wrong in a city is because of the Rabbi? Only after the Rabbi has moved on and perhaps been "replaced" by someone of "lesser" stature does everyone reflect upon his scholarship, virtue and character. This idea also explains why Yitzchak and Rivkah's remaining in the community after Yaakov's departure did not fill the void left by Yaakov. Only after the *tzaddik* departs is his presence truly felt.