

Weekly Internet Parsha Sheet Beshalach 5772

Jerusalem Post :: Friday, February 3, 2012
THE FRIER COMPLEX :: Rabbi Berel Wein

The most dreaded status in Israeli society is to be considered a frier - a sucker, a boob, stupid and unable to withstand being taken advantage of. The current backlash in Israeli society against Charedim is not merely a matter of theology or of vastly different societal values, different dress and customs.

That would prove insufficient to provoke the over the top reaction that has emerged against Charedim generally because of the abominable behavior of some Charedim - with unfortunately the tacit approval of many other Charedim - over the past month.

The underlying motive for all of this Charedi bashing is that the Israeli public, including the divergent sections of it - religious, traditional, secular and Charedi light, is tired and disgusted at being a frier. It has had it with supporting a large and growing section of the Israeli population that it feels is being supported by the general public while itself contributing next to nothing to the general good and welfare of society.

It is useless to protest that the study and observance of Torah and the continuity of Eastern European or Sephardic traditions is somehow the guarantee of the continued existence of the State of Israel. The religious Jewish community has never educated the general public to understand this issue correctly and thus the Charedi world stands defenseless in the face of the public onslaught against it. And not only is it defenseless, it itself, in many respects, is the main culprit in causing this situation of the disparagement of Torah, its students and teachers. It is guilty of making the general Israeli society feel like a frier and in being very smug about so doing.

It is well recognized that thousands of Charedi young men are not really cut out to sit and study Talmud all day. The streets are full of them even if they are not yet those who have thrown off their garb and faith. Yet the rabbinic and Chasidic leaders of the Charedi community refuse to endorse the practical notion that these young men do national service stints - in hospitals, nursing homes, schools, shelters and other welfare institutions.

In this way they can fulfill their obligations to the state and society and allow themselves to obtain the necessary educational and vocational skills to enter the Israeli workforce and not be condemned to a lifetime of borrowing, charity and poverty.

Who should care for the stranger, the widow and the orphan if not the strictly observant Orthodox community? Why is this not seen as the fulfillment of a Torah value? Why is it perfectly acceptable, after already condemning two generations of Charedi families to poverty and many times to the dysfunction that poverty causes, to continue to condemn a third and a fourth generation to such a fate?

Is the sole and main purpose of the Charedi members of Knesset to allocate as much government funds as possible for the unemployed, the uneducated and the unappreciative at the expense of others in society? These are the questions that Israeli society asks of the Charedi world for these are the issues that engender in general Israeli society the feeling of being made a frier.

And then there are the small things that have been raised to be great principles of faith in Charedi society that are continual irritations. I cannot understand why a prayer on behalf of the soldiers of the State of Israel is not allowed to be recited in Charedi synagogues and institutions of learning. Is this not the height of ingratitude when such prayers for the Czar's army, the Turkish army and other "friendly" governments when we were in exile were recited?

The Charedi community may have legitimate theological problems with the state and its leaders but what does that have to do with the ability to say thank you to those that protect it from annihilation or for that matter to a government that provides it with millions of shekels and without its support it would collapse.

Its refusal in the smallest way to acknowledge these benefits and be appreciative of them creates the frier complex in the general Israeli public and endangers the very way of life and goals which the Charedi society is attempting to preserve. One would think that these realities would be self-evident to the Charedi community and its leaders.

It is our joint responsibility as Jews to make the Torah and its holy traditions beloved amongst all other Jews and respected in the general world. Following policies and mores that accomplish just the opposite of this goal is morally indefensible. In essence this makes a frier of all of us, Charedim included.

Weekly Parsha :: BSHALACH :: Rabbi Berel Wein

The miracle of the manna that fell from heaven and nurtured millions of people for forty years is one of the focal points of this week's parsha. The obvious reason for the miracle's occurrence is that the Jewish people had to have daily nourishment simply to survive. However the rabbis of the Talmud injected another factor into the miracle of the falling manna.

They stated that "the Torah could only have been granted to those that ate manna daily." Thus the necessity for the manna was directly associated with the granting of the Torah to the Jewish people on Mount Sinai. No manna, no Torah. Why is this so?

Most commentators are of the opinion that only a people freed from the daily concerns of earning a living and feeding a family could devote themselves solely to Torah study and acceptance of the life values that acceptance of the Torah mandates. The Torah is a demanding discipline. It requires time and effort, concentration and focus to appreciate and understand it. cursory glances and even inspiring sermons will not yield much to those who are unwilling to invest time and effort into its study and analysis. This was certainly true in this first generation of Jewish life, newly freed from Egyptian bondage and lacking heritage, tradition and life mores that would, in later generations, help Jews remain Jewish and appreciate the Torah.

The isolation of the Jewish people in the desert of Sinai coupled with the heavenly provision of daily manna and the miraculous well of Miriam together created a certain think-tank atmosphere. This atmosphere enabled Torah to take root in the hearts and minds of the Jewish people.

In his final oration to the Jewish people, recorded for us in the book of Dvarim, Moshe reviews the story of the manna falling from heaven. But there Moshe places a different emphasis on the matter. He states there that the manna came to teach, "... that humans do not live by bread alone but rather on the utterances of God's mouth." In order to appreciate Torah, to truly fathom its depths and understand its values system, one has to accept its Divine origin. Denying that basic premise of Judaism compromises all deeper understanding and analysis of Torah. Thus the manna, the presence of God, so to speak, in the daily life of the Jew allowed the Torah to sink into the depths of the Jewish soul and become part of the matrix of our very DNA.

The Torah could only find a permanent and respected home within those who tasted God's presence, so to speak, every day within their very beings and bodies. The rabbis also taught us that the manna produced no waste materials within the human body.

When dealing with holiness and holy endeavors there is nothing that goes to waste. No effort is ignored and no thought and attempt is left unrecorded in the heavenly court of judgment. Even good intent is counted meritoriously. Let us feel that we too have tasted the manna.

Shabat shalom.

Ohr Somayach :: Torah Weekly :: Parshat Beshalach
For the week ending 4 February 2012 / 10 Shevat 5772
by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair - www.seasonofthemoon.com

Insights
A Divine Tapestry
"Then Moshe and the Children of Yisrael chose to sing this song to G-d." (15:1)
As a young boy, I remember my mother weaving a tapestry of Gainsborough's "The Boy In Blue". It took her forever. One day, shortly before she finished it, I remember picking it up and thinking to myself: "Mommy, you may be the best mother in the world, but when it comes to needlework, well... There's a piece of red sticking out here. Over here, there's a turquoise thread that seems to go nowhere. Clumps of wool all over the place. This doesn't look anything like Gainsborough. This thing is a mess!" The whole thing looked like chaos.
Suddenly, my fingertips detected smooth regular stitching on the other side of the tapestry. I turned the tapestry over and saw the most beautiful sight. An exquisite and precise copy of Gainsborough's "Boy in Blue". The stitches were so regular and well formed. The colors all blended so beautifully together. A divine tapestry! All the disjointed threads that I saw on the other side of the tapestry harmonized into a complete and beautiful whole.

Sometimes it's very difficult to see sense in world events. It's difficult to believe that the world is being run by Somebody. You wonder how things could be part of a Divine coherent plan. You hear about suffering and evil, and you wonder how this can be the handiwork of a Merciful G-d?

Don't think you're alone if you feel like that. You're in good company. Because one of the greatest men who ever lived felt exactly like you. Moses, our greatest teacher, also had his questions about how G-d was running the show. In last week's Torah portion Moses went to Pharaoh to ask him to let the Jewish People go. Pharaoh, as you may remember, was not the easiest of negotiating partners. In reply to Moses' request, Pharaoh told the taskmasters to stop giving the Jews straw. However, the Jews were still required to produce the same quantity of bricks as before. Not surprisingly, the Jews complained bitterly to Moses. So Moses went back to G-d and said, "Why have You done evil to this people; why have you sent me? From the time I came to Pharaoh to speak in Your Name, he did evil to this People, but You did not rescue Your people."

Moses wasn't just complaining about the problems he was having now with Pharaoh. Rather, he was saying that "from the time" — from its very beginning — the whole plan to take the Jews out of Egypt was fatally flawed. He was saying to G-d that he didn't see any order in what was going on.

When you look at life's rich tapestry from the wrong side it looks like a complete mess. Moshe didn't see the Divine needlework of the Creator. He was looking at events from the wrong perspective. However, the same word that Moshe used to complain to G-d, he repeated in G-d's praise when he saw the perfection of the Divine Plan. The Midrash says that just as Moses erred with the expression M'Az — "From the time" — so too with that same word "Az", Moses rectified his mistake.

After the Jewish People emerged from the splitting of the sea, they saw the mighty Egyptian army strewn across the beach like so many broken toy soldiers. It was there that every Jew, from the greatest to the most humble, reached a level of insight into the workings of the world that has never been repeated.

This perception moved Moses and the Children of Israel to song. Song in Jewish thought represents the ability to harmonize all the disparate events in our world and plug them back into the One — "G-d is One".

"Then — Az — Moses and the Children of Israel sang a song."

That song is part of the prayers we say every single day of the year. Maybe one of the reasons we say it every day is to remind ourselves that when life seems like a bad attempt at modern art, we must know that there is a Supernal Artist weaving the Divine Tapestry. And not a single thread is without design and beauty.

Print © 1995-2012 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

Parshas Beshalach

Hashem shall do battle for you, and you shall remain silent. (14:14)

If one had to suggest the underlying motif of Parshas Beshalach, I think it would be emunah and bitachon, faithful trust in the Almighty. From its very outset, as the nascent Jewish nation left Egypt, until its closing pesukim, describing our triumph in battle over our archenemy, Amalek, the parshah is replete with instances of emunah and bitachon. I will focus on a few of these examples.

As Klal Yisrael stood at the banks of the Red Sea, the people, filled with overwhelming fear, began to cry. They raised their voices in prayer, entreating Hashem to spare them. Moshe Rabbeinu quieted them with the declaration, Hashem yilachem lachem v'atem tacharishun. "Hashem shall do battle for you, and you shall remain silent" (Shemos 14:14). Simply, this implies that the nation's prayer will achieve efficacy if the people merit salvation. By demonstrating their readiness to enter the waters, thereby showing their willingness to sacrifice themselves for His Name, they would be spared. Horav Meir, zl, m'Premishlan, renders this pasuk homiletically, with contrasting lessons. Hashem yi'lachem lachem. Yilachem is related to the word lechem, bread, the symbol of livelihood. Moshe was saying to the people, "Can you imagine, a G-d that is always there, Who never forsakes His people? He provides us with our daily lechem, bread. Yet, we feel the need to plow, plant and harvest? Where is our faith in Him?" Hashem yilachem lachem - Hashem will provide your lechem, daily bread, yet, v'atem tacharishun, "Yet, you still feel the need to plow!" (Charishah is plowing). Where is your trust in the Almighty? Spend your valuable time learning - rather than applying yourselves to the mundane. In a contrasting interpretation, Horav Meir Premishlaner reads the pasuk differently. "True, Hashem yilachem lachem, the Almighty provides your daily bread, but, nonetheless, V'atem tacharishun, You must be mishtadel, endeavor on your own, by plowing. You cannot just sit back and wait for the check to come to your doorstep. You must do something to provide the basis upon which the blessing can occur.

Veritably, these variant renderings apply to two different people. The individual whose bitachon is exemplary, whose trust in Hashem is unequivocal and sincere, can live on trust alone. This is the domain of yechidim, unique individuals who have achieved an enormous sense of bitachon. For the rest of us, bitachon goes hand in hand with hishtadlus, endeavoring. We must realize that the blessing is not commensurate with the endeavor. We must do "ours," just to do something. Hashem provides the rest.

Certainly, there are different venues upon which miracles manifest themselves based on a person's faith. A young man from a secular background came before the Baba

Sali, zl. He was in a wheelchair, as a result of an injury sustained as a soldier in the Yom Kippur War. He had one leg that was mobile. The other leg was completely paralyzed, leaving him to rely on a wheelchair for mobility. He came before the sage to seek his blessing.

The Baba Sali asked him, "Do you put on Tefillin every day?" The young man replied that he did not. "Do you observe Shabbos?" Once again, the answer was in the negative. "If this is the case, it is small wonder that you have the use of one leg. Consider it a gift from the Almighty. The strength we have to function originates from Hashem. If we do not carry out His will, how can we expect to exist?"

When the young man heard these stern words, he began to weep uncontrollably. The Baba Sali looked at him and asked, "If I bless you with health, will you accept upon yourself the yoke of mitzvos?" "Yes! Yes!" replied the young man. "Hold onto my hands, and I will bless you." the Baba Sali declared. The young man did as he was told, and then kissed the hands of the sage. "Rise up from your chair and walk across the room," the Baba Sali instructed. To everyone's surprise, and to the shock of the young man, he crossed the room on his own, as if he had never had an impediment.

Afterwards, the Baba Sali remarked to his grandson that when a Jew accepts upon himself to correct his shortcomings, the force of the emunah exhibited by this acceptance will intercede before Hashem to grant a miracle in his behalf. True belief generates true response.

The power of faith is awesome, maintaining the ability to transform the most grave circumstance into one of joy. The following episode substantiates this idea. The parents of a young child were distraught. Their six-year-old son would wake up in the middle of the night and cry incessantly. They had taken him to specialists to seek an explanation, a cure to this malady, to no avail. They turned to tzaddikim, righteous men, for blessings and or amulets -all to no avail.

One day, the mother, who was a simple, trusting soul, found a page torn out from a Chumash lying on the street. She felt this was a Heavenly sign. After cleaning off whatever dirt was on the page, she placed it that night beneath her son's pillow, with the hope that this page of Chumash would be the amulet through which her son would be cured. Lo and behold, the child had his first restful night! He slept through the night without incident. The parents were overjoyed until the father looked at the verses printed on the page. The sheet was torn out of the Tochechah, Rebuke, of Parashas Ki Savo. "Hashem will strike you with madness...and you will be frightened night and day" (Devarim 28:28.66).

"How could you use this page? Do you know the terrible curses that are stated here?" the frightened husband asked. "I did not read it," she replied. "It is a page of Chumash; that is all that counts. The holy words and letters will provide an amulet for our son."

The husband, however, could not accept this. He went to the venerable Rav of the Sephardic community, Horav Yaakov Mutzafi, zl, to seek his guidance in the matter. The sage told him he had no reason to worry. This is the power of pure emunah. His wife's faith was so positive that it could transform curse into blessing, tragedy into joy.

There is one more story I have been saving for last. It is about a Kollel fellow in Yerushalayim, a scholar of note, who viewed and lived his life through the lens of bitachon. He confronted challenges with total equanimity; nothing fazed him. His trust in the Almighty was consummate. Thus, he was able to live in near-objekt poverty as if he did not have a care in the world. Somehow, his family survived the daily financial pressures. The man never worried. Hashem ya'azor, "The Almighty will help."

It was now time to marry off his eldest daughter who was a lovely girl, a baalas middos, paragon of character refinement, and G-d -fearing. The finest of girls, however, requires an apartment. This had become the accepted norm. A girl becomes engaged, and her parents pay for the apartment. A shidduch, matrimonial match, was arranged with a fine Torah scholar, a young man who was truly the young woman's equal. The father of the kallah, our hero, promised an apartment for the wedding. They had selected a small "hole-in-the-wall" that would suffice for their needs. It cost only \$60,000.

The kallah's mother looked at her husband as if he had suffered a breakdown, "Where will we obtain \$60,000? We hardly have enough for our own simple, daily expenses!" Her husband assured her that she need not worry. Hashem will provide the necessary money in time for the wedding. He returned to his idyllic life of Torah study. The subject was closed - for the time being.

We must understand that the husband was neither a fool nor a simpleton. He had a profound sense of bitachon. If Hashem could provide their daily bread, He could likewise provide \$60,000. It was all based upon their merit. In any event, the wedding date was looming closer, and still there was nary a penny in the till. The wife was getting more nervous, while her husband was as serene as ever, as he delved into the tomes of Talmud which were his life. His wife, realizing that her husband had no plans for any hishtadlus of his own, decided to speak with Rebbetzin Elyashiv, whose husband, the posek ha'dor, had a tremendous influence on her husband. Rav Elyashiv informed the husband that he must make some form of hishtadlus. He should not just sit back and wait for a miracle. The gadol ha'dor

had spoken, and the husband's response was immediate. He went to one of his good friends who was the executive director of a large girls' school and solicited his assistance. Perhaps he could tell him the name of one of his donors, someone from whom he could endeavor to obtain the \$60,000 that he needed almost immediately.

The director shared with him the name of one of his American donors. He did not bother telling him that his annual donation was fifteen dollars. The kallah's father immediately sent off a letter explaining his present need, and solicited his assistance to the tune of \$60,000. The letter was sent. The fellow returned to his chavrusa, study partner, in the Kollel. He had performed the required hishtadlus. The wedding was in two weeks. He trusted that Hashem would provide them with His beneficence. "How" and "when" were unimportant. It would happen!

It was a few days before the wedding, the father of the kallah was, as usual, engrossed in his learning, while his wife and daughter were beside themselves with worry. They would have to call off the wedding. The embarrassment would be traumatic. What could they do? They could not possibly come up with \$60,000 in the next three days. That afternoon, an envelope arrived from America; the return address was that of the man to whom their father and husband had written earlier. With trembling hands, they opened the envelope. Words cannot describe their shock, joy and utter disbelief to discover a check for \$60,000 in the envelope. The wife immediately ran to the Kollel to inform her husband of the exciting news. A miracle had surely taken place!

The kollel fellow took the news in stride, accepting what he had been sure about all along. He trusted in Hashem, and his faith was affirmed. He immediately wrote a warm letter of gratitude to his new benefactor - and returned to his Torah study. Meanwhile, his friend, the executive director of the girls' school, was shocked into disbelief. If this is what the American donor was sending to an unknown kollel fellow, he would surely send him much more! He would not settle for a letter. He purchased a plane ticket and flew to New York to visit with the American benefactor. Upon arriving at his home, he was shocked that the man lived with his wife and young daughter in a small, simple apartment. There was nothing about the apartment's simple accoutrements that bespoke any allusion to wealth. Perhaps the man lived frugally.

"Let me tell you my story," the benefactor began. "For many years, my wife and I prayed for a child. Finally, we were blessed with a little girl. She was the center of our lives. At the age of four years old, we enrolled her in nursery school. Everything seemed to be going so well in our lives until, one day, we received the call that every parent dreads: my baby was hit by a car. The situation was grave. We ran down to the hospital as they were wheeling her into surgery. The surgeon was brutally honest with us. Hope for a successful outcome were, at best, slim. We began to pray fervently. All the tears that we shed to have this child were renewed, as we entreated Hashem for a blessing: 'Please let our baby live!' I then made a vow that half of the money that we had placed in a savings account for her dowry would be given to tzedakah, in the hope for a complete recovery.

"Hours elapsed, and finally an exhausted, but smiling, surgeon came out to greet us. The surgery had gone well. He was cautiously optimistic. That very day, I went to the bank and withdrew half of my account. It amounted to \$60,000. I declared that the first needy person to approach me would receive this money. That night, we came home to find a letter in our mailbox from a Kollel fellow in Eretz Yisrael. He was marrying off his daughter and had no money to pay for her apartment. I felt it was Hashem's way of providing the dowry for one girl with the dowry of another. Thus, he was the one to whom I sent the entire check."

This is a true story of bitachon that we can "take to the bank."

And He said, "If you hearken diligently to the voice of Hashem, your G-d...Any of the diseases that I placed upon Egypt I shall not place upon you, for I am Hashem, your Healer. (15:26)

The Talmud Sanhedrin 101a questions the message of this pasuk. In as much as Hashem has promised that He will not place any disease upon us, i.e. that we never become ill in the first place, why, then, do we have a need for His healing? The Talmud replies that the pasuk is self-explanatory. If one hearkens to Hashem's voice and observes His mitzvos, he will not be stricken with disease. If, however, he will not listen to Hashem and will not faithfully carry out His mitzvos, then the diseases of Egypt will be placed upon him. There is one "plus": Hashem will cure you, because He is your Healer. This is the meaning of the seemingly contradictory language of the latter part of the pasuk.

The question seems to remain. The pasuk clearly implies that if one does not listen, he will be stricken with the disease. What is the purpose of the healing? Obviously, he is receiving the disease because he has rebelled against Hashem. There is a purpose in the punishment. Why the healing? Eitz Yosef explains that the purpose of the afflictions is to cure the person of the spiritual malaise that caused him to sin in the first place. Hence, the afflictions are therapeutic - not punitive. Thus, the healing comes after one has realized the purpose of the affliction.

Horav Sholom Schwadron, zl, explains that, while it is true that one who sins will be stricken, a distinction exists between the affliction meted on the nations of the world and that which is received by a Jew who has sinned. When Hashem afflicts a gentile,

the disease is purely punitive. Hashem is taking revenge on those who scoff Him. When He afflicts a Jew, however, the disease has one purpose: to stimulate his teshuvah, repentance. The afflictions experienced by Jews are remedial. They are powerful motivational forces which inspire remorse and repentance.

The hands of two people can be cut off, yet the situation is different one from another. The first one stole with his hand. He is incarcerated awaiting punishment. His punishment is that his hand is to be cut off. The hand of the second person is also to be cut off, but he is having it performed as a surgical procedure, administered in a hospital to prevent an infection from spreading to the rest of his body. Two people - two hands - two surgeries - two disparate reasons. One is punitive; one is remedial.

If we do not listen - Hashem will then place upon us a disease. Since He is our Hashem, this disease will serve to expiate our sins - not simply to hurt us. It is only concerning the Jewish People that affliction is a "good" thing.

"For the hand is on the Throne of G-d: Hashem maintains a war against Amalek from generation to generation." (17:16)

No people is so reviled by Hashem as Amalek, the archenemy of the Jewish People. Regarding no other nation do we have a commandment to obliterate their name. Only Amalek has that distinction. Why? What is there about Amalek - his hatred of the Jews and everything that they represent - that differentiates him so? I think the answer lies in Amalek's attack on us. We were leaving Egypt after two centuries of bitter, brutal persecution. We were not bothering anyone. Yet, Amalek, for some reason, felt it necessary to attack. Why? We were threatening no immediate danger to him; we were not traveling through his land. The Jewish People were basically minding their own business. Yet, Amalek attacked them for no apparent reason.

Perhaps the answer lies in Megillas Esther, which relates the Purim story, in which Haman, descendant and heir to the evil Amalek, attempted to wipe out the Jewish population of Persia. How did he do it? What was his convincing argument? Yeshno am echad mefuzar u'meforad bein ha'amim... v'daseihem shonos mi'kol am, "There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples... Their laws are different from every other peoples" (Megillas Esther 3:8). Haman reveals the "reason" for his hatred of the Jews: they are different! Haman was intolerant of the Jews' distinction. He was not suffering from the Jews. He lost no money. The mere fact that they were not like him was reason enough to hate and kill them.

This is Amalek. The Jewish nation that was liberated from Egypt had no issues with Amalek. Yet, the fact that they were different was reason enough for Amalek to wage war with them. Halachah, Eisav sonei l'Yaakov, "It is Halachic axiom, that Eisav hates Yaakov." No rhyme or reason - just simple hatred. Why? Yaakov is different. Eisav's insecurity cannot tolerate anyone who is different than he is. In the womb, Eisav was already out to destroy Yaakov Avinu. Why? Because, when Rivkah Imeinu passed a shul or bais ha'midrash, Yaakov wanted out. This agitated Eisav, since the avodah zarah, house of idol-worship, is where he would gravitate. He was different, and this troubled Eisav enough to hate him.

Hashem declared that His Throne is not complete as long as Amalek exists. The Almighty wants Amalek's name obliterated. The world society exists on a multiplicity of people. Different people, different cultures, different beliefs. This is the world. Klal Yisrael has its little niche in which we are isolated from the world society. Our way of life, the Torah way of life, is distinct. As a result of our mandate to be exclusive, we enrage the forces of evil represented by Amalek and his ilk. Throughout our history, the Amalekites have hounded and persecuted us for no reason other than Eisav sonei l'Yaakov. Our point of divergence, our individuality, is, in fact, our badge of honor, our source of pride. I guess this troubles Amalek.

The problem does not end there. I think the issue is much more acute, with grave ramifications reaching into our own insular society. I was reading recently how a prominent European Rav of Chassidic persuasion was walking through a vibrantly chareidi, observant, neighborhood one Shabbos afternoon, together with his family. He was shocked to hear the taunting voices of little children poking fun at his grandson's payos. At first, he thought that some gentile youths must have moved into the neighborhood. We can all imagine his shock and utter disbelief when he saw that the ridicule was coming from a group of frum children. The Rav writes how disturbed he was about this outrage. It is one thing to suffer the derision of anti-Semites, but to hear it from the mouths of innocent Jewish children was quite distressing. After all we have gone through collectively as a nation, how can children raised in fully observant homes make fun of another Jewish child's appearance? Furthermore, it would be wrong to place the onus of guilt on the children alone. Children reflect what they hear and observe from their parents and other adults with whom they come in contact. Apparently, manifesting a different appearance than one's own is reason for ridicule. This is subtle Amalekism creeping beneath the veneer of religiosity.

Let me assume my writer's license to submit that these feelings exist across the board. Right wing, left wing, centrist, modern, traditional, yeshivish, heimish; these are some of the labels by which we identify other frum Yidden who are "different" from who we are. We determine one's level of frumkeit based upon the shul in which he davens, the rabbi he supports, the school or yeshiva to which he sends his

children, the color, texture, and shape of his hat or yamulka. It has gotten to the point that we are intolerant of people for no reason other than that they are different. Since when do we have the right to question someone's preference concerning which minhagim, customs and traditions, they want to observe? How are our children being affected by our petty, obtuse perception of one another?

Klal Yisrael is comprised of twelve Shevatim, Tribes, each with its own individual blend of attributes, qualities, and religious devotion. They all have one goal in common: serving Hashem. The individual approach may vary, but the goal and devotion remains unchanged. If their observance does not totally adhere to the purvue of the Torah it is simply not Jewish - end of subject. While throughout history all factions under the religious umbrella have not always seen eye to eye, for the most part there were elements of respect that were manifest between them. There were, and always will be, individuals who are extreme and for whom respect for their fellow Jew is not a priority, but that is why I call them extreme. They are beyond the pale. Everyone needs "his" place, his comfort zone, where he feels in-sync with others. It should not be reason for disparagement if another's choice of venue is not in harmony with ours. It is an expression of insecurity when one belittles others who are "different," who dance to a different tune. This is how Haman commenced his campaign against the Jews: "They are different from us." We have enough enemies from without. Why should we have to contend from enemies within?

"For the hand is on the throne of G-d: Hashem maintains a war against Amalek, from generation to generation." (17:16)

Sensitivity to the feelings of others is a given. No decent, upstanding ben Torah would knowingly hurt his fellow Jew. What about Hashem? Are we cognizant of the effect our actions and words have in the Heavenly sphere? While the concept of "feelings," "emotions," are corporeal and, thus, do not apply in the spiritual dimension, certainly not to Hashem, that should not excuse our thoughtless behavior. The following vignette is an example to what I am alluding.

When the Chafetz Chaim, zl, reached an advanced age, his congregants took note of the fact that the chair which he used in shul was literally falling apart. In his honor, they purchased a new one for him. When they brought the chair into shul, the Chafetz Chaim took umbrage with their choice of gifts. They were shocked. Perhaps he had developed an affinity to his chair, as it had "served" him for so many years. It still was no reason to become agitated. In a voice laden with despair, the Chafetz Chaim explained the following: "It is written in the Torah that Hashem's hand is on His Throne. The word used for throne / chair is kais, instead of kisei. The incomplete spelling prompts Chazal to derive an important message. As long as Amalek exists, Hashem's Throne is incomplete. Apparently, you show greater concern for my honor than for Hashem's. How can I sit on a new chair as long as Hashem's Throne is deficient?"

What a powerful statement! Do we feel the "pain" of Shechinta b'galusa, the Divine Presence in exile? Do we understand the concept of Imo Anochi b'tzarah, "I am with him in his affliction?" Hashem feels our pain. Do we feel His?

Va'ani Tefillah

V'kulam m'kablim aleihem ole Malchus Shomayim zeh mi'zeh.

And they all accept upon themselves the Kingdom of Heaven, one from another

When we refer to a yoke, it does not necessarily have to have an inglorious connotation. While it is true that a yoke is placed upon animals, we use it for the purpose of harnessing them all together under one "yoke." Thus, the animals all pull together in harmony. They are now called a "team." This is how it should be concerning our relationship toward serving Hashem. We must participate in teamwork, such that all Jews work together to serve the Almighty. While we may all have individual strengths, we contribute these forces to the greater good, to serve the team. We bear the yoke of Heaven willfully, joyfully, together, each one looking out for the other. When one member of the team falters, it affects all the others. This lesson is derived from the Heavenly angels who "accept the yoke" one from another, almost as if asking permission, so that when they begin their praise it is with perfect harmony, in complete unison. This is how we should serve Hashem: by being part of the community, working with others, influencing others, not by ignoring them, but by including them. It might not always work, but at least we will have made the attempt.

Sponsored l'ilui nishmas Aidel bas R' Yaakov Shimon a"h Keller niftar 13 Shevat 5767 Idu Keller

By Perl & Harry M. Brown & Family Marcia & Hymie Keller & Family

Orthodox Union / www.ou.org

Person in the Parsha

Rabbi Weinreb's Torah Column, Parshat Beshalach

Sponsored in memory of Nathan and Louise Schwartz a"h

An Ounce of Prevention

I couldn't believe it. One of my trusted old reference books failed me for the first time.

You see, I am an old-fashioned guy and I still use books for reference rather than resorting to the electronic high-tech alternatives. Therefore, on the shelf next to my writing desk, I have three reliable works: Webster's College Dictionary, Roget's Thesaurus, and Bartlett's Book of Familiar Quotations. It was the latter that disappointed me as I prepared to write this week's Person in the Parsha.

This week's Torah portion is Beshalach (Exodus 13:17-17:16). It contains the following verse: "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in His eyes... I will put none of the diseases upon thee, which I have put upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee." (Exodus 15:26)

That is how Rabbi J. H. Hertz, late chief Rabbi of the British Empire, phrases it in the translation which accompanies his excellent commentary to the Pentateuch. However, Rashi's commentary suggests a different translation.

This is what Rashi says: "Simply put, I am the Lord your physician, who teaches you Torah and mitzvot so that you will be spared illness, much as a physician would instruct his patient not to eat certain things because they may lead to his getting sick..." Thus, For Rashi, the more accurate translation of the end of our first is not "I am the Lord that healeth thee...", "But rather, "I am the Lord thy physician."

At this point, you must be asking yourself, "What's the big deal? Is there any difference between "I heal you" and "I am your doctor"?"

Rashi would respond, "Yes, there is a great difference between the two. 'I heal you' means that you are sick and I make you better, whereas 'I am your doctor' means that I have the ability to prevent you from getting sick in the first place."

For Rashi, this is fundamental. The Almighty has the power to prescribe for us a lifestyle that will protect us from illness; from spiritual illness certainly, but arguably from physical suffering as well.

Rashi, of course, never knew the great physician who was Maimonides. But Rashi's conception of a good physician as one who does not merely heal the sick, but who counsels those who are well about how to avoid disease, is identical to Maimonides' definition of a good doctor.

Maimonides was the court physician for the Sultan Saladin in medieval Egypt. The Sultan was never ill and once called Maimonides on the carpet, as it were, and demanded of him proof that he was a good doctor. "I am never ill," said Saladin, "so how am I to know whether you in fact deserve the reputation that you have for being a great physician?"

Reportedly, Maimonides answered: "The greatest of all physicians is the Lord, of Whom it is said 'I am the Lord thy physician'. As proof of this, it is written 'I will not place upon you the illnesses which I have placed upon ancient Egypt'. Who is truly the good doctor? Not the person who heals the sick from their diseases, but rather the one who helps the person from becoming sick and sees to it that he maintains his health."

As Maimonides writes in one of his medical works, Essay on Human Conduct, "Most of the illnesses which befall man are his own fault, resulting from his ignorance of how to preserve his health - like a blind man who stumbles and hurts himself and even injures others in the process due to not having of a sense of vision."

As I was contemplating the merits of the translation suggested by both Rashi and Maimonides, I couldn't help but think of the old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." My memory told me that this was another wise saying of crafty old Benjamin Franklin. But these days, I have grown increasingly distrustful of my memory and so decided to confirm the origin of those words.

Here is where the reference books with which I opened this column came into play. I reached for my trusty and well-worn Bartlett's Familiar Quotations. I searched under "prevention," "cure," and even "ounce," but to no avail. Then I looked up "Franklin, Benjamin," and found all sorts of words of wisdom but nothing about "an ounce of prevention."

Google was my next resort. And there I indeed confirmed that it was Benjamin Franklin who echoed an important Jewish teaching when he said, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

But there is more to be learned from the verse in this week's Torah portion which we have been pondering: That the Almighty describes Himself as a healer or physician is more than just a lesson in the importance of living the kind of life that avoids the very real physical suffering that is often the consequence of an immoral life.

The metaphor of "physician" also makes a strong statement about the nature of the relationship between the Almighty and us, his "patients."

If the verse would read, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord... for I am the Lord thy Master," that would suggest that He demands our obedience in order to assert His own authority. But by urging us to "hearken to His voice" because He is "our physician," we gain an entirely different view of why we should be obedient. As Malbim, a 19th century rabbinic commentator, puts it, "A physician, like a master, demands obedience, but only for the purpose of securing the patient's

welfare." Thus, the divine commandments are to be seen as being for our own benefit, for our own ultimate well-being.

The image of a divine healer is one of the special gems to be found in Parshat Beshalach, which is a rich treasury of such images. How helpful it is for the Jew to experience a life of Torah and mitzvot as a gift given to him by a divine being who is concerned with his benefit, and how meaningful it is to know that the observant life is designed to avoid every manner of illness and to promote spiritual health and material wellness.

Orthodox Union / www.ou.org
Britain's Chief Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks

Music, Language of the Soul

For the first time since their departure from Egypt the Israelites do something together. They sing. "Then sang Moses and the children of Israel." Rashi, explaining the view of R. Nehemiah in the Talmud (Sotah 30b) that they spontaneously sang the song together, says that the holy spirit rested on them and miraculously the same words came into their minds at the same time. In recollection of that moment, tradition has named this week Shabbat Shirah, the Sabbath of Song. What is the place of song in Judaism?

There is an inner connection between music and the spirit. When language aspires to the transcendent and the soul longs to break free of the gravitational pull of the earth, it modulates into song. Music, said Arnold Bennett is "a language which the soul alone understands but which the soul can never translate." It is, in Richter's words "the poetry of the air." Tolstoy called it "the shorthand of emotion." Goethe said, "Religious worship cannot do without music. It is one of the foremost means to work upon man with an effect of marvel." Words are the language of the mind. Music is the language of the soul.

So when we seek to express or evoke emotion we turn to melody. Deborah sang after Israel's victory over the forces of Siserah (Judges 5). Hannah sang when she had a child (1 Sam. 2). When Saul was depressed, David would play for him and his spirit would be restored (1 Sam. 16). David himself was known as the "sweet singer of Israel" (2 Sam. 23: 1). Elisha called for a harpist to play so that the prophetic spirit could rest upon him (2 Kings 3: 15). The Levites sang in the Temple. Every day, in Judaism, we preface our morning prayers with Pesukei de-Zimra, the 'Verses of Song' with their magnificent crescendo, Psalm 150, in which instruments and the human voice combine to sing God's praises.

Mystics go further and speak of the song of the universe, what Pythagoras called 'the music of the spheres'. This is what Psalm 19 means when it says, 'The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of His hands . . . There is no speech, there are no words, where their voice is not heard. Their music[1] carries throughout the earth, their words to the end of the world.' Beneath the silence, audible only to the inner ear, creation sings to its Creator.

So, when we pray, we do not read: we sing. When we engage with sacred texts, we do not recite: we chant. Every text and every time has, in Judaism, its own specific melody. There are different tunes for shacharit, mincha and maariv, the morning, afternoon and evening prayers. There are different melodies and moods for the prayers for a weekday, Shabbat, the three pilgrimage festivals, Pesach, Shavuot and Sukkot (which have much musically in common but also tunes distinctive to each), and for the Yamim Noraim, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

There are different tunes for different texts. There is one kind of cantillation for Torah, another for the haftarah from the prophetic books, and yet another for Ketuvim, the Writings, especially the five Megillot. There is a particular chant for studying the texts of the written Torah, for studying Mishnah and Gemarah. So by music alone we can tell what kind of day it is and what kind of text is being used. There is a map of holy words and it is written in melodies and songs.

Music has extraordinary power to evoke emotion. The Kol Nidrei prayer with which Yom Kippur begins is not really a prayer at all. It is a dry legal formula for the annulment of vows. There can be little doubt that it is its ancient, haunting melody that has given it its hold over the Jewish imagination. It is hard to hear those notes and not feel that you are in the presence of God on the Day of Judgment, standing in the company of Jews of all places and times as they pleaded with heaven for forgiveness. It is the holy of holies of the Jewish soul. (Lehavdil, Beethoven came close to it in the opening notes of the sixth movement of the C Sharp Minor Quartet op. 131, his most sublime and spiritual work).

Nor can you sit on Tisha B'av reading Eichah, the book of Lamentations, with its own unique cantillation, and not feel the tears of Jews through the ages as they suffered for their faith and wept as they remembered what they had lost, the pain as fresh as it was the day the Temple was destroyed. Words without music are like a body without a soul.

Each year for the past ten years I have been privileged to be part of a mission of song (together with the Shabbaton Choir and singers Rabbi Lionel Rosenfeld and Chazanim Shimon Cramer and Jonny Turgel) to Israel to sing to victims of terror,

as well as to people in hospitals, community centres and food kitchens. We sing for and with the injured, the bereaved, the sick and the broken hearted. We dance with people in wheelchairs. One boy who had lost half of his family, as well as being blinded, in a suicide bombing, sang a duet with the youngest member of the choir, reducing the nurses and his fellow patients to tears. Such moments are epiphanies, redeeming a fragment of humanity and hope from the random cruelties of fate.

Beethoven wrote over the manuscript of the third movement of his A Minor Quartet the words Neue Kraft fühlend, "Feeling new strength." That is what you sense in those hospital wards. You understand what King David meant when he sang to God the words: "You turned my grief into dance; you removed my sackcloth and clothed me with joy, that my heart may sing to You and not be silent." You feel the strength of the human spirit no terror can destroy.

In his book, Musicophilia, the neurologist and writer Oliver Sacks (no relative, alas) tells the poignant story of Clive Wearing, an eminent musicologist who was struck by a devastating brain infection. The result was acute amnesia. He was unable to remember anything for more than a few seconds. As his wife Deborah put it, 'It was as if every waking moment was the first waking moment.'

Unable to thread experiences together, he was caught in an endless present that had no connection with anything that had gone before. One day his wife found him holding a chocolate in one hand and repeatedly covering and uncovering it with the other hand, saying each time, 'Look, it's new.' 'It's the same chocolate', she said. 'No', he replied, 'look. It's changed.' He had no past at all. In a moment of awareness he said about himself, 'I haven't heard anything, seen anything, touched anything, smelled anything. It's like being dead.'

Two things broke through his isolation. One was his love for his wife. The other was music. He could still sing, play the organ and conduct a choir with all his old skill and verve. What was it about music, Sacks asked, that enabled him, while playing or conducting, to overcome his amnesia? He suggests that when we 'remember' a melody, we recall one note at a time, yet each note relates to the whole. He quotes the philosopher of music, Victor Zuckerkandl, who wrote, 'Hearing a melody is hearing, having heard, and being about to hear, all at once. Every melody declares to us that the past can be there without being remembered, the future without being foreknown.' Music is a form of sensed continuity that can sometimes break through the most overpowering disconnections in our experience of time.

Faith is more like music than like science. Science analyzes, music integrates. And as music connects note to note, so faith connects episode to episode, life to life, age to age in a timeless melody that breaks into time. God is the composer and librettist. We are each called on to be voices in the choir, singers of God's song. Faith teaches us to hear the music beneath the noise.

So music is a signal of transcendence. The philosopher and musician Roger Scruton writes that it is "an encounter with the pure subject, released from the world of objects, and moving in obedience to the laws of freedom alone." He quotes Rilke: "Words still go softly out towards the unsayable / And music, always new, from palpitating stones / builds in useless space its godly home." The history of the Jewish spirit is written in its songs. The words do not change, but each generation needs its own melodies.

Our generation needs new songs so that we too can sing joyously to God as our ancestors did at that moment of transfiguration when they crossed the Red Sea and emerged, the other side, free at last. When the soul sings, the spirit soars.

1. Kavam, literally "their line," possibly meaning the reverberating string of a musical instrument.

Parsha Parables - Parshas B'shalach 5772

Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky

Stories & Anecdotes that Illuminate the Weekly Torah Portion and Holidays

Dear Subscribers,

I apologize for missing the last two weeks. I took a brief unannounced hiatus, but the plethora of emails with concerns for my welfare, (and faxhomily) prompted me to get back on track.

Thank you for your concern!

With Torah blessings,

Mordechai Kamenetzky

Dedicated in loving memory of

Rabbi Avrohom Ginzberg zt"l

Rav Avraham Yaakov ben Rav Moshe zt"l

who passed away suddenly, last evening, 16 Shevat

May his memory be a blessing to his entire family and Talmidim of Yeshiva Chofetz Chaim and his Kehilla in the Kessel Street Shul in Forest Hills, Queens.

Sweet Offerings

Though the highlight of the portion of B'shalach is the splitting of the Red Sea, the Jews passing through safely and the drowning of the Egyptians, there are a number of seminal segments of the Torah in it as well. Of course, there is the Song at the Sea, known as Az Yashir recited everyday in the morning tefilah by thousands of Jews worldwide. But there is also the portion of the manna. After the miraculous sea-crossing, things don't go as well. The nation becomes thirsty and hungry, and repeatedly complains to Moshe and Aaron. Hashem commands Moshe to use his staff to miraculously sweeten bitter waters at Marah, and later Moshe uses the same stick to bring forth water from a rock by striking it.

But one miracle that began in this week's parsha, continues day in and day out for 40 years, probably the longest ongoing miracle of sustenance in recorded history.

The manna falls every day except for Shabbos. The Children of Israel are instructed to gather a double portion of manna on Friday, as none will descend on Shabbos.

"So he said to them, that is what Hashem spoke, "Tomorrow is a rest day, a holy Sabbath to Hashem . . . And Moshe said, eat it today, for today is a Sabbath to the Lord; today you will not find it in the field. Six days you shall gather it, but on the seventh day, Shabbath, on it there will be none" (Exodus 16:23).

The Torah tells us that there were, however, those who were not so trusting. "It came about that on the seventh day, [some] of the people went out to gather [manna], but they did not find [any]. Hashem said to Moshe, how long will you refuse to observe My commandments and My teachings? See that the Lord has given you the Sabbath. Therefore, on the sixth day, He gives you bread for two days. Let each man remain in his place; let no man leave his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." (Exodus 16:25-30).

Then finally the Torah describes the manna. "The house of Israel named it manna, and it was like coriander seed, [it was] white, and it tasted like a wafer fried with with honey" (ibid 16:31).

I am troubled. The narrative should have described the color, texture and taste of manna right from the very start. Why did the Torah tell us about the sweetness of the manna only after it relates the story of the would-be Shabbos violators? It is also interesting to note, that later in the Torah portion of Behalosecha, in an episode unrelated to Shabbos, the Torah tells us that the manna tasted like fried dough (See Numbers 11:6-7).

The Story

I recently received this story via e-mail, I assume it is apocryphal, but it is indeed telling.

When they first built the super highway from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv, they built an exit that passed straight through a town of either Breslov or Chabad Chassidim, known for their warmth and hospitality. Of course, it was uncomfortable for them to see cars whizzing by on Shabbos, but they did not protest. They did not rant and rave to the Government and they did not throw stones and soiled diapers at the cars driving through.

Instead, the Chassidim went out after their morning services and set up tables beside the road. They invited the people driving through to stop for kiddush and some cake and wine and gefilte fish. They even offered hot cholent and a bit of vodka. Then they invited them home to have Shabbat lunch with their families. The drivers soon became interested in Torah and the meaning of Shabbos observance.

Guess what happened? The government moved the exit.

The Message

Perhaps the placement describing the manna as sweet as honey is very calculated. It is juxtaposed directly after the episode of Shabbos violation, to subtly teach us an antidote to the naysayers and detractors who would go out in search of Shabbos desecration.

"Let the Manna taste like honey". Give them something sweet. Maybe when the fare that people are given does not taste as bland like fried dough, but rather sweet as honey, they too, will never look to go out and attempt to desecrate the Shabbos. Instead they will learn its sweetness from the delicious fare they just enjoyed.

© 2012 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky

Rabbi Yissocher Frand - Parshas BeShalach

Empathy for Others -- A Great Quality in Both the Wicked and the Righteous
Pharaoh had a change of heart right after he let the Jewish people go. "He said to the Children of Israel: They are lost in the land." [Shmos 14:3] Rashi raises the obvious difficulty with this pasuk. Why does the pasuk say that Pharaoh spoke TO the children of Israel (l'Bnei Yisrael)? They had left Egypt already. How could he be talking to them? Rashi responds that we must interpret the pasuk to mean that Pharaoh spoke ABOUT the Children of Israel ("al benei Yisrael") rather than TO them.

The Targum Yonasan ben Uziel has a unique interpretation. The Targum Yonasan ben Uziel interprets that Pharaoh was addressing Dassan and Aviram, who remained

in Egypt. The Maharal Diskin asks a strong question. We know that large numbers of the undeserving members of Klal Yisrael died during the plague of Choshech [Darkness]. According to one interpretation in Rashi (on the pasuk "The Children of Israel went up from Egypt 'Chamushim'"), 80% of the Jewish community perished during those 3 days of Darkness. The Maharal Diskin asks -- We are talking about Dassan and Aviram -- who are known to us -- from several statements of Chazal -- as being wicked people. How can it be that they survived the plague of Choshech?

The Targum Yonasan ben Uziel gives a fascinating answer. The Egyptian slave state had a hierarchy. Pharaoh assigned the job of enslaving the Jews to Egyptian taskmasters. The taskmasters identified Jewish policemen and forced these policemen to make the Jewish slaves produce their quota of work. The taskmasters beat the policemen and the policemen beat the Jewish slaves. Chazal praise the Jewish policemen for often absorbing the beatings of the Egyptian taskmasters and thereby sparing greater suffering on the part of the Jewish slaves.

The Maharal Diskin says that even though Dassan was a wicked person and an extreme trouble maker, but nevertheless he was one of the policemen and he had the merit of absorbing the blows of Egyptian taskmasters to save the Jewish slaves from being whipped themselves. This merit caused his life to be spared during the days of Darkness. A person who accepts suffering on himself to save the suffering of a fellow Jew has tremendous merit -- neither the Red Sea nor the Angel of Death can touch him.

Rav Shmuel Auerbach, when eulogizing his father Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, quoted one of his father's favorite stories: The Baruch Taam once arranged for the marriage of his son to the daughter of a very wealthy individual. The families got together before the wedding to talk about the details of the marriage. The future mother-in-law (of the Baruch Tam's son) saw that the Baruch Tam was distressed. She went to him privately and asked him what he was so distressed about. "Is there anything wrong with the shidduch?" she wanted to know. The Baruch Taam told her that he was upset because the "water carrier" in the city was very sick. [In those days before people had running water, one of the more menial jobs in European villages was that of the water carrier. The water carrier went down to the river, filled up two buckets and carried them back to town on his shoulders. He did this all day, going back and forth between the river and the town. All one needed to do this job was to have a good back and a lot of stamina. One did not need to be very bright and this was literally among the most menial of professions.] The Baruch Taam felt great empathy for the water carrier, who was sick and could not enjoy the engagement party of his own son.

The future mother-in-law of his son told the Baruch Taam, "Get over it! What does that have to do with you? Don't let his sickness spoil what should be a happy day for you!" The Baruch Taam came out of the room and announced that the engagement was off. "Anyone who could not empathize with the suffering of another Jew is not the type of family I want my son to marry into, regardless of how much money they have." If one is not seriously bothered by the fact that someone else is hurting, one lacks the sensitivity required of a caring member of the Jewish people.

This was one of the favorite stories of Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach. Empathy for others is a great quality to have, whether one is as wicked as Dassan and Aviram or as righteous as Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach.

Transcribed by David Twersky Seattle, WA; Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman, Baltimore, MD

RavFrاند, Copyright © 2007 by Rabbi Yissocher Frand and Torah.org.

Rav Kook List

Rav Kook on the Torah Portion

Beshalach: The Proper Time to Light

It is customary in most Jewish communities to light Sabbath candles 18 minutes before sundown. The Talmud (Shabbat 23b) records a conversation between fifth-century scholar Rav Yosef and his wife regarding the proper time to light.

Not Too Early, Not Too Late

When Rav Yosef saw his wife lighting just moments before sundown, he gently rebuked her, explaining that the candles should be lit earlier, while it is still light outside. He compared the Sabbath lights to the pillar of fire that led the Israelites during their travels in the desert.

"The Torah states: 'The cloud-pillar by day and the fire-pillar by night never left their place in front of the people' (Ex. 13:22). This teaches that the cloud-pillar would complete the task of the fire-pillar, and visa-versa."

In other words, the cloud-pillar would appear shortly before the start of day, and the fire-pillar would appear shortly before the night. So too, we should light Sabbath candles before the start of night.

Upon hearing this, Rav Yosef's wife considered lighting much earlier Friday afternoon. But the scholar instructed her to light "not too early and not too late."

This account requires clarification. What is the connection between pillars of fire and Sabbath candles? And why should one light not too early and not too late?

Fire and Cloud

The pillars of fire and cloud provided a visual focus for the Israelites in their travels across the vast desert. At first glance, it would seem that these two phenomena were unrelated, since they served opposite functions. The fire-pillar lit up the night, while the cloud-pillar blocked the desert sun and provided shade. But in fact, they shared a common purpose, as they both provided a continual point of reference for the people. As Rav Yosef taught, each one completed the work of the other. This complementary relationship expressed itself in the fact that, as the day waned, the fire-pillar already began to appear. And as the night neared its end, the cloud-pillar would become visible.

Similarly, Sabbath lights are a focal point of the Sabbath's inner peace and holiness. Like the pillars of fire and cloud, we have two opposites - the Sabbath and the days of week. And like the pillars, they also share an inner connection. The enlightenment of Shabbat should not be confined to the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath day, but should influence and benefit the entire week. By lighting the Sabbath candles before Shabbat has commenced, we demonstrate that the Sabbath light casts its spiritual radiance over the other days of the week.

However, lighting too early is also inappropriate. The weekdays have their own function and purpose. Without the six days of activity, we could not fully experience and appreciate the spiritual rest of Shabbat. Just as a white piece of paper stands out more clearly when contrasted against a black background, so, too, the holiness of the Sabbath is more vivid against the background of six days of work.

Exile and Redemption

The final redemption is described as a time that is "completely Sabbath" (Tamid 33b). The redemption also has its polar opposite - the period of exile. Yet each is required in its own time. Were the redemption to come before its time, we would be unprepared for it, and blinded by its brilliant light. As Rav Yosef taught, the light needs to come at the proper time. Not too early, not too late.

(Silver from the Land of Israel. Adapted from Ein Eyah vol. III on Shabbat 23b (2:31).)

Comments and inquiries may be sent to: mailto:RavKookList@gmail.com

Weekly Halacha

by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

Opening Cans, Bottles and Boxes on Shabbos

The complicated question of opening cans and bottles on Shabbos has been debated at great length among contemporary poskim, and in the final analysis, there is no consensus as to the practical halachah. This Discussion, however, is to explain the halachic principles involved and to familiarize the reader with the main schools of thought regarding this complex subject.

There are six possible Biblical or Rabbinic prohibitions one may violate when opening bottles, cans or boxes on Shabbos. They are: 1) Korea—Tearing; 2) Makeh b'patish—Completing the formation of a utensil; 3) Fashioning an opening, also a violation of Makeh b'patish; 4) Mochek—Erasing; 5) Mechatech—cutting or tearing to a specific size; 6) Soser—Destroying a utensil. In order to avoid violating any of these strict Shabbos prohibitions, it is highly advisable and strongly recommended that one open all bottles, containers and wrappings before Shabbos. Most people have a mental "checklist" of "things to do" on erev Shabbos, and opening boxes, bottles and bags of food and drinks should be on the list. Our Discussion, therefore, is aimed at those who forgot or failed to prepare properly for Shabbos.

Background and Basic Principles

Tosefta¹ cites the following halachic decision which is quoted by all of the poskim:² "It is permitted on Shabbos to rip the skin (in olden times, skins were used to seal barrels) off the top of a barrel (as long as there is no intention of creating a spout)." There is a great deal of controversy among the poskim as to why this is permitted, since it is prohibited to tear on Shabbos. Several explanations are given, but let us focus on the two basic approaches:

The Chazon Ish³ explains that it is permitted because the ripping is done in a destructive manner. The person who opens the barrel has no interest in preserving the cover for later use. A Shabbos Labor done in a destructive manner is not considered a melachah and is permissible even mi-d'Rabbanan. The Chazon Ish permits ripping off a salami wrapper, for example, since the wrapping is destroyed while it is being ripped. Thus, according to this approach, it is permitted to rip something on Shabbos only if the packaging will be destroyed as it is being opened.

Other poskim,⁴ however, explain the Tosefta differently. The reason it is permitted to rip the skin off the barrel (or the wrapper off a package, etc.) is that the

wrapper is totally "subordinate" to its contents. Removing the wrapper is like removing a nutshell from a nut or unwrapping the binding which surrounds dates from the fruit—both of which are clearly permissible according to the Shulchan Aruch.⁵ As long as one is tearing for the sake of removing contents from a package, it is permissible to tear. According to this approach, it makes no difference if the package is destroyed in the process or not; even if the wrapper remains partially intact and is able to retain its contents, tearing is permitted. Still, even according to this view, it is forbidden to tear the packaging with the intent of reusing at a later date, since in that case one is completing the formation of a utensil on Shabbos—Makeh b'patish.

This debate has ramifications for opening cans on Shabbos as well. According to Chazon Ish when one opens a can one "completes the formation of a utensil." Before the can was opened it was a "closed shell," unusable as a utensil. After it is opened it becomes a container which can serve as a utensil. Since it was not destroyed in the process of being opened, it is forbidden to be opened on Shabbos. [In the view of yet other poskim,⁶ opening a can is not "completing the formation of a utensil" but rather "breaking an existing utensil" which is also prohibited on Shabbos.]

But the other poskim mentioned earlier do not consider opening a can as "completing the formation of a utensil" [nor do they consider opening a can as "breaking an existing utensil"]. In their view, since cans are generally discarded after their contents are removed, no usable utensil is created. Opening a can is merely like the peeling off of a "shell," which is a permissible activity. Indeed, if the can is made from durable material which is meant to last and be reused in the future, then it is prohibited according to all poskim to open it on Shabbos, since none of the leniencies mentioned above apply.

Question: Most bottle caps in use nowadays⁷ either leave a ring around the bottle neck or perforate along the edge when the bottle is opened. Is it permitted to open them on Shabbos or Yom Tov?

Discussion: This question is widely disputed among contemporary poskim. The debate centers around two basic issues. 1) Unscrewing a cap renders it a functional utensil, since before unscrewing it serves as a seal and it now becomes a cap which may be used as a cover.⁸ Thus, the first time the cap is unscrewed, it completes the formation of a utensil—the bottle cap—which may be a violation of Makeh b'patish.⁹ 2) Unscrewing the cap at the perforated edge may be a violation of Mechatech, since the cap is being cut down to a specific size. There are conflicting views among the poskim in regard to the practical halachah:¹⁰

1. Some poskim prohibit opening all bottle caps that leave a ring or perforate along the edge. Some consider it Mechatech,¹¹ while others consider it Makeh b'patish.¹²
2. Some poskim permit opening plastic bottle caps but forbid opening the ones made from metal.¹³ This is because plastic caps are functional even before they are screwed onto a bottle (as opposed to metal ones which—due to differences in technology—become operational only after being unscrewed from the bottle the first time).

3. Some poskim permit opening all bottle caps, since in their opinion neither makeh b'patish nor mechatech is being violated.¹⁴

Contemporary poskim agree that it is forbidden to open bottle caps which are stamped with the date of production, etc., and the letter formation will be broken or erased when unscrewing the bottle cap.

Question: Is it permitted to open a soda or tuna-fish can on Shabbos?

Discussion: In the opinion of Rav S.Z. Auerbach¹⁵ it is permitted to open both a soda can or a tuna fish can on Shabbos. He explains that Makeh b'patish does not apply to any utensil which will be discarded after its contents are removed, even if the contents are not removed immediately but will remain in the can for some time. In addition, he holds that Mechatech does not apply when lifting off a tab from a can of soda or beer, since one is not aiming to make a tab of a certain size, but rather to lift the tab off in the easiest way possible, which is where the manufacturer perforated it.

There are other poskim who forbid the opening of all cans on Shabbos for various halachic reasons—either because of Mechatech, Makeh b'patish or Soser.¹⁶ Those whose custom is to follow the more stringent opinion should continue to do so.

Question: Is it permitted to rip off the packaging of wine bottles, coffee jars, candy bars, paper goods, sugar packets or other items necessary for Shabbos?

Discussion: It is permitted to rip off or tear a wrapper which surrounds wine or grape juice bottle caps, candy bars, freeze pops or any items necessary for Shabbos. It is permitted to rip off a seal that covers the contents of a container, such as the inside seal of a coffee jar or an aluminum foil seal on a yogurt container, etc. When tearing any packaging, one must be sure that no letters or pictures are torn. It is permitted to cut or tear between the letters of a word or between words.¹⁷ It is permitted to poke a hole and insert a straw into bags or boxes which contain beverages.¹⁸

Question: Is it permitted to rip open a corrugated box which contains packages of cookies or paper goods, etc.?

Discussion: It is permitted to rip off the tape which seals this type of box. But it is forbidden to open such a box if the flaps are glued together tightly and must be separated to open. Corrugated boxes are often reused after their contents are removed, and one is particular to open them in a manner which is not destructive, so that it can be reused. This may be a violation of Tearing.¹⁹

But it is permitted to open a cookie or cereal box or bag, even if one does not immediately empty out its contents and even if the box or bag is not destroyed in the process. It makes no difference if the box is made out of cardboard, plastic or paper, nor does it make a difference if the box contains food or something else such as medicine, clothing or toys. It is only prohibited to open a container which is made of strong, long-lasting material such as a barrel or a corrugated box which might be reused in the future.²⁰

Question: Leben or yogurt cups sometimes come attached to each other and must be separated along a perforated line before they can be eaten individually. Is that permitted to be done on Shabbos?

Discussion: Contemporary poskim debate whether or not it is permitted to separate attached yogurt or leben cups from each other. Some consider it a violation of Mechatech and Makeh b'patish,²¹ while others hold it is permitted altogether.²²

General note: Even if one mistakenly opened a can or a bottle in a manner which is clearly prohibited, it is not forbidden to eat the food or beverage.²³

Beitzah 3:9.

Beis Yosef, Magen Avraham and Mishnah Berurah 314:25. See also Shulchan Aruch ha-Rav 12 and Chayei Adam 29:4.

O.C. 51:13; 61:2. See Binyan Shabbos, vol. 1, pgs. 210-216 and 226-230 for a comprehensive review of this opinion.

Shevisas ha-Shabbos, pg. 12b; Chazon Yechezkel (hashmatos to Tosefta Shabbos); Rav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9, note 12 and Shulchan Shelomo 314:7-4). See also Igros Moshe, O.C. 1:122 who agrees, in principle, with this approach.

O.C. 314:8.

Tehillah l'David 314:12.

Bottle caps which lift off with a bottle opener may be removed; Mishnah Berurah 314:17; Chazon Ish 51:11.

Even if the cap was partially unscrewed before Shabbos, but it remained attached to the ring, it is prohibited to unscrew it further on Shabbos; Binyan Shabbos, vol. 1, pg. 158; Meleches Shabbos, pg. 343.

See explanation of entire issue in Shulchan Shelomo 314:9-4, 5.

The same debate applies to plastic containers which are sealed with a plastic lid which is secured to the bottle by means of a plastic strip which is pulled off in order to open the container; see Binyan Shabbos, vol. 1, pg 108 and 246. See also Orchos Shabbos 12:20.

Rav Y.S. Elyashiv (Orchos Shabbos 12:18. note 31, Me'or ha-Shabbos, vol. 2, pg. 551).

Rav Y.Y. Weiss (Kol ha-Torah, vol. 42, pg. 14); Rav N. Karelitz (Chut Shani, Shabbos, vol. 2, pg. 274). One may, however, puncture a hole in the cap and then unscrew it; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:18, or better yet, puncture a wide hole in the cap and then pour the beverage through the punctured hole; Meleches Shabbos, pg. 344; Orchos Shabbos 12, note 30.

Shulchan Shelomo 314:9-9.

Rav Y.Y. Fischer in Even Yisrael 2:14; Tzitz Eliezer 14:45; Lehoros Nasan 7:21; Kinyan Torah 4:34; Yechaveh Da'as 2:42; Rav Y. Roth (Ohr ha-Shabbos, vol. 11, pg. 17).

Shulchan Shelomo 314:7-4. Many other poskim agree as well; see Minchas Yitzchak 4:82; Chelkas Yaakov 3:8.

See Orchos Shabbos 12:5 and note 6 and 10 and Chut Shani, Shabbos, vol. 2, pgs. 273-274.

Entire paragraph based on rulings of Rav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah and Tikunim u'Miluim 9:12-13; Me'or ha-Shabbos, vol. 1, pg. 496). Simple designs such as a square or a frame are not considered pictures; see Orchos Shabbos 15, note 28.

Orchos Shabbos 12:8; Binyan Shabbos, vol. 1, pg. 145, quoting Rav S.Z. Auerbach. See Orchos Shabbos 12:10.

Rav S.Z. Auerbach in Tikunim u'Miluim 9:11 and Shulchan Shelomo 314:7-5, 6. See Binyan Shabbos, vol. 2, pgs. 145-149, for a comprehensive review of the entire subject. There are dissenting opinions who are stringent and forbid opening all boxes or bags; see Knei Bosem 1:22.

Rav Y.S. Elyashiv (Orchos Shabbos 12:12, Me'or ha-Shabbos, vol. 2, pg. 551).

Rav S.Z. Auerbach (Orchos Shabbos 12:18. note 31, Shulchan Shelomo 314:13-3).

Shulchan Shelomo 314:9-6; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:24.

Weekly-Halacha, Weekly Halacha, Copyright © 2010 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Torah.org.

Rabbi Neustadt is the Yoshev Rosh of the Vaad Harabbonim of Detroit and the Av Beis Din of the Beis Din Tzedek of Detroit. He could be reached at dneustadt@cordetroit.com

Carrying Nitroglycerin on Shabbos By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

The Torah's concern for the protection of life and health is axiomatic. In virtually all instances, Torah restrictions are superseded when a life-threatening emergency exists. If the situation is extenuating, but not life-threatening, then the rule of thumb is that the Torah restriction remains in force. Sometimes, however, mitigating factors allow the overriding of a rabbinic injunction because of extenuating circumstances.

A contemporary halachic question which relates to this issue is as follows: Can a person suffering from angina or other heart disease carry his medication on Shabbos through a public thoroughfare? In case of a sudden attack, there would indeed be a life threatening need that permits procurement of such medication through any necessary means. However, there is no medical reason that compels the patient to leave his home where his medicine is kept. Is there halachic basis to allow him to carry his medication, since the possible medical emergency can be completely avoided? Granted that this would result in a great hardship by making the patient housebound on Shabbos, yet this deprivation would not constitute a life-threatening emergency and would not be grounds for overriding a Torah-proscribed Shabbos prohibition.

The halachic question is two-fold: Can carrying the medicine be considered a rabbinic violation, as opposed to a Torah violation, thus making it more acceptable? Does there exist a halachic basis for permitting the overriding of a rabbinic prohibition because of hardships?

The same principles can be applied to other medical situations. For example, the diabetic who receives insulin injections is usually medically advised to carry with him some food items containing sugar, as a precaution against insulin shock; and certain asthmatics and other allergy sufferers are advised never to go anywhere without their medication available. Would these patients be allowed to carry their sugar or medicine on Shabbos in a way that involves violating only a rabbinic decree?

Most contemporary authorities who address this issue base their discussion on a responsum of Rav Shmuel Engel, dated 9 Tammuz 5679 (July 7, 1919).¹ At the time of this question, there was a government regulation in force, requiring the carrying of identification papers whenever one walked outside, with serious consequences for those apprehended in violation. Rav Engel was asked whether one could place his identification papers under one's hat on Shabbos while walking to shul. Rav Engel's analysis of the halachic issues involved will clarify many of the aspects of our question.

Shabbos violations fall under two broad headings: those activities that are forbidden min hatorah (Torah-mandated), and those that are forbidden by rabbinic injunction, but do not qualify as melacha (forbidden work) according to the Torah's requirements.

Torah law is not violated unless the melacha is performed in a manner in which that activity is usually done. If the act is done in a peculiar way, such as an item being carried in a way that things are not normally carried, it constitutes a rabbinic violation, but is permitted under Torah law. This deviation is called a shinui.²

Rav Engel points out that carrying identification papers in one's hat would constitute a shinui, thus allowing a possibility of leniency. He quotes two Talmudic sources that permit melacha with a shinui on Shabbos because of extenuating -- but not life-threatening -- circumstances.

Rabbi Marinus said, "One who is suffering is allowed to suck milk directly from a goat on Shabbos. Why? [Is not milking an animal on Shabbos a violation of a Torah prohibition?] Sucking is considered milking in an unusual way, and the rabbis permitted it because of the discomfort of the patient."³

Tosafos notes that the leniency is allowed only if the suffering is caused by illness and not simply by thirst. The Talmudic text and commentary of Tosafos are quoted as halachic decision by the Shulchan Aruch.⁴

There is another Talmudic text with a similar conclusion:

Nachum of Gaul said, "One is allowed on Shabbos to clean a spout that has become clogged by crushing [the clogged matter] with one's foot. Why? [Is it not forbidden to perform repair work on Shabbos?][Since the repair work is done in an unusual manner, the Rabbis permitted it in a case of potential damage."

Based on these Talmudic sources, Rav Engel concludes that the rabbis permitted the performance of melacha with a shinui under extenuating circumstances, even though rabbinic prohibitions are not usually waived for these situations. Furthermore, he points out two other mitigating factors: according to most opinions, the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos in our cities (even in the usual fashion) is rabbinic because "our public areas do not constitute a public domain according to Torah law." And

carrying identification papers would constitute a melacha done without any need for the result, which would also provide a reason to be lenient, as will be explained.

Melacha She'einah tzricha legufah

In several places, the Gemara⁵ records a dispute between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon as to whether a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah, an action done intentionally and in the normal fashion, but without a need for the result of the action, is forbidden by the Torah or only rabbinically. For example, carrying a corpse from a private domain into a public domain would not constitute a Torah desecration of Shabbos according to Rabbi Shimon, since one's purpose is to remove the corpse from the private domain, and not because he has a need for it in the public domain. Similarly, snaring or killing a predator insect or reptile would be a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah, since one has no need for the caught reptile, and therefore constitutes only a rabbinic violation, according to Rabbi Shimon. Both of these cases violate Torah prohibition according to Rabbi Yehudah, who opines that a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah is a Torah-mandated prohibition.

Although the Rambam⁶ follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah, the majority of halachic authorities concur with Rabbi Shimon.⁷

Rav Engel considers carrying identification papers in one's hat as a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah, because the carrier has no personal use for the papers and is carrying them merely to avoid injury or loss. He compares this to the killing of the snake, where the intent is to avoid injury. Although his point is arguable, as evidenced by a later responsum,⁸ Rav Engel reiterates his position that this situation qualifies as a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah.

Placing identification papers in one's hat and carrying them that way is permitted by Rav Engel because of the following mitigating reasons.

1. The Gemara permits performing a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah under extenuating circumstances (illness or financial loss).
2. In any case, the prohibition involved, even if performed in a regular manner, would involve only rabbinic prohibition, not a Torah law. This conclusion is justified, either because of the principle of melacha she'einah tzricha legufah, or because no Torah-mandated public domain exists today.
3. Carrying the identification papers is to be allowed only to attend the synagogue or to perform a different mitzvah.

This responsum provides us with strong halachic precedent, although certain aspects of our case differ from those of Rav Engel's. Firstly, whereas in Rav Engel's case, the identification papers had no intrinsic value to the carrier, the nitroglycerin tablets do have intrinsic value to the patient. This would render them a melacha hatzricha legufah, a melacha performed with interest in the results being done, which constitutes a Torah- forbidden melacha. Thus, one of the reasons for being lenient is nullified.

Secondly, Rav Engel permitted the carrying of identification papers only for the performance of a mitzvah. Would he have allowed a greater leniency for someone who is ill? Bearing in mind the case of Rabbi Marinus, where permission is based on medical needs, could leniency be extended to allow carrying with a shinui, even for social or other reasons?

Several later halachic works discuss the question of a patient carrying medication with a shinui, as a precaution against sudden attack. Rav Yekutiel Y. Greenwald⁹ suggests that a sugar cube be sewn into the pocket of a diabetic's coat before Shabbos, so that he would not be carrying in the usual manner. Rav Greenwald bases his opinion on the Gemara¹⁰ which allows the carrying of an amulet on Shabbos as a medicinal item, and the responsum of Rav Shmuel Engel quoted above. Unfortunately, the comparison to the law of kamayah (amulet) seems strained. The halacha clearly states that the kamayah must be worn in the way that it is normally worn, and that it can be worn only if it is a proven remedy; under these circumstances, the kamayah is considered to be like a garment. There does not seem to be a basis in these considerations to allow carrying for non-life threatening medical need. However, Rav Greenwald allows the diabetic to go outside even for non-mitzvah-related activities.

Rav Eliezer Yehuda Waldenberg¹¹ cites the responsum of Rav Greenwald, but disputes his conclusions sharply. In addition to the difficulty we have noted, he also disputes two assumptions of Rav Greenwald.

1. Whereas Rav Greenwald says that one could allow the sugar cube (or medicine tablet) to be sewn into the garment in order to carry it on Shabbos, Rav Waldenberg finds no halachic source to permit carrying an item in this fashion.

2. Rav Waldenberg writes that the only situation in which Rav Engel permitted the carrying with a shinui was when the activity would have constituted a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah. This applies to carrying identification papers, where the carrier has no personal need for the papers and is carrying them only to avoid being apprehended. It does not apply to the case of medication, where the patient wants the medicine available for his own use.

Rav Waldenberg concludes that the leniency proposed by Rav Engel is not applicable to our situation, and that this patient would not be allowed to carry his medication outside, even when using a shinui. A mediating position is taken by Rav Yehoshua Neuwirth.¹² Although he equates the situation of the person carrying identification papers to the one carrying medication, and does permit the carrying of medication with a shinui for the propose of performing a mitzvah, Rav Neuwirth recommends other specific guidelines, a discussion of which is beyond the scope of this article.

In a responsum on this topic by Rav Menashe Klein,¹³ he concludes that a patient is allowed to carry nitroglycerin tablets with a shinui for the purpose of going to shul or for performing another mitzvah. Rav Klein also includes two other reasons to be lenient:

1. There is currently no public domain according to Torah definitions.
2. He considers this carrying to be a melacha she'einah tzricha legufah, a point which is certainly disputed by the other authorities quoted.

An interesting comment quoted in the name of the Chasam Sofer by the Levushei Mordechai¹⁴ should also shed light on this issue. Levushei Mordechai reports that the Chasam Sofer was in the habit of carrying a handkerchief tied around his wrist outside of the eruv on Shabbos, because it is considered carrying with a shinui and is permitted, because of the need for the handkerchief. The prohibition of rabbinic origin is overridden by the need for personal dignity (kavod haberiyos). No stipulation is made by Levushei Mordechai that the walking is done exclusively for a mitzvah purpose.

One might think that the discomfort of staying home on Shabbos provides greater reason to be lenient than the concept of personal dignity, and that this responsum could therefore be utilized as a basis to allow carrying of nitroglycerin with a shinui. However, few later poskim refer to the comment of the Levushei Mordechai.¹⁵

The following conclusions can be reached:

1. There is halachic basis for permitting the performance of rabbinically-prohibited activities with a shinui, in certain extenuating circumstances.
2. Rav Engel allowed the carrying of identification papers in one's hat to enable one to perform a mitzvah.
3. Several contemporary poskim discuss this question and reach divergent conclusions.

1 Shu't Maharash Engel, 3:43

2 See Shabbos 92a, 104b

3 Kesubos 60a

4 Orach Chayim 328:33

5 Shabbos 12a, 31b, 73b etc.

6 Hilchos Shabbos 1:7

7 I refer the reader to read my Hebrew Kuntrus on the topic, published at the end of Nimla Tal Volume I

8 Shu't Maharash Engel, 7:20

9 Kol Bo on the laws of Aveilus, Volume 2, page 20

10 Shabbos 60a, 67a

11 Shu't Tzitz Eliezer 13:34

12 Shemiras Shabbos KeHilchasah, Chapter 40 #7

13 Shu't Meshaneh Halachos 7:56

14 Shu't Levushei Mordechai #133

15 It is quoted by Shearim HaMetzuyanim BaHalacha 84:13 and by Lev Avraham Volume 1, Chapter 6.

Please address all comments and requests to Hamelaket@gmail.com