BS"D

To: parsha@parsha.net
From: cshulman@gmail.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON **BESHALACH** - 5775

In our 20th year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to http://www.parsha.net and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous issues is now available at http://www.parsha.net It is also fully searchable.

Sponsored by **Dr. Phil & Leah Kazlow**
in memory of Phil's father –
Yosef ben Chaim Zvi - Joseph Kazlow z"l
on the occasion of his second Yartzeit - 13 Shvat

Sponsored in memory of
Chaim Yissachar z"l ben Yechiel Zaydel Dov

To sponsor a parsha sheet (proceeds to tzedaka) contact cshulman@parsha.net

---

from: Rabbi Yissocher Frand <ryfrand@torah.org> reply-to: do-not-reply@torah.org to: ravfrand@torah.org date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 9:05 PM subject: **Rabbi Frand on Parshas Beshalach**

Parshas Beshalach

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: CD #887Rejoicing At The Death of Reshoim -Recommended or Not? Good Shabbos!

http://www.yadyechiel.org/ It's our pleasure to welcome you to Rabbi Frand's new website. Feel free to contact us if you need any help. Welcome to the Torah Library of Rabbi Yissocher Frand, presented by the Yad Yechiel Institute. Every offering in the library is a live recording of a shiur presented by Rabbi Frand, a dynamic and inspiring teacher who brings a unique perspective to every subject he covers. The extensive online library catalogued in the following pages contains Parsha shiurim for the entire Torah, the Commuter's Chavrusa Series -delving into topical Halachic issues found in each Parsha; the Parsha Perceptions Series – inspirational thoughts on the week's Torah reading (great for your Shabbos table), Hashkafa Series -lectures of the issues of Jewish living – and Theme Sets – collections of lectures on specific issues with new shiurim and additional series being added regularly. Be sure to review the titles in each category to find the topics of greatest interest to you. Available on CD or MP3

The Orphans Were Not Forgotten

The pasuk in the beginning of the parsha says that when the Jewish people left Egypt, they were 'chamushim' [Shmos 13:18]. Rashi cites two interpretations of the word 'chamushim'. There are in fact at least 3 seemingly disparate interpretations of this word found among the commentaries.

According to one interpretation in Rashi, 'chamushim' comes from the word 'chomesh' (one-fifth) and indicates that only one fifth of the Jewish population in Egypt merited to leave, while the other eighty percent died during the 3 days of Darkness (Plague #9).

The Targum Yerushalmi interprets the word 'chamushim' to mean they were armed. Rashi alludes to this interpretation, but seems to interpret it to mean that they were literally armed with weapons. The Targum Yerushalmi, on the other hand, interprets it figuratively – they were 'armed with good deeds'.

The Targum Yonasan ben Uziel gives a third interpretation: 'Chamushim' means that everyone went out with 5 chil dren.

Superficially, these are three disparate interpretations: (a) one-fifth of the population left; (b) armed with good deeds; (c) bringing along 5 children each.

The interpretation of the Targum Yonasan ben Uziel is statistically mind-boggling. Shall we presume that everyone had exactly 5 children? In addition, even if that was the family size of each family unit, but the implication is that they were all children, of roughly the same age! What is the meaning of this?

The Be'er Yosef by Rav Yosef Salant gives a beautiful interpretation. He links all 3 seemingly independent interpretations of the word 'chamushim' into a single narrative with a single theme. He writes that if four-fifths of the Jewish people died during the Plague of Darkness, one can likely presume that specifically the adults died. Granted, the adults might have sinned and been unworthy of the Exodus, but how can we speak of the "sins of young children"?

Therefore, Rav Salant s uggests that the children of these 'wicked Jews' did not die, which would imply that four-fifths of the Jewish children at the time of the Exodus were orphans. Imagine the scene – tens of thousands of little Jewish orphans wandering around. Who is going to take care of them? What is going to be with them? The answer is that every one of the remaining Jewish families 'chipped in' and said, "We'll take these orphans with us." Thus, mathematically, every remaining family adopted four families worth of orphans.

Therefore, when the Targum Yonasan ben Uziel says "five children", he does not mean that everyone went out with 5 children. He means that everyone went out with 5 families worth of children – their own set and the set of four other families worth of orphans whose parents died during the Plague of Darkness! This then fits in perfectly with the interpretation of the Targum Yerushalmi – they went out armed with good deeds! The good deeds were the fact that they adopte d the poor orphans left over from the people killed during the ninth plague.

The Targum Yonasan ben Uziel is suggesting an amazing thing, which was a source of extraordinary merit. Consider that after the Holocaust, there were undoubtedly thousands of orphans. What happened to these kids? This is equivalent to everyone who survived the Holocaust taking in X number of orphans. Anyone who takes in an orphan is doing an amazing act of chessed. However, we must understand that these people were refugees themselves. They were not people who were living a normal life who then decided to "take in a few orphans". These were displaced people themselves. These people did not know where tomorrow's bread was coming from! When Klal Yisrael adopted the attitude "We can't leave these kids in Egypt" and dismissed all the natural concerns about their own welfare and the welfare of their own families in a time of great uncertainty, this was a tremendous act of courage and selflessness. This brought them great merit. This "armed them" with the merit of great acts of kindness.

Thus, all three interpretations: "one-fifth", "five children", and "armed with acts of kindness" dovetail together, according to the insight of Rav Yosef Salant.

Rav Matisyahu Solomon, the Lakewood Mashgiach, adds a beautiful appendage to this insight. The Medrash Rabbah in Eicha on the pasuk, "We were orphans who had no father" [Eicha 5:3] states that G-d tells the Jewish people "Because you cried out to me that you were like orphans who had no father, I will send to you a redeemer who has no father or mother." This refers to Esther in the time of Haman's decree, about whom it is written, "And he raised Hadassah who is the same as Esther the daughter of his uncle, for she had neither father nor mother..." [Esther 2:7].

Rav Matisyahu Solomon interprets this Medrash: There is a special 'segulah' [virtuous Attribute] in the way the Almighty responds to orphans. The Almighty testifies that He will inevitably respond to the cry of the orphan: "If you will persecute him such that he cries out to Me, I will surely hear his

cry." [Shmos 22:22] Hashem is the Father of Orphans. When people inflict pain on orphans, G-d says, "This is My Business!" Watch out for a father or mother when someone dares to startup with his or her children. So too, one must "watch out", as it were, for G-d's punishment if he dares start up with orphans and abuses or persecutes them. The Rambam defines this as a "sealed covenant" (Bris Kerusah) that the Almighty will respond to the cries of help from an orphan. [Matanos L'Aniyim 10:3]

When Klal Yisrael said (in the above quoted pasuk in Eicha), "We are like orphans who have no father" (referring to the Jews crying out in the time of Haman's decree), it guaranteed a response from the Almighty. Hashem agreed that a response had to be forthcoming, but He said (as it were) "I need a catalyst." The catalyst was Mor dechai. Since Mordechai raised Hadassah (Esther), who was an orphan and had no parents, this act of kindness triggered the Divine Response that brought about the salvation from Haman's decree. The Medrash says that Mordechai could have escaped the decree and returned to Eretz Yisrael, but he refused to leave Persia because he was concerned about Esther's welfare. This was the 'spark' -– the "arousal from below" – that in turn set off the "arousal from Above" which brought the redemption.

Rav Matisyahu Solomon says that with this background, we can now understand why Klal Yisrael in Egypt needed the merit of taking out all these thousands of orphans. When Klal Yisrael (despite all the reasons for not doing so) acted like the "father of orphans" and each took in four families worth of children with no parents, this (as the Targum Yerushalmi comments) was a tremendous merit, which triggered the Divine Response of G-d, the Father of all orphans.

This write-up was adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Torah Tape series on the weekly Torah portion
ranscribed by David Twersky Seattle, WA; Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman, Baltimore, MD RavFrand, Copyright © 2007 by Rabbi Yissocher Frand and Torah.org.
Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 122 Slade Avenue, Suite 250 Baltimore, MD 21208 http://www.torah.org/ learn@torah.org (410) 602-1350

---

from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org> reply-to: shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org to: internetparshasheet@gmail.com date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 4:58 PM subject: Difficult Houseguests, Face of Evil, Tu B'Shevat mailed-by: bounce.mkt3536.com

The Face of Evil

Britain's Former Chief Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks

After 9/11, when the horror and trauma had subsided, Americans found themselves asking what had happened and why. Was it a disaster? A tragedy? A crime? An act of war? It did not seem to fit the pre-existing paradigms. And why had it happened? The question most often asked about Al Qaeda was, "Why do they hate us?"

In the wake of those events an American thinker Lee Harris wrote two books, Civilization and its Enemies and The Suicide of Reason[1] that were among the most thought-provoking responses of the decade. The reason for the questions and the failure to find answers, said Harris, was that we in the West had forgotten the concept of an enemy. Liberal democratic politics and market economics create a certain kind of society, a specific way of thinking and a characteristic type of personality. At their heart is the concept of the rational actor, the person who judges acts by their consequences and chooses the maximal option. He or she believes that for every problem there is a solution, for every conflict a resolution. The way to achieve it is to sit down, negotiate, and do on balance what is best for all.

In such a world there are no enemies, merely conflicts of interest. An enemy, says Harris, is simply "a friend we haven't done enough for yet." In the real world, however, not everyone is a liberal democrat. An enemy is "someone who is willing to die in order to kill you. And while it is true that the enemy always hates us for a reason, it is his reason, not ours." He sees a different world from ours, and in that world we are the enemy. Why do they hate us? Answers Harris: "They hate us because we are their enemy."

Whatever the rights and wrongs of Harris's specifics, the general point is true and profound. We can become mind-blind, thinking that the way we – our society, our culture, our civilization – see things is the only way, or at least that it is the way everyone would choose if given the chance. Only a complete failure to understand the history of ideas can explain this error, and it is a dangerous one. When Montezuma, ruler of the Aztecs, met Cortes, leader of the Spanish expedition in 1520, he assumed that he was meeting a civilized man from a civilized nation. That mistake cost him his life and within a year there was no Aztec civilization any more. Not everyone sees the world the way we do, and, as Richard Weaver once said: "The trouble with humanity is that it forgets to read the minutes of the last meeting."

This explains the significance of the unusual command at the end of this week's parsha. The Israelites had escaped the seemingly inexorable danger of the chariots of the Egyptian army, the military high-tech of its day. Miraculously the sea divided, the Israelites crossed, the Egyptians, their chariot wheels caught in the mud, were unable either to advance or retreat and were caught by the returning tide.

The Israelites sang a song and finally seemed to be free, when something untoward and unexpected happened. They were attacked by a new enemy, the Amalekites, a nomadic group living in the desert. Moses instructed Joshua to lead the people in battle. They fought and won. But the Torah makes it clear that this was no ordinary battle:

Then the Lord said to Moses, 'Write this on a scroll as something to be remembered and make sure that Joshua hears it, because I will completely blot out the name of Amalek from under heaven.' Moses built an altar and called it The Lord is my Banner. He said, 'The hand is on the Lord's throne. The Lord will be at war with Amalek for all generations.' (Ex. 17: 14-16)

This is a very strange statement, and it stands in marked contrast to the way the Torah speaks about the Egyptians. The Amalekites attacked Israel during the lifetime of Moses just once. The Egyptians oppressed the Israelites over an extended period, oppressing and enslaving them and starting a slow genocide by killing every male Israelite child. The whole thrust of the narrative would suggest that if any nation would become the symbol of evil, it would be Egypt.

But the opposite turns out to be true. In Deuteronomy the Torah states, "Do not abhor an Egyptian, because you were a stranger in his land" (Deut. 23: 8). Shortly thereafter, Moses repeats the command about the Amalekites, adding a significant detail:

Remember what the Amalekites did to you along the way when you came out of Egypt. When you were weary and worn out, they met you on your journey and attacked all who were lagging behind; they had no fear of God … You shall blot out the name of Amalek from under heaven. Do not forget! (Deut. 25: 17-19)

We are commanded not to hate Egypt, but never to forget Amalek. Why the difference? The simplest answer is to recall the rabbis' statement in The Ethics of the Fathers: "If love depends on a specific cause, when the cause ends, so does the love. If love does not depend on a specific cause, then it never ends."[2] The same applies to hate. When hate depends on a specific cause, it ends once the cause disappears. Causeless, baseless hate lasts forever.

The Egyptians oppressed the Israelites because, in Pharaoh's words, "The Israelites are becoming too numerous and strong for us" (Ex. 1: 9). Their hate, in other words, came from fear. It was not irrational. The Egyptians had been attacked and conquered before by a foreign group known as the Hyksos, and the memory of that period was still acute and painful. The Amalekites, however, were not being threatened by the Israelites. They attacked a people who were "weary and worn out," specifically those who were "lagging behind." In short: the Egyptians feared the Israelites because they were strong. The Amalekites attacked the Israelites because they were weak.

In today's terminology, the Egyptians were rational actors, the Amalekites were not. With rational actors there can be negotiated peace. People engaged

in conflict eventually realise that they are not only destroying their enemies: they are destroying themselves. That is what Pharaoh's advisers said to him after seven plagues: "Do you not yet realise that Egypt is ruined?" (Ex. 10: 7). There comes a point at which rational actors understand that the pursuit of self-interest has become self-destructive, and they learn to co-operate.

It is not so, however, with non-rational actors. Emil Fackenheim, one of the great post-Holocaust theologians, noted that towards the end of the Second World War the Germans diverted trains carrying supplies to their own army, in order to transport Jews to the extermination camps. So driven were they by hate that they were prepared to put their own victory at risk in order to carry out the systematic murder of the Jews of Europe. This was, he said, evil for evil's sake.[3]

The Amalekites function in Jewish memory as "the enemy" in Lee Harris's sense. Jewish law, however, specifies two completely different forms of action in relation to the Amalekites. First is the physical command to wage war against them. That is what Samuel told Saul to do, a command he failed fully to fulfil. Does this command still apply today?

The unequivocal answer given by Rabbi Nachum Rabinovitch is No.[4] Maimonides ruled that the command to destroy the Amalekites only applied if they refused to make peace and accept the seven Noahide laws. He further stated that the command was no longer applicable since Sennacherib, the Assyrian, had transported and resettled the nations he conquered so that it was no longer possible to identify the ethnicity of any of the original nations against whom the Israelites were commanded to fight. He also said, in The Guide for the Perplexed, that the command only applied to people of specific biological descent. It is not to be applied in general to enemies or haters of the Jewish people. So the command to wage war against the Amalekites no longer applies.

However, there is a quite different command, to "remember" and "not forget" Amalek, which we fulfil annually by the reading the passage about the Amalekites command as it appears in Deuteronomy on the Shabbat before Purim, Shabbat Zakhor (the connection with Purim is that Haman the "Agagite" is assumed to be a descendant of Agag, king of the Amalekites). Here Amalek has become a symbol rather than a reality.

By dividing the response in this way, Judaism marks a clear distinction between an ancient enemy who no longer exists, and the evil that enemy embodied, which can break out again at any time in any place. It is easy at times of peace to forget the evil that lies just beneath the surface of the human heart. Never was this truer than in the past three centuries. The birth of Enlightenment, toleration, emancipation, liberalism and human rights persuaded many, Jews among them, that collective evil was as extinct as the Amalekites. Evil was then, not now. That age eventually begat nationalism, fascism, communism, two World Wars, some of the brutal tyrannies ever known, and the worst crime of man against man.

Today, the great danger is terror. Here the words of Princeton political philosopher Michael Walzer are particularly apt:

Wherever we see terrorism, we should look for tyranny and oppression … The terrorists aim to rule, and murder is their method. They have their own internal police, death squads, disappearances. They begin by killing or intimidating those comrades who stand in their way, and they proceed to do the same, if they can, among the people they claim to represent. If terrorists are successful, they rule tyrannically, and their people bear, without consent, the costs of the terrorists' rule.[5]

Evil never dies, and like liberty it demands constant vigilance. We are commanded to remember, not for the sake of the past but for the sake of the future, and not for revenge but the opposite: a world free of revenge and other forms of violence.

Lee Harris began Civilization and its Enemies with the words, "The subject of this book is forgetfulness," and ends with a question: "Can the West overcome the forgetfulness that is the nemesis of every successful civilization?" That is why are commanded to remember and never forget Amalek, not because the historic people still exists, but because a society of rational actors can sometimes believe that the world is full of rational actors with whom one can negotiate peace. It is not always so.

Rarely was a biblical message so relevant to the future of the West and of freedom itself. Peace is possible, implies Moses, even with an Egypt that enslaved and tried to destroy us. But peace is not possible with those who attack people they see as weak and who deny their own people the freedom for which they claim to be fighting. Freedom depends on our ability to remember and whenever necessary confront "the eternal gang of ruthless men," the face of Amalek throughout history.

[1] Lee Harris, Civilization and Its Enemies: The next Stage of History. New York: Free Press, 2004. The Suicide of Reason, New York: Basic Books, 2008. [2] Mishnah Avot 5: 16. [3] Fackenheim, Emil L., and Michael L. Morgan. The Jewish Thought of Emil Fackenheim: A Reader. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1987, 126. [4] Rabbi N L Rabinovitch, Responsa Melomdei Milchamah, Maaleh Adumim, Maaliyot, 1993, 22-25. [5] Michael Walzer, Arguing about War, Yale University Press, 2004, 64-65.

---

from: **Rabbi Berel Wein** <genesis@torah.org> reply-to: do-not-reply@torah.org to: rabbiwein@torah.org date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 10:05 PM subject: Rabbi Wein - Parshas Beshalac

Parshas Beshalach

Songs Throughout the Generations

There are many different types of songs familiar to human society. There are songs of triumph and of resignation and acceptance. There are songs of joy and love and anthems of hatred and violence. There are songs of nostalgia and remembrance and songs of hope in future greatness. There are also hymns of faith and melodies of rebellion and change. In short, in human history, one can almost identify with the events of the time by hearing the music and songs that were then prevalent and popular.

In this week's Torah reading, we encounter a song that is all of the above and yet none of the above. It is an ancient song recited or sung by the Jewish people on a daily basis for over 3300. At its heart, it is a song of faith, of belief, and survival and of the promise of eternal greatness and continuing challenge. At the beginning of Jewish history, it already establishes the equation of the relationship of the Jewish people to the rest of the world and to historical events.

Because of its emphasis on the eternity of God and of Israel, it is not confined to any one time period or historical era. It was a song sung at a particular moment in time but its essence and message is timeless and constantly pertinent and relevant. The words of the song delineate the struggle for survival in which Jews will always be engaged, against enemies who never completely disappear but rather morph into new forms and ideologies. The most uplifting message of the song is its timelessness and relevance. The most depressing part of the song is also its timelessness and relevance.

There is another song recorded for us in the Torah that is similar to this type of message and outlook. It is the song that concludes the great oration of Moshe to the Jewish people in the last days of his life in the desert of Sinai. That song, which appears in parshat Haazinu is also a song of survival and eventual success in the never-ending struggle that we call Jewish history. This week's song and that later song of Moshe really constitute the bookends of the Torah and of the Jewish story generally.

We are bidden to know and understand these songs and their import. We are to teach them to our children and to all later generations of the Jewish people. These songs are to be as unforgettable thousands of years from now as they were when first composed and sung. Jews who have somehow forgotten these songs – or perhaps even worse, never knew of their existence – will find it difficult to identify with God's Torah, His people and His holy land.

Song is a tool for remembrance and prophecy – for an appreciation of our wondrous past and a commitment to our promised and even more spectacular, future. That is why we are bidden to recite it day in and day out,

in all times and places, for it contains within it the essential kernel of Jewish life and existence. We should therefore pay attention carefully to its words and message and sing along with Moshe in this great anthem of Jewish and world history.

Shabbat shalom

Rabbi Berel Wein

In My Opinion FORTUNE AND EQUALITY

Rabbi Wein's Weekly Blog

One of the more popular and populist social and electoral issues here in Israel and in the rest of the Western world as well, is rectifying the seeming inequality of the distribution of wealth. The upper five percent of the population, in terms of wealth worldwide, control close to eighty percent of the wealth of the societies that they inhabit. In order to correct this seemingly unfair imbalance, government programs are introduced and legislative laws are passed to redistribute wealth – taking from the wealthy by substantially increasing their tax burden and giving to the less wealthy in the form of government subsidies and welfare programs. This is, in effect, a glorified Robin Hood philosophy that has always proved popular and even heroic. In those countries and societies where this utopian scheme was actually tried and enforced, the net result seems to have been that the wealthy became poor and the poor remained poor. The Soviet Union, which for seventy-five years destroyed the pre-existing wealthy class, only succeeded in creating a new class of bureaucrats and apparatchniks andan economy that bred universal poverty, social dysfunction and eventually collapsed under the weight of its own misguided policies. Here in Israel, the socialist founders of the state also addressed the problem of income inequality with enormous taxation and controls over various forms of private enterprise. This was the legacy of the Marxist mindset that was part of the belief system of the Eastern European Zionist founders of the state. Only over the last few decades has this situation changed, with many more Israelis prospering. Now more than ever before in the history of the country, there is a larger and growing wealthy class. Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly a great gap between the wealthy and the less wealthy. And this gap is trumpeted, by all of the parties, as being an important electoral issue that needs determined correction and government action. The Torah takes a more realistic and measured view of the human situation involved here. We are assured that there will always be a substantial number of people – if not even the vast majority of the population – that will be less wealthy than the rich people of the society. All human beings are created equal but they never are equal in talent, wealth, opportunity and accomplishment. That is simply a fact of human life. The Talmud, in its usual pithy and accurate way, teaches us that success in raising children, achieving longevity of life and becoming wealthy in material terms are all dependent upon good fortune. Seemingly perfect parents and warm and loving households can also produce children that are rebellious and even monstrous. One can rigorously follow the best of health, diet and exercise regimens and still not be guaranteed a long life. And one can work hard, be smart and intelligent, have great deal of knowledge and energy and still be a very poor wage earner. Apparently the Talmud takes for granted that income inequality will always be a part of human life. It encourages and demands that the wealthy constantly help the poor but it offers no magic bullet that will make everyone equally wealthy. There exists an imaginary poverty line that is drawn by statisticians in every society. There will always be a substantial portion of the population that finds itself below that poverty line. The issue is how high that poverty line is drawn on the graph of wealth and income. There is no question that the poor in Israel today are much wealthier than the poor in Israel were a half-century ago. Yet we are constantly reminded of how many in Israel find themselves in the group that is below the poverty line. I wish that there were no poor people in Israel or anywhere else in the world, but that is a hopeless wish. Those of us who find ourselves fortunate to have means and wealth are obligated to help our fellow citizens who need our help. But destroying the wealthy class, taxing them inordinately and attempting to redistribute wealth and income, only weakens the society and its economy. We should not remain passive in the face of the economic and social troubles that confront so many of our neighbors here in Israel and throughout the world. It is interesting to note that people are more resistant to paying taxes to a government than they are to contributing towards charitable causes and helping other human beings. As with everything in life there must be a balance between private wealth, government welfare, taxation policies and voluntary charitable behavior. Populist slogans rarely if ever contribute to achieving this most necessary balance. Lincoln famously once said: "The Lord must love the poor. He created so many of them". We should attempt to diminish the numbers of the poor but at the same time realize that certain facts in the human condition and in general society are not given to easy and popular theoretical solution. Shabbat shalom Berel Wein

---

TorahWeb <torahweb@torahweb.org> Jan 28

Rabbi Yakov Haber

Song of the Sea: Song of Unity, Song of the Future

I

"Az yashir Moshe u'vnei Yisrael es hashira hazos laShem vayom'ru leimor" (Shemos 15:1). This introductory phrase to Shiras HaYam, the exalted song of praise to G-d for the miraculous splitting of the Sea and the rescue of the nascent Jewish nation from the formidable Egyptian forces, presents a grammatical anomaly. Literally translated, the beginning of the phrase reads, "then Moshe will sing", in the future tense rather than in the expected past or present tense. Rashi, in explaining the usage of the future tense, presents two explanations. The first, according to p'shat, is that his heart instructed him to sing shira as if saying, "Moshe, arise and you should sing to G-d!" The second, following the Midrash, is that the future tense indicates that Moshe will sing this song again in the future at the time of t'chiyas hameisim, the resurrection of the dead. What connection is there between the Song of the Sea and the future resurrection?

In order to answer this question, Rav Chaim Ya'akov Goldwicht zt"l, the founding Rosh HaYeshiva of Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh, presented an inspiring insight as to the nature of the miracle of the splitting of the sea and the shira sung there.[1] The Midrash relates (Shemos Rabba 23:3):

Moshe said: "Master of the World, with that which I sinned before You, I shall praise You... I know that I sinned before You with [the word] "az", as it says, "From the time (umei'az) I came to Pharaoh to speak in Your Name, he harmed this people, and You have not saved your nation!" (Sh'mos 5:23), and [now] You have drowned him in the sea. Therefore I am praising you with [the word] "az", as it is written: "Az yashir Moshe". Come and see the way of the righteous, with that which they sin, they correct [their actions]. Normally, a correction implies acting in a different way in the same situation. How does Moshe's singing to Hashem when the Jewish people were saved from Pharaoh correct his complaining to G-d when the persecution and servitude became greater?

Shiras HaYam was more than just praise to the Creator for saving the Jewish people. It was a spontaneous outpouring of the soul reflecting the elevated state that Am Yisrael reached at that point. (Note Rashi's comment to verse 2 that the Jewish people "pointed" to the Divine Presence revealed then and the fact that even the babies and fetuses sang to G-d (Yerushalmi Sota 5:4).) In light of that exalted state, they merited for a moment the opening of the "curtain of history" masking the inner workings of Divine Providence.

To explain: On the intellectual plane, we know that "everything the Merciful One does is for the good" (Berachos 60b). But we do not always sense that on the level of experience and feeling. The different blessings pronounced on "good" news and "bad" news reflect this duality. However, in the perfect world of the future, Olam HaBa[2], we will praise G-d with the identical blessing of HaTov v'haMeitiv even for apparent evil. At that point, we will be able to feel and experience as well as cognitively know the latent good that was inherent in the seemingly evil events of Jewish history (See P'sachim 50a.)

The event and accompanying revelation of keriyas Yam Suf enabled the Jewish people, for a moment in history, to reach that same level of perception. They were able to sing to Hashem not only for the Exodus and miraculous salvation but even for all of the apparent evil. Moshe Rabbeinu led Klal Yisrael in this futuristic paean, singing it within the framework of Olam HaZeh - normally masked by the unclarity of our experience - since the "curtain" had been temporarily opened. Therefore, Moshe reflects back on his original usage of the word "az" when he expressed shock over apparent injustice and uses the same word at the time that he perceived how wrong he was to do so since he

now realized that the seeming downturn together with all of the rest of the servitude and persecution in Egypt was just Good in disguise.[3]

Therefore the future tense is used. This song, although sung in the past, ultimately reflects a level of revelation that will be the norm in the world of the future, the time of the resurrection.

The ancient pagans, including the Egyptians, solved the problem of the seemingly opposing forces of good and evil by inventing a god of good and a god of evil. Sometimes one was victorious; at other times, the other was. But Bnei Yisrael were shown the truth: that Hashem Echad, the Yotzeir or u'Borei Ra (Yeshaya 45:7), managed both powers in the world which were all harnessed for the good. The last verse in the Song of the Sea seems not to be part of the song. "When the horses of Pharaoh came with his chariots and horsemen into the sea, Hashem returned the waters of the sea upon them. And the Jewish people walked on dry land in the seabed" (15:19). This verse seems to just describe the timing of the song, but yet it is written in the Torah in the same unique spacing style as the Song itself and is commonly recited in the P'sukei d'Zimra every day together with the rest of the Shira. Why? Rav Goldwicht explained that this event, where simultaneously good was occurring to the Jews and evil was wrought upon the Egyptians, expressed the unity of good and evil, of one Actor bringing about both. This was the main thrust of the song: that even evil is but a tool in G-d's hands to bring about the good.[4]

The final paragraph of Psalms consists of a description of various musical instruments being used to praise the Almighty. I once heard that this is the final song of history, when we will realize that, just as in a symphony, each instrument alone might even sound cacophonous, but, blended in with all of the other instruments, contributes to the beautiful music. So too, at the end of history, even the seemingly discordant notes of apparent evil will be understood and felt in their true form, as part of the good.

Faith and trust in the Master of Providence is a central feature of avodas Hashem. In our individual and national lives we experience moments of triumph, of success, of revealed good. But we also experience hesteir panim, apparent evil, when the world seems upside down, where evil seemingly succeeds and good seems, at least temporarily, vanquished. Yet we are called upon to constantly place our trust in HKB"H and rely on our cognitively knowing that ultimately all events are for the good. Our rich tradition also teaches us that this knowledge will ultimately be transformed into feeling and experience. Our daily recital of the Song of the Sea highlights the fact that this Song of the Future will once again become a reflection of our experience.

II

The mann indicated that all parnassa comes from Hashem. Even though the midbar experience was not a "regular" existence it highlighted that even for one whose livelihood is "ordinary", it is as if he is receiving the mann, sustained by G-d. Now, just as then, "the one who took more did not benefit; the one who took less did not lack" (16:18). We all get what G-d ordains for us.[5] In essence, then, the midbar experience taught the Jewish people that even when living an "ordinary" life, there is nothing ordinary about it. It is driven by specialized Divine Providence. In a similar way, even when encountering evil and hardship in the world, the knowledge of the experience of the Shirat HaYam teaches us that that something transcendent and unique is occurring - that one is living through special Divine Providence guiding us toward the perfect world when all will be clear.

The common denominator between Hashem's providential guidance of the good and evil in our lives and His providing our sustenance is that both require reflection and thought to realize and internalize. Perhaps this allows us to link the two interpretations quoted above given by Rashi to the opening verse, "Az yashir". Our hearts have to arouse and awaken us to sing to G-d, to recognize His hand in our lives. In this way, we constantly tap in to an echo of the great Shiras HaYam, the song that will be fully relevant in the future.

These examples of living in this world but realizing that something far greater than ourselves and what we experience is happening should guide us in living a fulfilling, G-d centered life knowing that the All-Knowing Master of Providence is always there guiding everything and holding us in His Divine embrace.

[1]Heard in a shiur at Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh. Also see Asufas Ma'arachos (Shemos), Beshalach (Shira) for much more elaboration. It is presented here with some personal additions.

[2]This might also refer to the Messianic era.

[3]Based on this, Rav Goldwicht homiletically explained the verse, "vaya'er es halayla"," and it [the fire] illuminated the night" (14:20). At that glorious moment, the night of exile was illuminated for the Jewish people. They felt, not just knew, that all the bitter tragedies of the Egyptian bondage were indeed for the good and appreciated the beauty of even the "night".

[4]See Amaleik, Kaddish, and the Unity of G-d's Name for further elaboration of this theme.

[5]See Mann and Parnassa for further elaboration on the lessons of the mann.

---

from: **Chanan Morrison** <ravkooklist@gmail.com> reply-to: rav-kook-list+owners@googlegroups.com to: **Rav Kook List** <Rav-Kook-List@googlegroups.com> date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 3:59 AM subject: [Rav Kook List]

Beshalach: Sanctity in Space

Beshalach: Sanctity in Space The Israelites, having miraculously escaped death at the hands of the Egyptian army, sang a beautiful song of praise and thanksgiving for their Divine rescue - Shirat HaYam. The song concludes with the national aspiration to be settled in the Land of Israel, experiencing God's Presence in the Temple on Mount Moriah:

"Bring [the people] and plant them on the Mount You possess. To the place of Your dwelling that You prepared, God - the Temple, God, that Your hands have founded." (Ex. 15:17) The Sages noted that the word Mikdash (Temple) is sandwiched in between God's Name. "Great is the Temple, since it was placed between two Divine Names" (Berachot 33a). What is the significance of this fact?

In general, we need to examine how it is possible that a unique level of sanctity may be restricted to a particular location. What relationship can there be between holiness - a boundless, non-physical quality - and the boundaries of physical space? How can God's Presence be confined to a specific structure?

Spatial Sanctity

In truth, we cannot fathom the mystery of holiness limited to a particular place. However, we can recognize the logical benefit in designating a location as a focal point for people to gather together with the sacred aim of honoring God. Such a center serves to advance humanity's moral and spiritual progress.

Of course, the Creator of the human soul knows its inner workings. God knows that designating sanctity to a particular place is necessary for our spiritual growth.

This perhaps explains the significance of two Names of God surrounding the word Mikdash. God's Name indicates the way we call out to God and how we relate to Him. Our relationship to God, within the context of the Temple, has two aspects. The first is due to the intrinsic sanctity of the Temple, the pinnacle of holiness in the universe. We connect with this inner holiness on a deep emotional level. It inspires our imagination to spiritual greatness, instilling powerful yearnings for goodness and holiness. This is the first Divine Name associated with the Temple.

The second aspect of the Temple stems from its collective benefit for us as social beings. The Temple served as a central location for people to gather together for common spiritual goals, bolstering the moral resolve and aspirations of the entire nation. This aspect of the Temple's spiritual influence - one that is accessible to human logic - corresponds to the second Divine Name.

In fact, the text hints to both of these aspects. Regarding the intrinsic holiness of the Temple, it says, "The place of Your dwelling that You prepared." God Himself prepared the Temple's unfathomable sanctity, inspiring and uplifting those entering its gates.

Regarding the Temple's function as a spiritual center for the nation, the verse continues, "The Temple, that Your hands have founded." This is an indirect process, through 'God's hands' - the consequential benefit of the Temple as a center for our collective aspirations, a focal point to advance humanity's true fulfillment.

(Adapted from Olat Re'iyah vol. I, p. 236; Ein Eyah vol. I, p. 157)

RavKookTorah.org This Dvar Torah: BSHALAH260.htm To subscribe/unsubscribe/comments: Rav Kook List

---

http://5tjt.com/manna-from-heaven/

Manna From Heaven

Halachic Musings

By Rabbi Yair Hoffman

It is perhaps the parnassah segulah that has gone most “viral” among segulos. Numerous Torah websites link to the parashah of the mon and explain that you will become wealthier if you recite this section (Sh’mos 16:4–36) on Tuesday of Parashas Beshallach. It must be said twice in the Hebrew and once in the targum. But where does this segulah come from? Is there truly anything to it? Is it of recent origin or does it date back many centuries?

What is fascinating is that the aspect of reciting it on the Tuesday of Parashas Beshallach is of recent origin. The earlier sources recommended reciting it daily—not just on one day of the year. Rabbeinu Bachya (Sh’mos 16:16) writes, “It is a tradition in the hand of the sages that whoever recites the parashah of the mon each day is assured that he will not lose out in this world of his mezonos.”

Origins

The Tashbatz (siman 184) cites the daily reading of this parashah and its effect in the name of the Yerushalmi, and add the words, “And I am the guarantor.” The Tur (O.C., siman 1:5) also cites this tradition in the name of the Yerushalmi in Berachos. The

Mishnah Berurah (1:13) also cites this source. The problem is that it is not to be found in our versions or any manuscripts of the Yerushalmi.

To add to the mystery, the Sefer HaManhig in hilchos Shabbos (44) cites the source as a Yerushalmi in Yuma. Yet it is not in our Yerushalmi Yuma either.

The traditional answer often given when Rishonim refer to portions of Yerushalmi that have disappeared is that the term is used loosely by the Rishon and that Yerushalmi often included Midrashim that were edited in Eretz Yisrael. This won't work here, because the Tur specifically refers to the Yerushalmi in Berachos. It must be that the version of the Yerushalmi that the Tur had is lost to us.

Why The Mon?

Why single out the miracle of the mon, more so than the other miracles we experienced? Rav Saadia Gaon, in the introduction to his Emunos v'Dei'os, explains that the mon was a miracle of daily occurrence. The other miracles were more transient.

Although not mentioned by Rav Saadia, the mon played an important role even after the 40-year sojourn in the desert. The container of the mon (tzintzenes ha'mon) was placed alongside the Aron in both the Mishkan and the Beis HaMikdash until the days of King Yoshiyahu, one hundred years before the destruction of the first Beis HaMikdash. It served as a reminder then too.

Not Found In Siddurim

The Aruch HaShulchan points out that in his time, the Parashas HaMon was not found in Siddurim. He explains its absence in the Siddur as stemming from the fact that the parashah mentions a number of times the embarrassing detail that Klal Yisrael nagged and complained, and it would be improper to place that permanently in our Siddurim. Nowadays, many of the Siddurim have printed it, notwithstanding the AruchHaShulchan's reasoning.

How It Works

Many of the meforshim explain the daily recital of the parashah of mon serves to entrench within our minds that our parnassah, our sustenance, comes only from Hashem. The Mishnah Berurah writes that it is not enough to merely say it; its message must be fully embedded within us.

Others (Minchas Asher, for example) write that reciting it will build up our bitachon in Hashem. While some would explain that these are two sides of the same coin, it seems to this author that they are in fact two distinct concepts.

There seems to be a third method, taking a less mystical approach: The reading of the parashah serves to calm a person's anxieties about struggling for parnassah and thus helps him focus better, with the understanding that all is from Hashem. This seems to be the understanding of the Tzemach Tzedek (Parashas HaMon, 5644, referenced in index, page 100).

The Shevet Mussar (chapter 40) cites in the name of the mekubalim that it should be recited, as mentioned earlier, shenayim mikra v'echad Targum—twice in the Hebrew and once in the Aramaic of Onkelus. The Noheg Tzon Yosef (siman 34), however, quotes the shenayim mikra detail as having first been written by Rabbeinu Tam in his Sefer HaYashar. The Shelah's father, in his Yesh Nochlin, also writes this. According to the Shelah's father, however, this is merely the ideal method; from the Noheg Tzon Yosef it seems that it will not be effective at all if not done shenayim mikra v'echad Targum.

The Variant Blessing

Also interesting is that thus far, our sources indicate that a person will simply not lose out or suffer a loss of mezonos. In the Midrash Talpios (section on Havdallah), however, it states that the entire Parashas HaMon is mesugal for success and wealth. The nature of the blessing is thus ratcheted up a bit.

When Should It Be Said?

Both the Be'er Heitev and the Mishnah Berurah indicate that it should be recited in the morning, before the Korbanos. The Otzros Chaim, however, cites the Rekanti in the name of the Zohar that it should be said after Shacharis, although he does not actually source it. The most likely reference is to the Zohar in Parashas Pinchas (226): d'parnassah lo chazi l'mishal ela basar tz'lusa—requests for one's parnassah are viable only after praying. Since the rulings of the halachicposkim generally outweigh the rulings of the mekubalim, it would seem preferable to follow the Mishnah Berurah, but, as always, each person should consult his own rav or posek.

Other Minhagim

The Mishmeres Shalom (14:2), a sefer written in Yiddish, states that Rav Pinchas MiKoritz cited the minhag and also added that one should say the Thirteen Principles of the Rambam each morning as well.

The Tuesday Of Beshallach

So when exactly did the newer custom of reciting it on one particular Tuesday of the year arise? And who promulgated the new twist on the minhag? Some trace it to Rav Menachem Mendel of Riminov (1745–1815), one of the five main disciples of the Rebbe Reb Elimelech of Lizhensk. Others trace it to Rav Shalom of Stropkov (1855–1940) (see Yisroel V'Hazmanim, Rav Dovid Rossov, p. 291). It is clear, however, that Rav Shalom was quoting the Riminover and did not make it up himself. The original sefer of the Riminover is not easily accessible as only the first volume is extant.

Most people do not have the minhag of saying it on this day, and some remain firm in this minhag. Rav Ovadia also writes that this is not their minhag. There is a fascinating Rabbeinu Yonah in Shaarei Teshuvah (3:17), where he writes that it is a Torah mitzvah to remember the falling of the mon. That being the case, it doesn't hurt to recite it if it will help us focus on this mitzvah.

A Caveat For Everyone

Rav Shmuel Hominer in his Chumash Eved HaMelech (Sh'mos p. 42) brings out a fascinating yet obvious point. When reciting the Parashas HaMon one should take care not to recite it as segulah. Why? So that he will not be serving Hashem al menas lekabel p'ras—on condition of receiving reward. Let's not forget this yesod of Yiddishkeit, a fundamental point in our serving Hashem, as found in Pirkei Avos. v

The author can be reached at yairhoffman2@gmail.com.

---

from: Shabbat Shalom <info@ounetwork.org> reply-to: info@ounetwork.org date: Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 5:48 PM

OU Shabbat Shalom Weekly

What Exactly Is it That God Hears?

by David Olivestone | June 16, 2014 in Opinion

What exactly is it that God hears when we daven and simultaneously chat a little with the person next to us in shul? Here's what Ashrei might sound like to God when the shul-goer also has other things he or she needs to say. God, of course, has no problem understanding the mixture of Hebrew and English. But to simplify things for the Jewish Action reader, we present the entire piece in English.

Happy are those who dwell in Your House; they will always praise You, selah.

Happy are such people; happy are the people whose God is the Lord.

A song of praise of David.

I will exalt You, O my God, the King, and oh, it's about time you showed up! I will bless Your name, and if you wait till I move my Chumash, you can sit here, forever and ever.

Every day I bless You, and no one's using that siddur, so you can take it, and praise Your name forever and ever.

The Lord is great, and look who's here! Abba brought you to shul? He's greatly to be praised; His greatness is unlimited. He's a great Abba, lets Ima sleep.

One generation will praise Your works to another—such a big boy!—and tell of Your mighty deeds. You walked all the way to shul?

On the glorious splendor of Your majesty, and on Your wonderful deeds I will meditate, and here's a candy.

Hey, did you see the paper? They speak of the power of Your awesome deeds. Awesome game. I will talk about Your greatness; great is the only word for the Yankees these days.

They recite the record—they're now 53-35—of Your great goodness, and sing—oh no, that new gabbai is asking Chaim to daven Shacharit—of Your righteousness.

The Lord is gracious and merciful; God have mercy on us! Slow to anger; he's as slow as molasses, and great in loving-kindness.

The Lord is good to all, and by the way, you're a good guy. His mercy extends over all His works, because that stock tip you gave me last Shabbat really paid off.

All Your works shall acknowledge You, Lord, and I've really got to thank you. Your devoted ones shall bless You, but don't let it go to your head.

They shall talk of the glory of Your kingship, and will you look at those two talkers over there! They speak of Your might—from the moment they arrive, right up to Adon Olam.

To inform men of His mighty deeds—and new leadership, that's what this shul needs—and the glorious majesty of His reign.

Your kingdom is an everlasting kingdom . . . how long has Shimmy Cohen been president? Your dominion is for all generations. Forever!

The Lord supports all who falter; wait, I dropped my siddur, and picks up those who are bent over. Got it.

All lift their eyes to You in hope—do you think I might get an aliyah one of these days?—and You give them their food at the right time. At least there's a kiddush today.

You open Your hand, and satisfy every living thing with favor. I hope they have some decent Scotch.

The Lord is righteous in all His ways, but you gotta take what the One Above gives, right? And He is kind in whatever He does.

You know why I daven here? The Lord is near to all who call on Him, because there's a lot of kavanah in this shul, to all who call on Him in truth. Truth is, God runs the world, you know?

He fulfills the wishes of those who respect Him, and we gotta be serious about our davening.

He hears their cry and saves them, but how many people understand that? The Lord looks after all who love Him—Shush yourself!—but all the wicked He destroys.
Hey, they're at Az Yashir already; how did I get so far behind?
My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord and let all creatures bless His holy name forever and ever.
We will bless the Lord now and forever. Praise the Lord.
Let's daven!
David Olivestone, former senior communications officer of the Orthodox Union, now lives in Jerusalem where he davens in a very quiet shul.

---

from: Aish.com <newsletterserver@aish.com> date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 10:27 AM subject: Auschwitz Past & Present
Auschwitz: Past and PresentAuschwitz: Past and Present
Now is the time for every Jew to pledge active involvement in confronting the growing threat of anti-Semitism.
by Rabbi Benjamin Blech
Holocaust Memorial Day this week marked the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. It was yet another moment meant to affirm that we have not forgotten. We were the generation entrusted with the holy task of keeping alive the memory of 6 million who perished. For 70 years we built memorials in their names, we retold their stories, we included them in our prayers and took a small measure of solace in the ways we paid tribute to those who were victims of history's most brutal expression of genocide. But 70 years later it seems clear that our mission has changed. We can no longer afford to be merely a people of memory. As much as the past deserves recognition, it is the reality of the present that cries out for priority. Seventy years, we are told by King David in the book of Psalms, is a lifetime. [Psalms 90:10] In the Talmud we read the story of the Jewish Rip Van Winkle, Honi ha-Magel, who fell into a long sleep of 70 years duration and could no longer recognize the world when he awakened. So much can change in seven decades. But when it comes to the Jews it seems that the more things change, the more they remain the same. What would an Auschwitz survivor liberated from the death camp and gone into hibernation from that time to the present perceive as he made his way through our contemporary world? Picture him walking through the streets of France on his way to a synagogue he learns was recently surrounded by a mob screaming "death to the Jews." Imagine him taking his child to a Jewish house of study as he realizes he needs to be guarded by a cordon of heavy security. Travel with him to Belgium as she spots the sign that says "we welcome dogs but not Jews." Watch as he reads newspaper headlines which inform him that anti-Semitism is rampant around the world with the surprising twist that the word Israel seems to have become a more common synonym for the clearly intended word Jew. Remembering is supremely important - but if it is to be of value it needs to be a spur to action in the present. Yes, the Auschwitz survivor would be profoundly aware that what he is now witnessing has but small relationship to the unimaginable suffering he endured. It is certainly far less severe. Yet with the wisdom of his experience of the early stages of the Holocaust he would be keenly aware of the similarities. He would remember how it began with the world minimizing the threat. He would be keenly sensitive to the incremental stages of discrimination, of harassment and of persecution. Most of all he would be amazed that those who pride themselves on their civilized values could be so blind to the moral decay of civilization around them and so passive about their response to the evil forces threatening their survival. As a post-Holocaust Jew I grew up with the mantra that "never again" was more than a slogan; it was a prediction. The world would certainly never again countenance unrestrained evil. Never again could Jews become victims. But today we tragically know that anything is possible. And that is why I think our collective priorities need to be transformed. When a building is burning, firemen dare not focus on past conflagrations. Full attention needs to be paid to the present danger. Remembering is supremely important - but if it is to be of value it needs to be a spur to action in the present. Memory must go hand-in-hand with commitment. Without a future, the past cannot leave a legacy. Forgive me then if I urge that days of remembering must take second place to days of dedication. Now is the time for every Jew concerned with Jewish survival to pledge active involvement in confronting the growing threat of anti-Semitism – the blatant and open anti-Semitism against Jews as Jews, and the insidious and camouflaged anti-Semitism directed against Israel. That, after all, has always been the goal of memory as well as the reason for its importance to our people. Published: January 28, 2015

---

from: Torah Musings <newsletter@torahmusings.com> date: Thu, Jan 29, 2015 at 10:19 AM subject: Torah Musings Daily Digest for 1/29/2015: 4 new posts

Mann: What?!
by R. Ezra Bick

Let us ask the question the Jews asked in the desert, when they first encountered the manna:
The Israelites saw, and they said to each other, "WHAT ('mann') is it," for they did not know what it was (16,15).
I would like to change the meaning of the question slightly. What precisely is the point of having manna fall from the sky, with its special quality of being unhoardable? What is the reason that the manna is connected to Shabbat observance? What is the meaning of the manna, within the context of the narrative of Parashat Beshalach?
A. Some questions
Parashat Ha-man is contained in chapter 16 of Sefer Shemot. Let us first examine the verses and list the apparent anomalies and difficulties.
16,1: "They traveled from Eilim, and the entire congregation of the children of Israel came to the desert of Sin, which is between Eilim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month of their exodus from Egypt." Why are the location and the time here spelled out so extensively? If we compare this stop on their way with the previous two, we will not find a comparable specificity - "They came to Mara" (15,22), "They came to Eilim" (15,27). In neither case is there a date, or an attempt to exactly locate the station within the larger, and presumably better known, geographic picture. 16,2: "The entire congregation of the children of Israel complained against Moshe and Aharon in the desert." There is something missing here. This verse should have been preceded by a statement that there was no food in Midbar Sin, or that their original stores ran out. When they complained in Mara, the Torah first explained that "they could not drink the water in Mara, for it was bitter" (15,23). Similarly, in Refidim, we first find "there was no water for the people to drink" (17,1), and only then, "And the people argued with Moshe and said, give us water" (17,2). Why is the reason in our case for the complaint not explicated? What is indicated by "... Israel complained... IN THE DESERT?" We already know that the location is "the desert of Sin." Naturally, if the complained, they complained in the desert. Why does the Torah append this geographic location to the complaint?
16,4-13: The complaint of the Jews is followed by a confusing list of speeches of God, Moshe and Aharon. This is the order as described in the verses:
a. God tells Moshe that He will send down "bread from the heaven" to be collected each day, except for Friday, when there will be a double portion (4-5).
b. Moshe AND AHARON tell the Jews that in the evening and the morning they will witness that God will hear their complaint, "but what are we that you should complain about us?" ((6-7).
c. Moshe then - well, he seems to say exactly the same thing again (8).
d. Moshe tells Aharon to gather the Jews before God (9).
e. God tells Moshe that He will give the Jews meat in the evening and bread in the morning (11-12).
f. After the manna falls, Moshe explains to the Jews what the rules for collecting manna are, without mentioning Shabbat (15-16).
God promises meat by evening, and indeed the camp is covered with quail (13). But there is no further reference to the quail, nor are we told of the reaction of the people to this event, even though previously Moshe had predicted that "in the evening, and you shall know that God has taken you out of Egypt." What is the status and the meaning of the quail, especially in relation to the manna, which is described at length and clearly is at the center of the story? There are more questions, but that will do for now. (See the Ramban for some discussion of each of these questions).
B. No food?
Let us start from the second and third question. The Ramban already suggests that the answer to the second is found in the third. The reason the Jews complained was because they were in the desert. They "complained… in the desert" means that their complaint was formed and caused by their being in the desert. Now, you might understand this to be no more than a shorthand way of saying that they had no food, since the desert is associated

in our minds with a shortage of food. But that is not what I am suggesting, for had that been the case, I still would expect the Torah to state that "there was nothing to eat" just as when there is no water, that is explicitly stated. Rather, I am suggesting that there was, at least for the moment, plenty of food. It was the fact that they were entering the desert, a place where there is no assured supply of food IN THE FUTURE, that led to the complaints. It was not hunger, but uncertainty, that caused the unrest.

In fact, the desert is not necessarily a place where there is no food. More importantly, the Jews were only a few weeks from Egypt, and they had originally planned a trip that would have to take at least that long. Even the short route ("the way of the land of the Philistines") would have necessitated a trek of several weeks. If we assume that their immediate goal is Mt. Sinai (as God had promised Moshe in Shemot 3,12), they have yet some distance to go, and presumably they should have prepared food. We know that they had their flocks with them, and there is, as yet, apparently no shortage of water. So why are they complaining about imminent death from starvation?

The answer is not that they are feeling hunger but that they are scared. In the desert, it is difficult to know where your food will come from. They are no longer sure of the path (since they are not on the "way of the land of the Philistines"), and they are now "in the middle of nowhere" (between Eilim and Sinai). They lack not food but faith.

This is indicated by the picturesque language used to describe Egypt – the pot of meat. The contrast between the desert and Egypt is between a land of unknown resources and a full pot. They remember not the fullness of their bellies but the fullness of the pot; in other words, the assurance of food tomorrow. This is what they find so disturbing in the present – not the lack of food per se, but the lack of a pot brimming with an abundance of food. What was so special about Egypt was that there was more food than they could eat, and THAT is what they miss now.

In fact, we can not be sure that they always ate well in Egypt, for, as slaves, they might well have been deprived by their masters. But they undoubtedly had enough to survive and continue working, and, since this was Egypt, they had no fear for the future in that respect.

This situation, the assurance of tomorrow's meal without necessarily being richly fed now, is in fact the essence of being a slave. The slave has no riches of his own, but he relies on his master, who is rich. The complaint of the Jews when they reach the desert is a direct expression of their slave mentality, and their memories of Egypt are a form of nostalgia for the security of enslavement. To a slave, whose meal comes every day at the same time from the hands of his master, the desert is truly a terrifying place, even if at the moment he still has food in his hands.

We now understand the answer to the first question. The geographic location is "the desert of Sin, which is between Eilim and Sinai;" in other words, halfway between a place of abundant food (seventy palms and twelve springs) and their direct goal, Sinai. The time frame is "on the fifteenth day of the second month of their exodus from Egypt;" in other words, halfway between the crossing of the sea and the revelation of Sinai. (Actually, they were 24 days from the sea and 21 days from the giving of the Torah, but I think it is close enough. In fact, the midpoint here may be not in the number of days but in the count of the months. They left in the first month, the Torah is given in the third, and they are now precisely in the middle of the second, intermediate, month). The Torah is stressing to us the feeling of "being in the middle" – away from Egypt, but not yet at their goal. The open-ended future, cut off from their origin but not yet in sight of their destination, between worlds, as it were, is the background to their situation. The actual distance from Egypt is not great, nor is the time that has transpired sufficient to actually exhaust their food-supply, but mentally, psychologically, they are halfway from everywhere.

C. What is it?

The manna is God's answer to this complaint. We all know the special conditions of the manna – it fell every morning, but could not be stored for the next day. Everyone received the same amount. The attempt to hoard resulted in its becoming wormy and ruined. God explicitly tells Moshe that this is not merely a blessing but a "test" (nisayon) – "will they follow My Torah or not" (16,4). Rashi explains this test as referring to the laws associated with the manna. I would suggest, following the Ibn Ezra, that it refers not to any specific law but to the entire relationship of the Jews to God in the desert. "'In order to test them' - because they will need Me every day" (Ibn Ezra 16,4). The Manna is, in a sense, a recreation of the assured dependence of the slave on his master, only that God has replaced the Egyptian master. On the other hand, because God is not a natural cause, and His bounty cannot be seen with the same sense of natural assurance that the overflowing Nile gives to the population of Egypt, this is a test of faith. The manna will fall daily without failure, God promises, and you will be totally dependent on that promise, because it is impossible to accumulate manna and save it for a rainy day. The experience of the manna is a kind of education, training the Jews to have faith in the providence of God, weaning them from a dependence on hoarding, which would have been, perhaps, a natural reaction to their separation from the fleshpots of Egypt.

This helps us to understand the deep connection between the manna and Shabbat. One of the messages of Shabbat is that everything has to be prepared beforehand. On Shabbat one does not accumulate anything at all, but relies only on what has been prepared. This message is explicated in our parasha - "On the sixth day, they shall prepare that which they shall bring" (16,5). Shabbat is, for all generations, a small trial of dependence, where one enjoys what one has without gathering for the morrow. Imagine the feeling of the recently released slave, when finally, on the sixth day, he has managed to put aside a small nest-egg, a small security for the rainy day he knows in his Jewish heart will surely come - and then, on the next day, Shabbat, he has to eat his savings and go back to living on the edge of penury! Naturally, he can barely resist and goes out and tries to gather on the Shabbat, in order to protect his savings. "On it came about on the seventh day, some of the people went out to gather, but they did not find" (27).

This lies at the heart of the mysterious unknown nature of the manna as well. Were the manna to be any form of a familiar food, no matter how unexpected it were initially, the Jews would have come to view it eventually as the natural food found in this particular desert. It would have become a natural resource, a form of security for the inhabitants of the desert. But God wishes the Jews to remain on the edge of insecurity, with the desert remaining a land that does not provide assured food. Hence, manna is not the food of the desert but "bread from the heavens" (4), and the only thing the Jews can say when they encounter it is "what!?" What is it - its name is a question. "Mann hu?" - what is it? Therefore "The house of Israel called it mann" (31).

D. Manna and Quail

In the initial speech of Moshe to the Jews, he tells them that there will be meat in the evening and bread in the morning. Indeed, that is what takes place - quail covering the camp in the evening and the manna in the morning. We do not find the quail mentioned again except in exceptional circumstances (the episode of Kivrot Hataava, Bamidbar 11). This parasha itself concludes with the statement, "The Israelites ate manna for forty years, until they arrived at an inhabited land, they ate manna until they arrived at the edge of the land of Canaan" (35). While this does not necessarily mean that they ate nothing else, it definitely seems to imply that their only regular food was manna. (See Ramban v.12, who states that the quail fell for forty years). What happened to the quail, and what was the purpose of its falling in the evening?

To answer this, we have to follow very closely the multiple speeches of God and Moshe in the beginning of the story (question 4). When God first responds to the complaint of the people, He does not mention the quail. "Now I am going to rain down bread from the heaven, and the people shall go out to gather every day's amount" (4). At this point, God already mentions that on the sixth day there will be a double portion. Immediately afterwards

Moshe and Aharon speak to the people, and, for the first time and without apparent command from God, tell them that

in the evening, you will know that God has taken you out of Egypt; and in the morning, you will see the glory of God, when He hears your complaint against God, but who are we, that you should complain against us (7,8).

Moshe then makes explicit the meaning of "evening and morning," telling them,

when God gives you meat in the evening and bread in the morning in satiation, when God shall hear your complaints which you complain against Him, but who are we; your complaints are not against us but against God (8).

Only after Aharon gathers the people do we find God saying to Moshe:

Say to them, you shall eat meat towards evening and in the morning be satiated with bread, and you shall know that I am HaShem your God" (12).

What is happening here? Apparently, there are two different issues. One is the faith issue I described above. God's answer to that is the manna, with Shabbat emphasized. But Moshe and Aharon have seized on another issue. The Jews, in their complaint, have complained to Moshe and Aharon and placed the responsibility for their plight squarely on their shoulders. "Would that we had died by the HAND OF GOD in the land of Egypt... for YOU have taken us out to this desert, to kill all this congregation by hunger" (3). Moshe perceives a basic error of religious knowledge here. The Jews fail to see the guiding hand of God in the exodus and in the path in the desert. Moshe therefore speaks to the people and admonishes them, telling them that their complaint is not against him and Aharon, but against God. Moshe emphasizes that when they see the miracles of the quail and the manna, they will "know that God has taken you out of Egypt" (6). It appears to me that the manna is the basic answer to the slave mentality of the Jews, which is not so much a sin as a condition. God does not give the manna as a punishment or a rebuke, but as a gift. The quail, on the other hand, although food, carries within it a rebuke, similar to what happens in Parashat Behaalotekha, when the Jews rebel against the regimen of the manna and God bombards them with quail (Bamidbar 11). The purpose of the quail is directly to correct the theological transgression and to show them that God is in charge of their destiny. Precisely because the quail is a natural solution (though miraculous in its appearance in this place and time), it demonstrates God's mastery over NATURE, and therefore His responsibility for their fate. The manna, on the other hand, shows that those who are God's servants are completely out of the bounds of nature and are fed directly from "His table."

How could Moshe and Aharon have promised the quail if God did not first tell them? The answer presumably is that God DID tell them, since it is inconceivable that they made it up on their own. Nonetheless, the Torah gives the impression that God is initially only concerned with the manna and its message of dependence on God, whereas Moshe and Aharon are interested in the problem which concerns them directly, the misplaced "blame" and responsibility which the Jews place on their shoulders.

This difference between the message of the quail and the message of the manna is hinted at even in the language with which Moshe introduces the double miracle.

Moshe and Aharon said to all the Israelites: Evening, and you shall know that God has taken you out of Egypt.

And morning, and you shall see the glory of God, when He hears your complaints against God.... (6-7)

As Rashi points out (quoting the Sages), the first verse contains a note of displeasure, especially when compared to the second. The evening is directed only to correcting their theological error. The morning, by contrast, contains an element of religious excitement and uplifting - you shall witness the glory of God! The Sages state that the evening is "not with a shining face" and the morning is with "a shining face." Their complaint in terms of food is met graciously by God in the morning. The evening is not an answer to their complaint, but only a lesson in who is in charge.

Since there is a difference between God's main concern and Moshe's, the conversations between them and between them and the people become rather convoluted. First God speaks to Moshe about the manna (and Shabbat), then Moshe and Aharon speak to the people, stressing the proper address for their complaints, then, after they bring the people to the proper address, gathering them to hear the word of God, God appears and adopts their double plan. Once, however, the morning dawns and the Jews experience the manna, the primacy of God's plan is manifest, as the rest of the parasha deals exclusively with the manna and its ramifications.

I think there are two reasons for the primacy of the manna issue over the quail issue. The first is that it is genuinely more central, pointing, as it does, to the main purpose of the exodus - to turn the nation of slaves into the servants of God. At least in the immediate future, this is crucial, as it is a precondition for receiving the Torah. The recognition of God's leadership of Jewish destiny can wait - perhaps until they are about to enter the Land of Israel and begin political life.

The second reason, which admittedly at least partially contradicts the first, is that the message of the quail was not absorbed in the short run. The Jews continued to turn to Moshe as the source of their problems and to accuse him of responsibility for what happens on the way through the desert. In the case of the golden calf, this is especially evident -

The people saw that Moshe was tardy in descending from the mountain, and they gathered on Aharon and said to him: Arise and make us a god, for this man Moshe, WHO TOOK US OUT OF EGYPT, we do not know what has happened to him. (32,1)

... he made it into a molten calf, and they said: THIS IS YOUR GOD ISRAEL, WHO TOOK YOU OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT. (32,4)

This perception of Moshe as the actual leader and decision-maker in the desert continues to be expressed throughout the events in the desert, throughout the complaints of Sefer Bamidbar, until the original generation has disappeared. God's plan turns out to be correct. First one must take Egypt out of the soul of the Jews; only then can they reach full recognition of God's mastery of nature and their destiny.

This essay originally appeared on Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash and is republished here with permission.

From: **Rabbi Kaganoff** <ymkaganoff@gmail.com> reply-to: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com to: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com date: Tue, Jan 27, 2015 at 2:08 AM subject: for parshas Beshalach- **about carrying on Shabbos**

Do People Live in the Zoo? By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Question #1: Checking inside the eruv "Can the eruv fences, walls, and wires be checked religiously every week, yet the eruv is invalid?"

Question #2: Shabbos in a warehouse "May one carry in a warehouse on Shabbos?"

Question #3: Do people live in the zoo? What do the previous two questions have to do with the title of this article?

Answer: Invalidating an eruv from inside With the direction of his rav, Yankel has joined the committee of makers and shakers working on building an eruv in his hometown. He now knows that the area in which he currently lives has the halachic status of a karmelis, an Aramaic word meaning an area in which one may not carry, but which can be enclosed to permit carrying. Creating the enclosure in a halachically approved way is what one does when building an eruv. One of the benefits of his new project is that Yankel learns much about the laws of eruv. Among the laws he discovers is an entire area of halachah with which he was not familiar – that enclosing an area does not always permit carrying. Often, there is an area within the eruv that precludes carrying there. These areas are often called karpif, although Yankel discovers that this term is also not really accurate. As a result of his curiousity, he studies the relevant source material in the second chapter of Mesechta Eruvin, a topic that he, like most people, had never studied during his years in yeshivah.

What is a karpif? Although min hatorah one may carry within any enclosed area, Chazal permitted carrying in a large area only when the enclosing of

the area serves a residential purpose, which is called mukaf ledirah. If the enclosure was not mukaf ledirah, the area inside is also considered a karmelis in which one may not carry.

Technically, the word karpif means an enclosure outside the city in which one stores felled wood (Rashi, Eruvin 18a). However, the term is generally used to mean an enclosed area that is not mukaf ledirah.

Yankel learned that if an enclosure does not serve a residential purpose, one may carry within it only when it encloses an area that is no larger than the size of the courtyard of the mishkan, which was 50 amos (cubits) wide and 100 amos long, the size of 5000 square amos (Mishnah Eruvin 23a). An area this size is called a beis sasayim, an old farmers' term based on how much seed they would plant there, and equals approximately 1000* square meters or 10,000-11,000 square feet. For the balance of this article, I will refer to an area larger than a beis sasayim, that is, one that contains more than 5000 square amos, as a large area, and any area smaller than this as a small area.

There is another factor that must be met to permit carrying in a small area that is not enclosed for residential use – its length may not exceed twice its width by more than one amoh (Mishnah, Eruvin 23a).

Why is a small karpif permitted? Why may one carry in an area that is not mukaf ledirah when it is 5000 square amos or smaller? Was this size chosen arbitrarily?

Chazal permitted carrying in a small area, even when it is not mukaf ledirah, for the following reason: Since no one is permitted to live in the courtyard of the mishkan, the curtains that surround it do not make it mukaf ledirah. This would mean that carrying within the mishkan would be under the heading of a rabbinic prohibition. Yet this carrying was necessary on Shabbos for the regular functioning of the mishkan. Rather than treat the mishkan as an exception to the halachah, Chazal permitted carrying in any area that is this small, even when it is not mukaf ledirah (see Graz, Orach Chayim 358:3).

What is mukaf ledirah? The definition of what qualifies as mukaf ledirah and what does not is, at times, not obvious. The Gemara (Eruvin 22a) itself states that there are instances when an enclosed area is roofed and resembles a building, yet it is considered not mukaf ledirah, and there are places that are open-air and yet have the status of mukaf ledirah. The Mishnah (Eruvin 18a) mentions four cases that qualify as mukaf ledirah, even though (according to Rashi) there is no roof over them. They are:

(1) Dir -- a corralled area that one intends to plant eventually. At the moment, it is fallow, and one is grazing one's livestock there, so that they naturally fertilize the field.

(2) Sohar, which is, according to Rashi, an area where the townspeople graze their animals, and, according to the Rambam, a prison.

(3) Muktzah -- a backyard area.

(4) Chatzeir, a front yard. The Ritva (Eruvin 22a) explains that the list is progressively more obvious; meaning that the first case, that of dir, is the least obvious "residential" area. Indeed, much halachic literature is devoted to explaining why an area enclosed for animals is considered residential, when, as we will soon see, areas enclosed for trees or vegetation are not.

Non-residential enclosures Our next objective is to define what is considered a non-residential enclosure, eino mukaf ledirah, in which one may not carry unless it is small, as defined above. The Mishnah and the Gemara teach that several different types of enclosed areas are not mukafim ledirah. As I mentioned above, one of these is a karpif, an enclosure outside the city in which one stores felled wood (Rashi, Eruvin 18a). Similarly, a fenced-in orchard (Rambam, Hilchos Shabbos 16:1, based on Eruvin 25b), a vegetable patch or a grain field (Mishnah Eruvin 18a; Eruvin 23b) are not mukaf ledirah, even when they contain huts, called burgenin, for the watchmen (Eruvin 22a). In all of these instances, the fence built around the perimeter does not serve a residential need. Even the watchman's hut is there not to serve as a residence, but to allow the watchman to remain nearby (Rashi, Eruvin 15a). (We should note that some authorities [Tosafos Shabbos, 358:1; Pri Megadim, Eishel Avraham 358:1] contend that if the watchman sleeps overnight in the hut, it is considered a residence. In their opinion, a burgenin is considered not mukaf ledirah because one uses it only in the daytime.)

We need to understand exactly why certain uses are considered residential, and others are not. However, prior to explaining these ideas, we need to clarify another aspect of this discussion.

Mixed neighborhoods What is the halachah if an enclosure comprises both an area considered residential and an area that is not? For example, Yankel's neighbor, Shmerel, has a large fenced-in backyard, which his family uses predominantly for barbecues and other recreation. It sounds as if this area should be treated as mukaf ledirah, even if it is larger than 5000 square amos. Indeed, its proximity to the house and its use would make this backyard mukaf ledirah.

However, this yard also includes a section planted with various spices and vegetables. As we learned above, a planted area is not mukaf ledirah. Do we consider the entire yard mukaf ledirah or not? May Shmerel's family carry in the backyard? In the course of Yankel's studying the laws of Eruvin, he discovered that carrying in his neighbor's fenced-in yard might be prohibited!

A breached eruv -- Nifratz bemilu'oh To answer these questions, we need to explain a principle, called nifratz bemilu'oh, literally, breached in its entirety. Whenever an area in which one would otherwise be permitted to carry is open to an area where carrying is forbidden, the halachic result is that one may not carry in the otherwise permitted area (see Eruvin 25b). Thus, if it is prohibited to carry in the planted area, and the recreational part of Shmerel's yard is nifratz bemilu'oh to the planted area, one cannot carry in any part of Shmerel's yard (Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim 358:10). As we will soon see, this law has major ramifications for city eruvin also.

What is called "breached?" Our next question, germane both to Shmerel's yard and to our city eruv, is: How big a breach prohibits carrying?

There are two ways that a breach forbids carrying. One is when it is greater than ten amos, approximately seventeen feet or five meters. The other way is when the breach is smaller than ten amos but it comprises an entire side of the otherwise-permitted mukaf ledirah area. For example, if an otherwise-permitted rectangularly-shaped area is mukaf ledirah on three of its sides, but the remaining unwalled side opens to an area in which carrying is forbidden, even if the unwalled side is less than 10 amos wide one may not carry in the mukaf ledirah area.

In terms of Shmerel's yard, this means that if the recreational part is not isolated from the garden, and the garden is large enough to prohibit carrying, the entire yard is prohibited. The same concept is true in a city eruv, as we will soon see.

How large a garden? Before we can issue a ruling regarding Shmerel's garden, we need one more piece of information. How large a garden will prohibit carrying?

The Gemara (Eruvin 23b-24a) states that if a planted area is larger than 5000 square amos, one may not carry in any part of the backyard. Even when the planted area is smaller than 5000 square amos, if the planted part is larger than the rest of the yard and the entire yard is larger than 5000 square amos, one may not carry in any part of it.

Healing a breach Yankel and Shmerel measure the vegetable garden and the yard and discover that, lo and behold, one may not carry in Shmerel's yard. Is there any way to fix the above problem to permit carrying within the recreational part of the yard?

Yes, there are at least two ways that one can do this. The first is to separate the recreational area from the planted area, and the second is to subdivide the planted area until it is small enough not to create a halachic issue. There are several ways of implementing either of these methods, but discussing them is beyond the scope of this article.

A flower garden What is the halachah if Shmerel's garden consists of a flower garden, rather than a vegetable patch? Does his flower garden invalidate the area for carrying, just as the vegetable garden did?

The halachic issue here is the following: People do not live in vegetable patches, but they do enjoy looking and smelling pretty and fragrant flowers. Is this a sufficient reason to consider a flower garden mukaf ledirah?

This matter is a subject of dispute, with different authorities on, shall we say, different sides of the fence. Although most authorities rule that a flower garden does not present a problem (see also Meiri, Eruvin 24a), the Divrei Chayim of Sanz (Shu't Divrei Chayim, Orach Chayim 2:28) and the Sha'ul Umeishiv (Shu't 3:131) were among the authorities who ruled that a flower garden will prohibit an eruv. Someone with a similar shaylah should refer it to his own rav or posek.

Fair lawn As I mentioned above, the Gemara rules that a large, planted area for vegetables or grains will invalidate the eruv. Several halachic authorities say that a grass cover does not invalidate an eruv, since people relax by sitting or lying on the grass. However, can this logic apply when someone does not permit anyone to walk across their expensively tended lawn? This phenomenom, not uncommon in a modern suburban setting, implies that the contemporary lawn of this nature may not be considered mukaf ledirah and can therefore create a problem, if it is larger than a beis sasayim. I leave this question for the eruv movers and shakers to discuss with their posek.

Fenced first Another halachic factor is that mukaf ledirah requires that the enclosure must have been constructed initially for residential use. This is called pasach u'le'besof hukaf, literally, he opened the entrance first and then afterwards enclosed the area (Eruvin 24a). However, if the area was enclosed when it did not yet have a residential use, providing it with a residential purpose later will not render the area one in which carrying is permitted.

For example, if Shmerel had originally decided to fence in his large yard because he wanted to plant vegetables, and only later decided to use it for domestic purposes, one may not carry in the yard, since its enclosure was originally not for domestic use. (There are ways to rectify such a situation, but this is a topic that we need to leave for a different time.)

Bitul mechitzos We have yet to discuss another related question: What is the halachah if an area was originally mukaf ledirah, and then someone planted within the mukaf ledirah area? Does this now render the area a karmelis and prohibit carrying? As an example, let us imagine the following scenario: When Shmerel built the fence around his yard, his intention was for residential purposes, and it therefore had a status of mukaf ledirah. At this point, one could carry in the yard. Later, Shmerel decided to plant a large vegetable garden in the yard. Do we say that the yard remains permitted?

The halachah is that planting grain or vegetables invalidates the enclosure, and it is prohibited to carry in his yard.

However, there is an interesting halachah here. Not all planting invalidates the external walls. For example, the Gemara (Eruvin 23b) states explicitly that if one plants a large area of trees, one may continue carrying in the area. This ruling is very interesting, especially in light of the fact that a fence surrounding an orchard is not considered mukaf ledirah.

Trees versus veggies What is the different between trees, which do not invalidate the eruv, and grain and vegetables, which do?

Rashi (Eruvin 23b) explains that people do not live in a vegetable patch; however, people will walk through an orchard to enjoy the shade. Thus, the planting of trees does not remove the designation of mukaf ledirah from the area.

As I noted above, the latter halachah applies only when one planted trees in an area that was already mukaf ledirah. In other words, there is a difference between enclosing the area, which requires that it initially is mukaf ledirah, and changing its status once it was mukaf ledirah. Enclosing an orchard is not considered mukaf ledirah.

We will continue this article next week…

* The measurements used in this article are meant only for rough calculation.