



Parashat Hashavua

Eikev, 23 Av 5782

Harav Shaul Israeli zt"l Founder and President

On Tefilla - part II

Harav Yosef Carmel

Last week we started discussing the topic of concentration in *tefilla*, with the help of the *gemara* (Berachot 30b) which requires a wait between one *amida* and another for the amount of time it takes to put himself in the correct frame of mind (*titchonen da'ato* or *titcholel da'ato*).

The *geonim* explain the *gemara* differently than Rashi did. They posit that it is referring to getting over the fear associated with the *tefilla*. There is a difference between the two verbs used, as one corresponds to a *tefilla* of asking for a "present" from Hashem, and one relates to asking Hashem for forgiveness for his sins. A *tefilla* in which one asks for forgiveness for sin, as Moshe did on behalf of Bnei Yisrael (*Vayechal Moshe* – Shemot 32:11), requires increased effort.

This distinction can impact on the atmosphere that should exist in *shul*. When one approaches *tefilla* with a self-accounting during which one decides that he requires improvement, it can serve as an impetus for a more serious prayer. A *tefilla* in which one is just asking Hashem for His grace without focusing on beseeching for forgiveness should also be done with seriousness, but it can include song and happiness.

Is serious Torah study a good preparation for *tefilla*? It is possible, and there are hints at it in the aforementioned section of the *gemara*. The *gemara* tells that Rav Ami and Rav Asi would choose to pray specifically in the place where they regularly engaged in Torah study throughout the day. Even for those of us who do not spend large parts of the day in Torah study, it is proper that their place of prayer should also be their place of study. It is the rabbi's privilege and obligation to make a session of study a possible preparation for communal *tefilla*. This helps facilitate a closer connection between the member of the congregation and his Father in Heaven.

We conclude with a distinction between the Talmud Bavli and Yerushalmi. The *mishna* tells of pious people who would contemplate before and after each prayer for an hour. The *gemara* asks how they had enough time in the day to get around to serious learning and/or to work? The Talmud Bavli answers that because they were so pious, they had a special blessing that preserved their Torah study and made their work productive in much less time than normal. The Yerushalmi said that the positive blessing was not only that the Torah study would be preserved but that it would be blessed in a manner that it would qualitatively increase and expand. It is no surprise that this idea is found in the Talmud of *Eretz Yisrael*, where there is special blessing and unusual potential in the Torah study here.

May we take advantage of the opportunity to pray in a manner that elevates everything we do in the course of the day, which is especially worthwhile and uplifting in Israel.

<u> </u>	lemdat	Yamim	is	dedicated	to	the	memory	of:	
Fretz Hemdah's beloved friends and Members of Fretz Hemdah's Amutah									

Eretz Hemdah's beloved friends and Members of Eretz Hemdah's Amutah										
Rav Shlomo Merzel z"l lyar 10, 5771		Reuven & Chaya Le Aberman z"l ei 9, 5776 / Tishrei 20,		Mr. Shmuel & Esther Shemesh z"l Sivan 17 / Av 20		Mr. Moshe Wasserzug z"l Tishrei 20, 5781				
Hemdat Yamim is endowed by Les z"I & Ethel Sutker of Chicago, Illinois, in loving memory of Max and Mary Sutker & Louis and Lillian Klein z"I		R' Yaakov ben Abraham & Aisha and Chana bat Yaish & Simcha Sebbag z"l		ahu Carmel z"l carmel's father ar 8, 5776	Mr. Zelig & Mrs Wengrowsky Tevet 25 57 Tamuz 10 57	y z"l 82	R' Meir ben Yechezkel Shraga Brachfeld z"l & Mrs. Sara Brachfeld z"l Tevet 16, 5780			
			Rav Yisrael Rozen z"l Cheshvan 13, 5778		Gitta Klein z"l B / Av 4	R' Benzion Grossman z"l Tamuz 23, 5777				

Mrs. Leah Meyer z"l Nisan 27, 5782
Gital Gila bat Eliyahu Michael z"l Av 21
Yitzchak Eizik ben Yehuda Leib Usdan z"l Av 29
Those who fell in wars for our homeland. May Hashem avenge their blood!

Rabbi Dr. Jerry

Hochbaum z"

Adar II 17, 5782

Rav Moshe Zvi (Milton)

Polin 7"

Tammuz 19, 5778

Mrs. Julia

Koschitzky z"l

Adar II 18, 5782

In memory of Nina Moinester, z"l

Nechama Osna bat Yitzhak Aharon & Doba

Av 30, 5781

R' Yitzchak Zev

Tarshansky z"l

Adar 28, 5781



Ask the Rabbi

by Rav Daniel Mann

A Shul Kiddush as the "Third" Meal

Question: Can I count the cake and other foods I eat at a "shul Kiddush," followed by a regular Shabbat meal at home, as the second and third meals of Shabbat?

Answer: The question arises only if one is lenient on what constitutes *seuda shlishit*. The *gemara* (Shabbat 117b) derives from the *pasuk* about the *manna* to be eaten on Shabbat (Shemot 16:25), which uses the word "*hayom*" (today) three times, that one should have three meals on Shabbat. The straightforward reading of the *gemara* is that the three meals are primarily equivalent. Since the first two Shabbat meals must include (two loaves of) bread (Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim 274:1; ibid. 289:1), we should expect the same for *seuda shlishit*. Indeed, this is the principle opinion of the Shulchan Aruch (OC 291:4-5), except when it is quite difficult (ibid.).

On the other hand, the Shulchan Aruch (ibid.) cites as a minority opinion the possibility to fulfill *seuda shlishit* with foods other than bread. The Talmudic source for possible leniency is a *gemara* (Sukka 27a) about a rejected opinion about Sukkot. R. Eliezer says that one must eat fourteen meals on Sukkot and that if he missed one, he should eat an extra meal on the night of Shemini Atzeret. The *gemara* asks that the bread meal he has on Shemini Atzeret is for that day and answers that the *hashlama* (make-up meal) is by eating *minei targima* (there is a *machloket* exactly what that is – see Tosafot ad loc.) in addition to the regular meal. Tosafot (Berachot 49b) cites Rabbeinu Tam as learning from here that one does not need bread to be considered a modest halachic meal, for example, for *seuda shlishit*. Most *Rishonim* (see Beit Yosef, OC 291) say that at least *seuda shlishit* requires specifically bread because of the derivation from the *manna*. There are, though, those who do not have *seuda shlishit* with bread, and they have whom to rely upon.

As mentioned, all agree that bread is required for the second Shabbat meal, even though cake is enough of a meal to give *Kiddush* its halachic status (Shulchan Aruch, OC 273:5). So, your regular meal is needed to count for the second meal. According to some, that meal must start before *chatzot* (Aruch Hashulchan, OC 288:2). If this meal started before the earliest time for Mincha (half an hour after *chatzot*), it is too early for *seuda shlishit* (Shulchan Aruch, OC 291:2), and even if it extends from morning to afternoon it cannot serve as both the second and third meals (see Levushei Srad ad loc.). Stopping the meal with *Birkat Hamazon* and then starting a new meal again, could be a potential possibility (see Shulchan Aruch, OC 291:3 and Mishna Berura ad loc. 14). However, this is presumably not a more attractive practical option than making a small *seuda shlishit* some time later.

It is plausible to make the following halachic claim. Perhaps after having a proper daytime bread meal, we can say that the *shul Kiddush* constituted retroactively a third meal. While there is an expectation that there will be three meals at three different times of Shabbat (Rambam, Shabbat 30:9), perhaps the important thing is that at the end, fulfilling all of the requirements (two full meals, having eaten after the time of *Mincha*) in whatever order is enough. Rav Shimon Sofer (Hitorerut Teshuva I:74) left this as an open question and a possible *limud z'chut* for those who have a pre-meal *Kiddush* and do not eat *seuda shlishit*. The Shevet Halevi (I:57) does not view this a viable approach. He cites the Bach (OC 291) who says that the logic of Rabbeinu Tam to treat a non-bread meal as a meal applies only when it follows a full daytime meal, as another full meal might not be expected. However, a small meal **before** the big meal is not considered a halachic meal toward the three required meals.

In summary, while it is plausible that the setup you describe could remove the need for *seuda shlishit*, it relies on unlikely assumptions. Therefore, it is significantly better to either have bread at the small meal (i.e., Kiddush) or to have at least a small *seuda shlishit* sometime in the afternoon.

"Behind the Scenes" Zoom shiur

Eretz Hemdah is offering the readership to join in Rabbi Mann's weekly Zoom sessions, analyzing with him the sources and thought process behind past and future responses. Email us at info@eretzhemdah.org to sign up (free) or for more information on joining the group.

Do not hesitate to ask any question about Jewish life, Jewish tradition or Jewish law.





Igrot HaRe'aya - Letters of Rav Kook

Questions about Religious Services in *Eretz Yisrael* – #111 – part IV

Date and Place: 2 Adar I 5668 (1908), Yafo

Recipient: Rabbi Yitzchak Isaac Halevi, author of Dorot Harishonim.

Body: I will do my best to answer your questions. First, I will quote your question, and then I will answer.

Question #5, cont.: Will the religious schools teach the language of the land, if it is possible to find religious Jewish teachers who have fear of Heaven "from beginning to end"?

<u>My answer</u>: [We saw last time that in Eretz Yisrael, in response to the challenges from the Haskala movement, a ban was made by great rabbis against the study of secular matters, including foreign languages, and that Rav Kook felt that this prevented many parents from sending their children to religious schools, most of which followed the ban.]

Use of the term "the language of the land" is not precise in this case. The language of the government is Turkish, but there is no need for it in normal daily lives, and there are very few who need to use Turkish. It is true that it is very proper that there be at least a few exceptional individuals among the Torah scholars of the Land who know Turkish, so that they can go before the higher government officials in a respectable manner. However, the main usable language is Arabic, and most of those who are born in *Eretz Yisrael* learn how to speak it even without formal instruction. To be able to write Arabic or speak it with correct grammar is not viewed to be very valuable. In any case, it is not enough in order to be involved in life and commerce in the Land unless it is combined with knowledge of a European language, like English or French, which is worthwhile to obtain.

I want you to realize that in the existing religious schools they do not and will not teach any [foreign] language. In those that we are hoping to establish, we have to arrive at a point at which languages will be taught, but to do so in a manner of peace and sanctity, in a manner that the spirit of the sages will be happy with.

This also involves a problem, namely, that it is very difficult to find teachers for foreign languages who are reliable in regard to their fear of Heaven. This is because for the most part, those who learned languages did so in a forbidden manner [ed. note - perhaps Rav Kook meant that it was done in the wrong setting or with the wrong intentions or perhaps just that the fact they did it without rabbinic permission/guidance]. In that case, they already have leaned in the direction of external, negative influences and those who "damage the vineyard" (traditional Judaism). If we can find certain rare, special people, there will not be enough of them to teach in all of the religious schools. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to send to here some of the graduates among the G-d fearers in Germany, until a "path will be paved" upon which there will be a permitted way to learn foreign languages [in *Eretz Yisrael*]. This will be along the lines that Shmuel said: Everything should be done for the sake of Heaven.

We daven for a complete and speedy refuah for:

Nir Rephael ben Rachel Bracha Yisrael ben Rivka Arye Yitzchak ben Geula Miriam Yerachmiel ben Zlotta Rivka Together with all *cholei* Yisrael

Neta bat Malka Meira bat Esther



Tzofnat Yeshayahu-Rabbi Yosef Carmel

The Prophet Yeshayahu performed in one of the most stormy and dramatic periods of the Israeli nation's life, a period of anticipation for the Messiah that was broken by a terrible earthquake, and also caused a spiritual and political upheaval. The light at the end of the tunnel shone again only in the days of Chizkiyah.

"Tzofnat Yeshayahu – from Uziya to Áhaz" introduces us to three kings who stood at this crossroad in our nation's history: Uziya, a king who seeked God but was stricken with leprosy because of his sin; Yotam, the most righteous king in the history of our people; And Ahaz, the king who knew God but did not believe in His providence.

In his commentary on the prophecies of Yeshayahu, Rabbi Yosef Carmel, Head of the Eretz Hemdah-Gazit rabbinical court and a disciple of Rabbi Shaul Israeli zt"l, clings to the words of Hazal, our sages, and to the commentaries of the Rishonim, the great Jewish scholars of the middle ages, and offers a fascinating way to study Tanach. This reading attempts to explain the Divine Plan in this difficult period and to clarify fundamental issues in faith. Tzofnat Yeshayahu reveals to the reader the meaning of the prophecies in the context of the prophet's generation and their relevance to our generation.

Buy Now



P'ninat Mishpat

Questionable Promises to Kollel Students – part II

(based on ruling 71063 of the Eretz Hemdah-Gazit Rabbinical Courts)

<u>Case</u>: A group of *kollel* students (=*pl*), formerly of a certain *kollel* (=*def*), have claims about *def*'s alleged failures to keep promises to them. [We will deal with different claims separately.] Def had pl sign up for the Kollel Haelef program, where the *kollel* gets extra money for each avreich who promises to serve as a rabbi/teacher after a certain number of years. When some expressed misgivings, concerned it would cause them problems with stipends in the future, a member of def's administration assured them that def "would take care of them." Now pl want tens of thousands of NIS a piece because they have difficulty getting *kollelim* to pay them because the *Misrad Hadatot* will not pay for them anymore. Def argues that pl were aware of and agreed to the program's provisions, and def only promised to try to intervene in cases of difficulties, not to pay for many years of *kollel* studies.

<u>Ruling</u>: The Rashba (Shut V, 77) obligates someone who signs on a document to follow its provisions even if he claims that he did not understand what he signed and it is known he cannot read it, for he relies on those who inform him of its contents. In this case, it is easy to ascertain the provisions of *Kollel Haelef*, which is all the clearer after they expressed their concerns, at which point they should have considered all implications.

What is the impact of *def*'s assurance to deal with *pl*'s problems? The damages of having trouble with future *kollelim* is *gerama* (indirect and/or down-the-line problems). The Mordechai (Bava Kama 115) obligates one who explicitly commits himself to pay for *gerama*. One example is when one sells a field to a dangerous person and promises to pay his neighbors for damages the buyer will make (Bava Kama 114a, see Nimukei Yosef ad loc.). While some understand that the obligation there is even without a commitment (see Beit Yosef, Choshen Mishpat 175), it appears that there is a consensus that when one obligates himself to pay for a *gerama* damage, it is binding.

However, there are a few reasons to exempt *def* from paying for lost stipend opportunities. First, it is impossible to preclude *pl*'s explanation that they offered only non-monetary or very limited help. The Maharik (129) says that regarding vague commitments that need explanation, *beit din* must estimate what it is logical that people will agree to. Here, not only is it illogical that a *kollel* would give an open promise covering tens of thousands of NIS, but it is unlikely that *pl* would think they did. Second, endangering the ability to profit (i.e., from future stipends) is weaker than indirect <u>damage</u> discussed by the Mordechai (see Shut Harosh 68:12). While the Sha'ar Mishpat (61:2) posits that this obligation also works, it is unclear that in our case the obligation is sufficiently explicit. Third, this case is less than loss of future profit, as an individual cannot ask *Misrad Hadatot* for a stipend, just that his *kollel* can, and the *kollel* decides how much to give to the *avreich*. Thus, it is only more difficult, not impossible, for an *avreich* after the *Kollel Haelef* years to find a *kollel* willing to pay him as much as they would otherwise.

Because *def* did not do a sufficient job of clarifying the matter of *Kollel Haelef*, we rule based on compromise that *def* must pay each member of *pl* who lost as a result 4,000 NIS.

Comments or questions regarding articles can be sent to: info@eretzhemdah.org

Eretz Hemdah is the premier institution for training young rabbis to take the Israeli Rabbinate's rigorous Yadin Yadin examinations. **Eretz Hemdah**, with its distinctive blend of Religious Zionist philosophy and scholarship combined with community service, ensures that its graduates emerge with the finest training, the noblest motivations resulting in an exceptionally strong connection to Jewish communities worldwide.