

MOOR LANE MORE TORAH

ד"ר



Issue 3 - Jan 2019

Tu B'Shvat / Parshat
B'shalach / Yitro

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FROM THE MANCHESTER MONTEFIORE COMMUNITY KOLLEL

TU B'SHEVAT

RABBI MOSHE STAMLER
RABBINICAL ADVISOR, MOOR LANE SHUL



GROWTH AND PLANTING: THE DUAL APPROACH TO OUR CHILDREN'S SUCCESS

The phrase 'new year for trees' conjures up for me an image of a rowdy get-together of oaks, pines, beech and elms in a circle, knocking back the vodka and wishing each other a happy new year. But the trees are not men. But are men trees? Sounds silly, but read on.....

You see the phrase 'Is a tree a man?' actually comes in the Torah. A siege is on: the besieging army on the outside needs to build a ramp. Trees available? Plenty, but they are fruit trees. 'No', says the Torah: don't cut down the trees. האדם עץ השדה? Is the tree a man? Or copying the exact word order: Is man a tree? But the commentators take their cue from here to make the question a statement, to see a hint that 'man is a tree', a being who is meant to grow and grow until his/her dying day. And from here I take my cue to recall the words of a deep Jewish thinker of the late 20th century Rabbi Shlomo Wolbe who applies this idea to education; to define the two processes which parents need to understand if they are to bring out their children's potential correctly: building and planting. The following is loosely based on his ideas. A parent has to build the child: building is essentially a process done to passive material with a distinct plan. If this idea is applied to education, it means a parent must give the child a well-defined structure: clear daily routines, procedures, ingrained good habits, clear rules, consequences, knowledge, work ethic, bed time, healthy

eating regime, personal hygiene, effective inter-personal skills. The more structure, the more secure the child feels. So, it is a question of building, structuring, stage after stage, yes even 'programming', 'hard-wiring' their brains and personalities with the correct responses and behaviour patterns. A parent who provides this structure sensibly and out of a sense of duty and responsibility for the child which God has intrusted to their hands will be successful in communicating to their child that they are acting in their best interests. It is where the parent controls the child out of a personal need to dominate or out of concern for the parent's own communal standing that things can go wrong. So far, the building process. Now the planting process. A child is like a tree, which will grow of its own accord all his/her life. After all the structure we provide, we have to let the child grow: our aim is to ignite the fire until the point when the 'flame rises by itself' to use the analogy of lighting the menorah. Within the well-defined secure structure we provide - the building process - we also have to allow the child room for growth, and growth in their own unique way. We are not charged with producing carbon copies of ourselves, and we cannot expect each child to achieve the same end goal as his/her siblings, or goals for the sake of giving kudos to the family. Avraham, Yitschak and Yaakov all achieved different areas of greatness precisely because Yitschak and Yaakov did not just seek to replicate their father's accomplishments; each one grew independently. To allow our children to grow we have to give them the opportunity to develop their own talents and - in a safe way - to develop independence both in action and in thought processes. How to do this within the borders which the Torah lays down requires thought and planning, and the answer must be different for each child. However, there are growth factors which are

SPONSORED LEILU NISHMAT YEHUDAH BEN SHMUEL HACHOHEN BRESLAUER

common for every child. One is warmth and encouragement; a warm happy home where there is harmony and the parents share the same goals; where a child feels the parents recognise their achievements and understand the challenges they face. This is like sunlight for a plant. Another growth factor is inspiration. We have to be inspirational to our children; we must be people in whom they can see a genuine attachment to God and His Torah. We have to remember that we are parents and not just friends and that requires that we maintain a dignity they can look up to. We have to expose our children to inspirational people and motivating stories, and to raise their sights regarding the greatness and refinement that a person can achieve. If we let our children grow without building them, they may grow wild. If we build them without letting them grow, they may become robots. The combination of growth and building - that is chinuch.

HALACHA TU B'SHEVAT

RABBI NAMIR COHEN
ROSH CHABURAH



LAWS OF THE ORDER OF BRACHOT

The Shulchan Aruch in Orach Chaim (131) tells us that we do not do Nefilat Apayim on the 15th of Shevat nor on the 14th at mincha, as it is the New Year for trees when the sap goes through the trees to rejuvenate them.

The Magen Avraham cites that its customary amongst the Ashkenazim to eat lots of fruit. The Yalkut Yosef explains that this is in order to remind us to pray for good produce for that year.

Chazal tell us in the Gemarah Megillah that Moshe instituted to learn the Halachot of each Hag in its time, which certainly creates a spiritual connection between us and the Hag and enables us to contain the hashpa'ot of the Hag. (The Kaf Ha'haim writes that one should learn the Halachot of brachot on Tu B'shvat.) So I would like to present here some of the laws of the order of brachot in accordance with the Sefardi rite.

1) These laws only apply if the foods are in front of the person and has no preference as to the order, e.g. if one wants to consume one fruit for dessert, then he has no obligation to make the blessing over the fruit, even though it comes first in the order of brachot.

2) If one has a fruit on which he plans on making shehechyanu, and happens to recite ha'etz on a different fruit then he should make ha'etz, eat the fruit (eg. an olive) and then make a shehechyanu on the new fruit and eat it.

3) If the shehechyanu is being recited on the same fruit that he is making the blessing on, then one should recite ha'etz first and then shehechyanu and then eat it.

4) The order is as follows. 1) Hamotzi, 2) Mezonot, 3) Hagefen*, 4) 5 Species, 5) Ha'etz, 6) Ha'adama, 7) Shehakol**.

5) Within the 5 species from Eretz Yisrael, the order is: Olives, Dates, Grapes, Figs and then Pomegranates. This is learnt from the passuk in Ekeb. The fruit closest to the word 'Eretz' in the passuk has precedence.

6) The reason that - although olives precedes grapes - wine still precedes olives is that it is more specific, hence showing more Hashgacha Pratit on each min, which is the essence of saying berachot.

7) This order also applies to the beracha acharona. Hence, if one consumed wine, olives and cake, then one would say it in the following order: al hamichya v'al hakalkala v'al hagefen v'al pri hagefen v'al ha'etz v'al pri ha'etz.

8) As we said however that ha'etz precedes ha'adama, hence if one eats an apple and roasted wheat [on which the beracha is ha'adama] then one would make the blessing on the apple first. ***

- 9) The order in number 4 (above) takes precedence over the order of number 10 (below)****.
- 10) Where they are the same beracha, then the order is as follows: Shalem – Whole. Chaviv – what they normally prefer (if he has no usual preference, then we usually go after what he prefers now). Naki - White bread. Gadol – size.
- 11) Therefore, if one has a slice of white bread and a loaf of spelt, one makes the beracha over the slice since the 7 species take precedence. *****
- 12) Within the 5 grains, the order is as follows: Wheat, barley, spelt, rye and oats.
- 13) Cake is before pasta; however, wheat pasta is before spelt cake.
- 14) The Kaf Ha'haim says that in absence of the 7 species, then fruit which Eretz Yisrael is praised for come first; so for example apples and walnuts (mentioned in Shir Hashirim) come before oranges.
- 15) If one likes oranges more than apples, then one can eat whichever one wants to first.
- 16) Once one has made the beracha, there is no order of eating the rest of fruit e.g. he has all of the 7 species, he makes beracha over olives, but now he may eat pomegranates before dates even if he likes the dates and they are whole and bigger.
- 17) These laws are only L'hachchila – in the first instance. However, if one changed the order one has still fulfilled their obligation. A case where the order of importance does make a difference to whether a beracha on one species covers another is the following: normally if one made a beracha on apples with no positive or negative intention regarding if they want to eat more then, if before they have finished eating what's in front of them they are brought an orange, they need not to make another beracha on the orange, as an apple is of equal important to an orange; however if they are brought a grape, they do need a new ha'etz, as an apple is less important than a grape.

*See Yalkut Yosef for dissenting opinion.

**However, if one is making Shehakol because of a Safek or Minhag like on sweets or chocolate where there is a reasoning to say

Ha'etz or Ha'adama, then one should say Shehakol first.

***See Mishna Berurah for dissenting opinion.

****See Yalkut Yosef for dissenting opinion.

*****Obviously, if one likes whole meal it is Chaviv and comes first.

TEFILLAH CORNER



RABBI DAVID SASHA

FRUITIER PRAYER

We've all heard of "Soup of the day" but who's heard of "Fruit of the day"? Recently I came across an interesting passage in "The Kuzari" where R' Yehuda Halevi refers to Tefillah as "the fruit of our day". As we find ourselves in the month of Shevat, I'd like to suggest an explanation of his comparison of Tefillah to fruit. In order for fruit to grow well, a great deal of care must be taken. The soil must be maintained, weeds removed, seeds selected wisely, and don't forget the frequent watering. Proper Tefillah also requires us to choose an ideal place, remove irrelevant thoughts, think carefully about the words and to water them with love. Secondly, as well as being a convenient and healthy snack, fruit is also tasty and refreshing; so too, with the appropriate preparation, Tefillah is a source of tangible enjoyment and vitality as we freshen and strengthen our relationship with the creator.

FOR CRYING OUT LOUD



RABBI GABRIEL KADA

Rabbi Yitschak Hutner in his magnum opus, Pachad Yitschak, has a magnificent insight into the workings of our Tefilla. In Shmot Perek 14,15, we find a perplexing dialogue between Hashem and Moshe: we find Moshe together with Bnei Yisrael trapped at the edge of the sea and Moshe crying out in prayer to Hashem and to which Hashem replies, "Why are you crying to me!?" In attempting to explain this baffling reply, which questions the very foundations of Prayer, Rashi comments that Hashem was answering that it isn't the time now to give a lengthy prayer as the Jewish nation are in distress. However, surely, the time of distress is the opportune time to pray and call to Hashem? Rabbi Hutner enlightens us by quoting a Medrash which brings the following Mashal. A king was once passing by on his way when he heard the cries of a young lady. The king noticed the young noble lady being attacked and immediately intervened and saved her. Feeling that special bond of dependency, they married each other. As time passed, those initial feelings wore off, and so, the king set up the scene again and riding his white horse, he again saved the day. Says the Medrash, when Hashem desires to hear our voice and our feelings of total reliance, He puts us through these difficult moments, which are staged by Hashem, in order for us to cry out to Him. This Medrash clarifies that sometimes Tefilla isn't a function to drive away problems we are facing; rather, it's a medium that creates that close relationship with Hashem, where sometimes unfortunately, the catalyst is the

painful times we endure. That being the case, concludes Rabbi Hutner, some tefillot must be kept short. As the purpose of the initial distress is the catalyst of prayer, that initial distress which caused the tefilla can only be terminated once the tefilla is completed. At the time of the exodus of Egypt, Hashem created the scenario of the distress at the splitting of the sea for the purpose of hearing the prayer of His Jewish people. The salvation could only come once the prayer had ended. Hence, Moshe's lengthy prayer at the time of the splitting of the sea was considered inappropriate and Nachshon's act of jumping in brought the salvation.

THE FAMILY
BUSINESS

RABBI MOISHE WIEDER



After the strain of a lifetime of servitude and the thrill of the dramatic maccos, finally, Pharoh, fearing for his own life, says "enough", and we are free! The feeling is indescribable...Like free men we can begin to dream of a bright future; we wonder what our cities will look like, how our children will look, dressed in real clothes as opposed to slave rags; what homes we'll live in. The possibilities are endless! Then, suddenly we are made aware of the fact that we are under pursuit, but who are we being chased by? A group of desert bandits? No...The Egyptian Army. What?!? We are confused. Not only by the fact that Pharoh, and seemingly the Egyptian people, have changed their minds so dramatically, but also by Hashem. We can't help but wonder why it could be that we would be led this far, with so many "not seen before and never to be seen again" miracles, only to be recaptured, or worse - killed at this point by the sea! Rav Shlomo Wolbe zt"l writes that this question is in fact asked by the Medrash in parshat Beshalach, Shemot Rabbah 21:5: The Medrash answers, that the reason why Hashem brought about such a strange sequence of events is because he desired the tefilot of the Jewish People. Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi, the Medrash relates, then goes on to tell a tale...Once upon a time, there was a king who set upon his journey from one kingdom to another. At one point, he heard screams coming from outside the carriage. He saw it was none other than a princess, and she was being attacked

by a group of bandits. Immediately he made his presence and power known and the group scattered. Months later, the king attempted to contact the princess he had saved; however, she showed no interest and failed to respond in kind. The king was broken hearted. He then came up with a plan...He sent a group of bandits to attack the princess as he was travelling through the same kingdom. The princess again screamed, and again the king was there to save her. The king said to her, "This is all I've been waiting for...to hear your voice again!". Explains Rebbe Yehoshua Ben Levi, the Jewish People are like the princess in the tale. We were saved by Hashem from all the evils of Egypt, however, we then failed as a nation to maintain the relationship with G-D which He yearns for. So, Hashem's plan was to bring us to heartfelt prayer and connection once again through the terror of the oncoming siege. And it worked. The passuk says that Bnei Yisrael "lifted up their eyes and behold, the Egyptians were travelling towards them, and they became very fearful and the Bnei Yisrael screamed out to G-D" Shemot 14:10. This response to adversity is the age-old response entrenched deep within the make-up of every Jew. As Rashi says on this passuk: "They took up the trade of their forefathers", Rashi then goes on to relate how the Torah records the prayers of Abraham, Yitzchak and Yaacov, which brings home the rich history of prayer among our people. Rav Wolbe once related, that a talmid of his who was serving at one point of his life in the Israeli Army was amazed by the following occurrence: When his unit came under fire from the enemy, the most cynical and secular of his army comrades burst into fervent prayer, reciting Kriat Shema and other pesukim, which their subconscious had stored away for times like these. The reason for this, explained Rav Wolbe, is the deep connection every Jew has at his root to his Creator. Only, sometimes, a person may need an existential threat to be present for it to be brought out into the open. We all, however, can "pick up the tools" of our forefathers and harness the great power of tefillah which Hashem yearns to listen to, whatever our current situation. What greater incentive is there than that!

HALACHA IN THE PARSHA

לחם משנה

RABBI MEIR RABINOWITZ



One of the classic symbols of Shabbat - a pair of tasty-looking brown shiny platted challot – takes its source from this week's parsha בשלח, which refers to לחם משנה, a double share of bread, the origin of having two challot at every Shabbat meal. I will deal with three questions about לחם משנה:

1] whether it is a Torah or Rabbinical requirement; 2] whether we need to cut both challot; 3] whether the second challah can be bread which you cannot eat.

Is לחם משנה a Torah requirement? The actual phrase לחם משנה in our parsha is talking about the double amount of manna which fell on Fridays. Rabbi Abba derives from this phrase the need to have two loaves when making המוציא at the Shabbat meals גמרא שבת קי"ז.

רב זרובב understands this to be a Torah requirement, and as a result he holds that if shortage of funds required a choice to be made between לחם משנה and כרם וקדוש on wine and חנוכה, then לחם משנה comes first. Contrast this to the view of the אברהם. He is dealing with the rules of when we have to repeat ברכת המזון if we forgot to say יעלה ויבא or רצה, and in this context he states that לחם משנה is a Rabbinical requirement and the source quoted from the פסוק is only an אסמכתא, a source used as support for a Rabbinical concept.

Another place where the אברהם shows his view about לחם משנה is regarding the prohibition against taking bread out of the oven on Shabbat. [This is talking about 'unsticking' bread which has been baked against the

wall of an oven]. He allows this if you have no other bread, as eating bread on Shabbat is an obligation, but not merely for the sake of complete loaves for לחם משנה, 'which is not such an obligation' I conclude this first question by quoting the פרי מגדים in [אורח חיים רע"ד] who writes that if someone makes an oath not to eat bread on Shabbat, the oath is valid. Even the רשב"א – whom he quotes as holding that there is a Torah obligation to eat bread on Shabbat- would agree with this: even though an oath not to fulfil a מצוה is not valid, where the obligation is not explicit in the Torah but is derived from חז"ל Rabbinical exegesis the oath takes effect. This proves that eating bread on Shabbat is an obligation, but not לחם משנה. Regarding the question whether we need to cut both challot, we start with the Gemara [שבת קי"ז]: Rav Ashi said 'I saw Rav Kahana take two but break one. Rabbi Zera used to break bread 'for the whole service'. Rashi explains this phrase to mean larger slices than on the weekday. Rashba understands this to mean that he cut all the loaves, in which case Rabbi Zera is arguing with Rav Kahana. The Shulchan Aruch rules that you only need to hold the two loaves when saying המוציא but not to cut/break both of them. The Vilna Gaon rules according to the Rashba's explanation of Rabbi Zera and requires both challot to be cut. The Vilna Gaon's custom was to cut both challot, so that over the course of all three Shabbat meals he would cut six loaves into two, the twelve pieces serving as a reminder of the twelve loaves. of the לחם הפנים [show bread on the table of the משכן]. Some use twelve small challot based on the Arizal. I will start the third question about bread you cannot eat with the issue of using a frozen challah. Here there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the bread – it has a temporary problem which will solve itself. The Minchat Yitzchak and Or Letzion use this argument to permit frozen challa. The [סימן רעד] in ילקוט יוסף writes that it can be used if nothing else is available, but is good to prolong the meal so that the bread has become edible by the end of the meal. Better still is to borrow a challah from a neighbour, ensuring to return it after המוציא. Rav Moshe Sternbuch writes that a frozen challah is kosher to make up לחם משנה but is best avoided, because a 'stone-like' challah does not fit the requirement to use top quality challot as a reminder of the special taste and smell which the manna had on erev Shabbat. What about a non-kosher loaf as the second challa? The concept of reminding us of the manna is used by Rabbi S Z Auerbach to disqualify using a second loaf which is forbidden to eat. Since the manna was permitted, so must the לחם משנה be. So, a lard-based bread is no use. What about bread forbidden because of a 'chumra' [stricture]? Commercially baked bread where all ingredients are kosher but is baked by נכרים is allowed under certain circumstances. Someone who is strict about this may nevertheless use it to make up לחם משנה - פרי מגדים. If your second loaf is milky and you are having a meaty meal or vice versa, does this count as לחם משנה? Firstly, it must be clarified that bread must be parve unless it is a small loaf or is clearly in a different form than regular bread, so a large regular-looking milky/meaty loaf of bread cannot be eaten at all and certainly cannot make up לחם משנה. A small or unusual-looking milky/meaty loaf can be used – not only if it is milky bread followed by a meaty meal [where eating the bread does not spoil the meal] but even meaty bread followed by a milky meal [where eating the bread would spoil the meal by making you meaty]. This is because the bread is not intrinsically forbidden - שמירת שבת כהלכתה based on the פרי מגדים.

WE NEED THE TORAH

RABBI SHMUEL OPPENHEIMER



The Gemarah in Shabbat 88b famously relates an interesting give-and-take between the Malachei Hasharet and Moshe Rabbeinu. When Moshe ascended to heaven the following exchange took place between the Angels and Hashem: "What is mortal man doing amongst us?.... He has come to receive the Torah"..... The Angels then said to Hashem, "Keep Your glory (The Torah) in the Heavens"... Hashem told Moshe to give them an answer, so Moshe said to them, "What does it say in the Torah? Don't kill, don't steal... is there any jealousy or evil inclination amongst you"? Hashem immediately approved Moshe's response.

This narrative is perplexing. Surely the Malachim knew that the Torah wasn't 'geared' towards them! Why did they make such a fuss and say that the Torah should stay in the Heavens? The Dubno Maggid (1741-1804) explains with the following parable: There was once a Rabbi of a very large city who had presided there for many years. As he aged he felt that he no longer had the strength to preside over such a large city with all that

this entailed. Thus he sought a position in a smaller town which wouldn't be so taxing. Lo and behold he found such a position. The date was fixed for them to come with their horses and wagons to fetch him, his family and their belongings and bring them to their little town. The day came and as they entered the large city they were attacked by a mob of people who hit them!! They came and

WE NEED THE TORAH TO LIVE; THE TORAH TEACHES US THE CORRECT WAY OF LIFE. IT TEACHES US TRUE MORALS. WE CAN'T MANAGE WITHOUT THE TORAH. AS THE GEMARAH IN KIDDUSHIN 30A SAYS "I CREATED THE EVIL INCLINATION AND CREATED THE TORAH AS ITS ANTIDOTE".

complained to the Rabbi who promptly summoned the attackers for an explanation. The attackers answered the Rabbi: "We did it for your honour, in order that the people from the little town shouldn't think that you're not such a great Rabbi and were forced to leave your position. We therefore hit them in order to show how much we value you and we don't want you to go. We did this in order

that they should appreciate you and understand that you simply had no choice because you had no more strength". In the same way, says the Dubno Maggid, the Malachim wanted to show Moshe the tremendous value of the Torah in their eyes so that we should know what we're getting. Hence they put up a great fuss. Rav Yaakov Neyman zt"l, in his classic sefer Darkei Mussar, offers another approach to the above question. He explains that there are two parts to the Torah, Nigleh and Nistar (revealed and hidden). The Malachim knew that the Nigleh is geared to humans, but they wanted the Torah for the Nistar part, in order to benefit from the immense pleasure found in learning and toiling in it, as David Hamelech wrote "It is sweeter than honey...". Moshe Rabbeinu answered them: Do you have any jealousy between you, do you have an evil inclination? You Malachim don't kill or steal. You want the Torah to enjoy learning it. We need the Torah to live; the Torah teaches us the correct way of life. It teaches us true morals. We can't manage without the Torah. As the Gemarah in Kiddushin 30a says "I created the evil inclination and created the Torah as its antidote". How fortunate we are to have received the Torah which is the correct way of life given by The Creator of the universe.

All
Welcome



WE ARE PLEASED TO INVITED YOU TO A



SUSHI SUNDAY

Come and join us for

SUSHI TASTING

and hear a fascinating Shiur from
R' Moishe Wieder about:

“What is the correct Bracha on Sushi?
Is there a problem of raw fish?”



Sunday 10th
February

7.45 pm
(Arbit at 7.30)

Moor Lane Shul,
18 moor lane