

Weekly Shiur from Maran HaRishon LeTzion HaGaon Rabbi David Yosef shlit"a, Motzaei Shabbat Parashat Noach 5787, Shiur #372

English

Parashat Lech Lecha

Requesting Tal U'Matar | Hastening Cooking on Shabbat

Topics of the Shiur:
Praying from a Siddur | Mistakenly Omitting *Veten Tal U'Matar* | Remembering at the Conclusion of the Blessing after Saying Hashem's Name | Requesting *Tal U'Matar* Between Blessings | Stirring a Pot | Returning the Lid of a Pot on Shabbat | Causing Cooking | *Melachot* Performed Indirectly | Concern for Chicken Bones Softening | A Shabbat Urn Whose Water Has Not Fully Boiled | Feeling Pain over the State of Judaism in the Holy Land

From the Opening Remarks of HaGaon Rabbi David Berdugo shlit"a, Dayan in the Great Rabbinical Court:

…As we said earlier, Maran a"h built us a great ark of Noach, and that is where we must go. We must not be drawn after all sorts of small arks that stand no chance against the great flood that could, Heaven forbid, sweep them away. We have one ark that Maran built for us. We must always go with him, constantly immersed in Torah, mitzvot and good deeds, and in bringing merit to the public. We have merited, *Baruch Hashem*, that Maran continues to give us the opportunity to keep learning from his holy books; it is impossible to take a step without his books. *Baruch Hashem*, we also merit his son, Maran, the crown of our head, shlit"a, who brings merit to the public. I heard what Rabbi Ovadia the grandson, the son of *morenu ve'rabbenu*, said last week about the enormous scope of this work of bringing merit to the public—so many kollelim, evening kollelim, so many *talmidei chachamim*. Maran is alive; Maran is with us. Maran is with us—here we are now continuing in his ways, and Maran shlit"a continues his holy path of bringing merit to the public. We need only remember this: not to leave, not to distance ourselves from the ark of Noach that Maran a"h gave us, until we merit, soon, with Hashem's help, the complete redemption, speedily in our days, amen.

Shiur of Maran HaRishon LeTzion shlit"a

Yashar koach to HaGaon Rabbi David Berdugo shlit"a, a member of the Great Rabbinical Court, who is one of the most senior and most distinguished *dayanim* in Eretz Yisrael and among the first graduates of the Yechaveh Daat Bet Midrash. *Baruch Hashem*, he sits in the Bet Din and judges with complete truth, in the depths of halachah, with sharpness and breadth of knowledge—fortunate is he and fortunate is his portion. He is a true model to follow, and he also disseminates Torah widely. May his strength be firm; may he continue to go from strength to strength, spreading his wellsprings outward, to magnify Torah and glorify it.

Praying from a Siddur

This evening we began (in Eretz Yisrael) requesting *tal u'matar*—"*Barech Alenu*" and "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah*." Of course, someone who prays from a siddur is almost certain not to err and omit "*Barech Alenu*." The problem begins when people pray by heart, because then a person follows the habit of his tongue. We must know that according to the *Talmud Yerushalmi* (*Ta'anit* 1:1), if a person did not concentrate properly in his prayer and does not know whether he said "*Barech Alenu*" or not, this is not considered a doubt. The *Yerushalmi* says that for thirty days there is a presumption that one has not yet grown accustomed to saying Barech Alenu, and he must go back since it can be assumed that he didn't say it. It is therefore very important that everyone pay attention to this and be careful and precise to say "*Barech Alenu*" and "*Veten tal u'matar*."

Mistakenly Omitting Veten Tal U'Matar

If a person erred and did not say "*Barech Alenu*": among the Sepharadim there is a huge difference in the entire wording of the blessing. In the summer we say "*Barechenu*," and in the winter "*Barech Alenu*." Among the Ashkenazim the difference is one sentence: in the winter they add "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah al kol penei ha'adamah*."

If a person did not say "*Veten tal u'matar*"—he did not request rain—I already explained in previous shiurim that *Chazal* established that this invalidates the prayer, because it is not merely a mention of praise but a request from *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* for rain at a time when the world needs it; therefore we make him go back. However, the Gemara (*Berachot* 29a) says that if he did not request it in the Blessing of the Years (*Birkat HaShanim*), we do not make him go back, because he can say it in *Shome'a Tefillah*. *Chazal* gave him an option. All the middle blessings, from "*Atah Chonen*" to "*Shome'a Tefillah*," are requests for a person's needs, and if he did not request it in the *Birkat HaShanim*, the blessing instituted specifically for this, he can say it in the last of the middle blessings, the blessing of "*Shema Kolenu*," which is a general blessing for all kinds of requests a person wishes to make. In "*Shema Kolenu*" he can say "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah… ki Atah shome'a tefillat kol peh, Baruch Atah Hashem, shome'a tefillah*."

He Did Not Yet Conclude the Blessing and Remembered

Someone who said "*Baruch Atah Hashem*" but had not yet said "*Mevarech hashanim*," and remembered that he did not say "*Veten tal u'matar*"—I said in the shiur two weeks ago that this applies to something whose omission requires going back. For example, on Rosh Chodesh in *Shacharit* and *Minchah*, if he did not say "*Ya'aleh VeYavo*" and said "*Baruch Atah Hashem*" but had not yet concluded "*hamachazir Shechinato leTzion*," the *Ritva* (*Ta'anit* 3a) writes that he says "*lamedeni chukecha*" and goes back to "*Retzeh*." This is because it is a verse in *Tehillim* (119:12): "*Baruch Atah Hashem lamedeni chukecha*" (Blessed are You, Hashem; teach me Your statutes). He has made a certain interruption in his prayer, but at least he has gained that he did not make a *berachah levatalah* (a blessing in vain).

Here, however, there is a question. If he says "*lamedeni chukecha*" and goes back to "*Barech Alenu*"—this is indeed something for which we make him go back: if he finished the prayer without requesting *tal u'matar*, he must return to the beginning of the prayer, because it invalidates the prayer. On the other hand, we could say that since he can correct it in "*Shema Kolenu*," it is considered like something for which we do not make him go back. The *Ritva* cites a dispute on this, and we rule in practice that only in a case where the omission requires going back is there the enactment of saying "*lamedeni chukecha*." Therefore, if someone said

"*Morid hatal*," reached "*Baruch Atah Hashem*" and had not yet said "*mechayeh hametim*," he cannot say "*lamedeni chukecha*" and go back to "*Atah Gibor*," since the law there is that he does not go back, because he mentioned "*Morid hatal*."

He Should Say Lamedeni Chukecha

In practice, I think he should say "*lamedeni chukecha*" and go back to "*Barech Alenu*," because we treat this as something for which one goes back, since ultimately it invalidates the prayer. As I will explain shortly regarding requesting *tal u'matar* between blessings, there is proof from there that this is indeed considered something for which one goes back. In fact, I saw an article published many years ago in the name of Maran HaGaon Rabbi Meir Mazuz zt"l that says exactly this. He brings these considerations, and this is his conclusion: to say "*lamedeni chukecha*" and go back to "*Barech Alenu*."

Mentioning It Between Blessings

In previous shiurim, when I spoke about "*Mashiv HaRu'ach U'Morid HaGeshem*" and about "*Ya'aleh VeYavo*" on Rosh Chodesh, I said that for something whose omission requires going back—for example, if he did not say "*Ya'aleh VeYavo*" on Rosh Chodesh in *Shacharit* or *Minchah*, concluded "*hamachazir Shechinato leTzion*," and then remembered—he says "*Ya'aleh VeYavo*" there. This is the view of Maran the *Shulchan Aruch* (*O.C.* 422:1). It is true that this is a dispute among the *Rishonim*: once he has finished the blessing but has not yet begun the next one, do we say that since he finished the blessing he is no longer connected to it? Or perhaps, as long as he has not begun the next blessing, he still has a connection to the previous one? In practice, however, Maran the *Shulchan Aruch* rules that he may say it between blessings.

In light of this, if he said "*Mevarech hashanim*" and remembered that he did not request *tal u'matar*, he should say there "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah al kol penei ha'adamah*," and continue with "*Teka beshofar gadol lecherutenu*." However, since this is disputed—some say there is room to argue that since *Chazal* established that he can say it in "*Shema Kolenu*," it is considered something for which we do not make him go back, and consequently saying it between blessings will not help—in such a situation it is advisable that in "*Shema Kolenu*" he say "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah*" once again.

Halachah in Practice

Let us make a quick, brief summary of all the details, so that everyone will remember them, and if, Heaven forbid, he encounters such a problem in the middle of prayer, he will know what to do and will not stand there not knowing what to do. He cannot ask, and he cannot go look in a book—it is not simple:

If he did not say "*Veten tal u'matar*" and reached the conclusion of the blessing:

- If he has not concluded at all, and said only "*Baruch Atah*" and remembered, he goes back to "*Barech Alenu*."
- If he said "*Baruch Atah Hashem*," he says "*lamedeni chukecha*" and goes back to "*Barech Alenu*."
- If he said "*Mevarech hashanim*" and remembered, he says there "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah al kol penei ha'adamah*"—only this sentence—and continues with "*Teka beshofar gadol lecherutenu*." It is proper and advisable that in "*Shema Kolenu*," before "*ki Atah shome'a tefillat kol peh*," he say "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah al kol penei ha'adamah*" again.
- If he said "*Teka*," even one word, he has lost all these remedies, and he must continue on to "*Shema Kolenu*," which is the solution *Chazal* gave us in the Gemara.
- If he forgot in "*Shema Kolenu*" as well, and said "*Baruch Atah Hashem*," the *Mishnah Berurah* (117:19) writes that he should say "*lamedeni chukecha*," go back to "*Shema Kolenu*," and say "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah*" there.
- If he concluded "*Shome'a Tefillah*" and remembered, he says there "*Veten tal u'matar livrachah al kol penei ha'adamah*."
- If he already began "*Retzeh*," even only one word, there is a great dispute among the *Rishonim*. Some *Rishonim* say he goes back to "*Shema Kolenu*," since *Chazal* gave him the option of correcting it in "*Shema Kolenu*." Other *Rishonim* say that although they gave him the option of saying it in "*Shema Kolenu*," if he lost that option he must return to the source—to "*Barech Alenu*." This is the ruling of the *Shulchan Aruch* (*O.C.* 117:1), that he must go back to "*Barech Alenu*." This is one of the strong proofs my father, Maran zt"l, had that in prayer we do not apply *safek berachot lehakel* (in a doubt regarding blessings we are lenient); the very ruling of the *Shulchan Aruch* proves it.
- If he already finished the second "*Yihyu leratzon*" after "*Elohai Netzor*," and remembered that he did not say "*Veten tal u'matar*," or he is in doubt—even though he has not yet taken the three steps back—he returns to the beginning of the prayer.

These, briefly, are the details of the laws. Everyone should take them to heart, and we hope we will not need them.

Stirring a Pot

In *Masechet Betzah* (34a), the Baraita speaks about several people, each of whom performed one action, and all of them are liable by Torah law. One of the things mentioned there is "*higis bekederah*"—stirring a pot. That is, there is a pot in which the food has not yet cooked, and someone came and stirred—mixed what was inside the pot—and he is liable for cooking. The *Rishonim* write that he is liable for cooking because *kiruv bishul* (hastening cooking) is cooking. We do not say: the food was in the pot anyway, with the fire burning underneath, and it would have cooked anyway; all he did was stir the food, turn it from top to bottom, and speed up the cooking of certain parts of it by just a few minutes. Nevertheless, hastening cooking is called cooking, and one is liable by Torah law; it is a complete desecration of Shabbat. Stirring food that is not fully cooked is called *megis bekederah*.

Furthermore, *Chazal* also forbade taking food out of the pot. For example, someone prepared a dish before Shabbat, such as boiling beans with potatoes. On Shabbat night the potatoes are fully cooked, but the beans, which are harder, take time and are still not cooked, and he wants to take out some potatoes that are already cooked. It is forbidden to do so, because removing food from a dish that is not entirely fully cooked also makes one liable for cooking.

Hastening Cooking

The law that hastening cooking is considered cooking and is forbidden by Torah law is written by several of the *Rishonim*, and this is how they explain the Baraita that says one who stirs is liable—because of hastening cooking. So write the *Ramban* (*Shabbat* 18b), *Rosh*, *Ran* (*Shabbat* 6b in *Rif*), *Ritva* and *Meiri* (*Shabbat* 18b), and others.

Tosafot (*Shabbat* 48b) add another halachah. If there is a dish that is not fully cooked, sitting on the fire or on the *plata* (electrical hotplate, or a metal sheet on top of a flame)—for this subject the *plata* is like fire, since after several hours the food on the *plata* cooks—and he removed the lid from the food, it is forbidden to put the lid back on. Once he removed the lid, it will take longer to cook, and when he covers it again, the covering is hastening cooking. The lid increases the heat, and it certainly hastens the cooking of certain parts, for example the parts at the top of the dish. Therefore, if there was no lid at all, or there was a lid and he took it off and wants to put it back, this is called hastening cooking, and it is a Torah prohibition of full-fledged cooking.

There is something very interesting here. After all, he merely removed the lid and put it back. Had he not put the lid back, then instead of being cooked at four in the morning it would have been cooked at seven in the morning; sometimes the liquid would evaporate faster, and it might even burn sooner. In the end he eats it much later, and the dish is cooked just the same. Yet the very fact that he sped up the cooking of certain parts of the dish is already forbidden.

On the other hand, when the entire dish is fully cooked, one may lift the lid off the pot and put it back. But this is only when he knows that everything in the pot is fully cooked. Then, even if the dish improves in the meantime, it is not forbidden, for this is how the view of the *Shulchan Aruch* is explained: once the food is fully cooked, there is no cooking after cooking, even where it shrinks and that improves it (*mitztamek veyafeh lo*). But if it is not fully cooked—as I said, if part of it is not fully cooked—then it is hastening cooking.

Causing Cooking

We said that hastening cooking is a Torah prohibition. Now, in the *Tur* (end of 257) and in *Rosh* it is written that it is forbidden because he "causes" (*gorem*) its cooking to be hastened. Maran HaGaon Rabbi Ben Tzion Abba Shaul zt"l writes in his responsa *Ohr LeTzion* that it really is only a *grama* (indirect causation). That is, he too of course rules that it is forbidden to return a lid to a dish—there is no question that it is forbidden—but he says the prohibition is only Rabbinic, since it is merely *grama*. It is not similar to *megis*, stirring inside the dish: when one stirs with his hands, he performs the act of hastening cooking with his hands, whereas when you return a lid, you are only preventing the heat from escaping. This is only causing, and it is forbidden only Rabbinically.

HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Levi

HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Levi zt"l writes similarly. We mention him today because this week is his yahrzeit: he passed away on the 11th of Cheshvan, cut short in his days and years, at the age of thirty-nine. He was very young, yet he managed to write many, many books. He was a great *matmid*, a man of straight reasoning and a great *lamdan*. My father, Maran zt"l, loved him very much and greatly esteemed him and his greatness in Torah. He wrote the books *Menuchat Ahavah*—where he writes what I just said—and *Birkat Hashem*, and many other books. He had a pure intellect and clear thinking; he was a tremendous *gaon*. He too, on his own, arrives at this novel idea: that where one merely returns the lid, it is called

"causing cooking."

One Must Be Careful

The words of Maran Rabbi Ben Tzion Abba Shaul and HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Levi seemingly have several proofs from the *Shulchan Aruch*. The *Shulchan Aruch* (*O.C.* 257:4) says: "But if it is not fully cooked…"—that is, there is a pot that is not cooked, and he placed on it all sorts of covers, cloths and the like, to preserve the heat, to insulate it. The words of Maran the *Shulchan Aruch* make clear that when the food is fully cooked, one may add a blanket over the *hamin*. But if it is not fully cooked, even adding to the covering is forbidden, because this addition causes it to cook.

In the *Tur* (257) this law is brought with the wording that it "causes" its cooking to be hastened, and seemingly we see that this is merely indirect causation. Indeed, the *Shulchan Aruch* (*O.C.* 254:4) writes that it is forbidden to add a covering over something that is not fully cooked, in these words: "However, one must be careful not to return the cover if it was uncovered after dark, and not to add to it until they are roasted, because this hastens the completion of their cooking on Shabbat." He does not write the word "causes," but he writes "one must be careful," meaning that it is not forbidden by Torah law; one must only be careful. Likewise, the *Rama* (end of 259) writes that if the food is not yet fully cooked, it is forbidden to seal the oven, because it "causes" cooking.

There are several proofs here, among them the *Tur* and *Rosh* (the father of the *Tur*) who use the word "causes." From this, the two great authorities I mentioned seek to prove that causing cooking is only Rabbinic.

However, if we look carefully at the words of the *Rishonim*, we will see that it is impossible to say this. The *Tur* (end of 257) writes that it "causes" its cooking to be hastened, and on this the *Bet Yosef* writes that all of this comes from the words of *Tosafot* in *Masechet Shabbat* (48a, s.v. *Dezeitim*). Whoever opens that *Tosafot*—it is a long *Tosafot*—will see that *Tosafot* write about covering a dish, and the wording of Tosafot is: "he is found to be cooking on Shabbat." *Tosafot* do not write "causes," but "he is found to be cooking on Shabbat," which implies that it is a Torah prohibition. Like *Tosafot*, *Smag*, *Sefer HaTerumah*, *Orchot Chayim* and several other *Rishonim* write so explicitly.

There are indeed *Rishonim*, such as *Smak*—the *Sefer Mitzvot Katan*—and *Hagahot Maimoniyot* on the *Rambam*, who write: "he is *like* one who cooks" (*kimevashel*), with the prefix *kaf*. But this is still no proof that they hold it is only indirect causation and forbidden only Rabbinically, because one can say that "like one who cooks" means that it is one of the ways of cooking—hastening cooking. Just as stirring is hastening cooking, and it is like cooking and Torah-level according to all opinions, here too "like one who cooks" is one of the ways of cooking.

Furthermore, the *Chiddushei Rabbenu Yehonatan HaKohen* of Lunel, who lived in the period of the Rambam, writes explicitly: "he is liable for cooking." When our Rabbis use the word *chayav* (liable), from the Gemara and the *Rishonim*, it means a Torah prohibition, and when it says *patur* (exempt), the meaning is exempt but forbidden Rabbinically. The *Meiri* also writes the word "liable" explicitly, meaning that they held one is liable by Torah law.

Similarly, the *Mishnah Berurah* writes in the *Bi'ur Halachah* (318:4), where there is a long discussion of the whole subject of food cooked to the level of *ma'achal Ben Derusai* (partially cooked, edible only in a pinch). Within it he writes that covering that hastens cooking makes one liable. He quotes the wording of the poskim who write that it "causes," and he says that we are compelled to say the meaning is that one is liable by Torah law. He writes that this is also the view of the Vilna Gaon.

Shabbat Melachot Performed Indirectly

One can explain this principle as follows. Although some of the *Rishonim*—as mentioned, the *Rosh* and *Tur*, as well as the *Shulchan Aruch*—used the word "causes," "causes" does not necessarily mean *grama*, since in truth the entire *melachah* of cooking consists of causing something to cook. Take, for example, the *melachah* of *borer* (selecting): the *melachah* is done by an act with one's hands; one must perform an action. Most *melachot* are likewise done by a person with his hands. But with the *melachah* of cooking, we place the pot on the fire, and the fire performs the act of cooking. Yet a person cannot say, "Master of the World, I did not cook; I only put the pot there, and the fire cooked." That is, the entire essence of this *melachah* that the Torah forbade is accomplished indirectly. This explanation is written by Rabbenu Chayim Ohr Zarua, the son of the Ohr Zarua, in one of his responsa. He gives an example: the *melachah* of *zoreh* (winnowing). *Zoreh* is when a person takes grains that are inside the stalk, inside the chaff, and throws them up; the chaff is very light, so the grains, which are much heavier, fall to the ground, while the wind blows the chaff to one side. This is how he separates the grain from the chaff.

The *melachot* of *zoreh*, *borer* and *meraked* are very similar *melachot*; in fact they are the same thing. There are certain differences in how they are performed. *Meraked* has nothing to do with dancing… *meraked* means sifting flour—he moves the sieve from side to side. But the root of all three is one: separating food from waste.

The Gemara in *Masechet Bava Kamma* (60b) says that one who winnows is liable by Torah law because it is called *melechet machshevet* (purposeful labor). The *Rosh* there explains: why is winnowing called a Torah *melachah*? After all, the one who winnows is assisted by the wind; without the wind he cannot do anything—without wind the grains and the chaff will fall to the ground together. He selects with the help of the wind. Yet it is not called *grama*, since his intention was to select and his plan was fulfilled—and this the Torah forbade. That is, according to the *Rosh*, winnowing is a *melachah* that is *grama*, yet the Torah forbade *grama* in this *melachah*.

Trapping by Indirect Means

There are more examples. Suppose a deer entered a person's house—how wonderful, a deer came in! (He will make delicacies from it later… today that is against the law…) He wants to trap the deer. Instead of pouncing on it and catching it, he can do something simple: close the door—and the deer is trapped. He can play innocent and say: "What did I do, after all? I closed the door. Is it forbidden to close a door on Shabbat?" The answer is yes! When there is a deer there and you intend to trap it, closing the door becomes a full-fledged Torah *melachah*.

Or a person took a trap—he does not want to catch mice, he wants to catch deer, so that he will have food. He sets a trap for a deer, puts food inside, and leaves the trap. There are many detailed laws on the subject of traps—whether the animal is considered trapped immediately or not—with a wide range of opinions among the *Rishonim* and *Acharonim*. With Hashem's help, in my book *Halachah Berurah*, volume 24, which will be published soon, I deal at length with the *melachah* of trapping, and there I bring from the words of the poskim that many poskim say setting a trap is similar to winnowing. It is one of the ways of trapping—hunters normally set traps. Even though he only set the trap and did not touch the deer, since trapping is normally done with a trap, it is called full-fledged trapping by Torah law.

We see that not every *melachah* requires a person to perform a physical act with his hands. There are *melachot* in which he performs an action, but the *melachah* itself is done by another factor. The same applies to cooking: he only places the food on the fire, the fire cooks it, and he is liable by Torah law. That is, the entire essence of the *melachah* is accomplished indirectly. Therefore, when the *Rosh*, *Tur* and *Shulchan Aruch* used the word "causes," they did not mean that it is *grama*; their main intent was to describe the form of the *melachah*, because this *melachah* is by nature indirect. Since ultimately he sped up the cooking, even though it would have cooked anyway, he is nevertheless liable by Torah law.

Don't Stick Your Nose In

We can learn from this several very important halachot that everyone should pay attention to in his home. A person who places food that is not fully cooked on the *plata* on Erev Shabbat must be careful not to stick his nose where it does not belong… He wants to see, to smell, to check—but when he lifts the lid and puts it back while not everything is fully cooked yet, he is performing a full-fledged Torah *melachah*. May one open the lid? Only if the entire dish—all of it, everything inside it—is fully cooked.

Concern for Chicken Bones Softening

In this context, the poskim of the last generation discussed an interesting question. Usually, when people put chicken into the *hamin*, they put chicken with bones. Some bones soften, and some people like to eat those bones. For example, in a chicken drumstick the inner bone softens and becomes edible; some people eat it and some do not. HaGaon Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (cited in *Shemirat Shabbat KeHilchatah*, ch. 1, footnote 56; *Minchat Shlomo* 1:6), wrote that if one lifted the lid of a pot containing chicken whose bones have not yet softened, then not all the food is cooked, since the bones are not yet fully cooked, and it would be forbidden to cover this pot again.

HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Feinstein (*Igrot Moshe, O.C.* 4:76-77) of the United States, in contrast, disagrees, and writes that bones are not fit for human consumption—no one eats bones—and therefore he writes that it is permitted to close the pot. Rabbi Moshe Feinstein lived in the United States, and he was altogether surprised; he had not heard of putting chicken in *hamin*… Usually one puts meat—for a good *hamin* you need beef—so why on earth chicken?! But anyone who studies Rabbi Moshe Feinstein's words will see that he agrees that it depends on whether people eat it or not. If a person says that he eats the bones, then Rabbi Feinstein too acknowledges that it is forbidden. Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, however, is more stringent. Even if the person himself says, "I do not eat bones, and no one in my family eats bones, but I know that in Yerushalayim there are people who eat bones"—even though they are not the majority—in his view it is forbidden.

Several poskim of the last generation, such as HaGaon Rabbi Shmuel Wosner, HaGaon Rabbi Chayim Pinchas Scheinberg and HaGaon Rabbi Nissim Karelitz, wrote on this subject, along with several other poskim of the last generation, who argue that it depends: if I do not eat it—I and my household, meaning that no one will eat the bones from this dish—then it will indeed be permitted to return

the lid, because the bones are not considered human food; they are considered animal food.

But I say that I think we can rely on the words of the great poskim, since almost all of them agree that if I and my household do not eat them—meaning that no one will eat the bones of this dish whose lid is being returned—then even if there are other Jews in of Yerushalayim who do eat them, the very fact that no one will eat the bones of the dish in my home means it will be permitted to return the lid (see *Halachah Berurah* 318:81).

A Shabbat Urn That Has Not Fully Boiled

There is another common example of hastening cooking. In most homes there is an urn in which water is boiled for Shabbat. Of course, everyone should try to be prompt and prepare the urn an hour before Shabbat, so that the water inside will be fully boiling. But sometimes people forget, and then a few minutes before Shabbat they put water into the urn, on the Shabbat setting, and by late Shabbat night it will have boiled and be very hot. But this is a process—cooking is a process; it takes time. Since it is on the Shabbat setting, the cooking is slow. And there is a very difficult question here: what is the definition of cooked water? When is water called cooked? The *Ran* writes that once vapor begins to rise and the water begins to diminish, it is called cooked. But since the *Ran* holds that cooking to the level of *ma'achal Ben Derusai* is considered cooking, we cannot bring proof from his words.

The truth is that in reality a person always wants the water to boil before he uses it. For example, when someone makes coffee, he first boils the water, waits until it cools, and then drinks. No one says: "Why do I need to boil it and then wait for it to start cooling?! It is enough that the water gives off a little steam, even before it bubbles, and then I will make the coffee—that way I will shorten the process!" People do not say that, because people are particular to boil it. That is the way of people; also, in order to eliminate all the germs, it is better to boil it fully. Almost no one merely heats water; people boil it. That is, from his perspective, as long as it has not boiled, it is not called fully cooked. Now, suppose a person put water in an urn and it has not yet come to a bubbling boil. He comes home from the synagogue, makes Kiddush, and after the meal he wants to make a cup of tea. The water has not yet boiled, and he opens the urn's tap and takes out water. There is no doubt that once the amount of water in the urn has decreased, it will boil faster. Everyone knows that boiling a liter takes a certain amount of time, and boiling half a liter takes much less. So by opening the urn's tap—true, the water came out indirectly; he only released the way for the water to come out—ultimately, the bottom line is that he reduced the amount inside the urn and caused the cooking of the water in the urn to be hastened. Indeed, the *Minchat Yitzchak* discusses this subject, and his conclusion is to forbid it. Therefore one must pay attention, when preparing water for coffee and tea on Shabbat, to be careful to boil it before Shabbat. And if it has not boiled, he should be careful not to start taking water from it until he is sure it has reached the boiling point (see *Halachah Berurah* 318:144).

The Difference Between Noach and Avraham

Noach was in the ark for a very long time, months upon months. His job in the ark was not to sit and learn Gemara; rather, day and night he had to be the waiter of the animals and the beasts—that was his job. He had to go from one to the next and work hard, he, his wife and his children. It was dreadful.

When the flood ended, *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* told him, "Go out of the ark." *Chazal* note to his credit that he did not go out until *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* told him to. But what is praiseworthy here?! Being in the ark was hardly the greatest pleasure; it was dreadful. He should have gotten up and fled from there, to breathe freely! But Noach sat and waited until *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* would tell him.

Why did *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* give him this punishment? If *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* wanted there to be food for all the animals, why does He say to Noach, "And you, take for yourself of all food that is eaten, and gather it to you, and it shall be food for you and for them"? *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* could have sent down manna for them from Heaven! But no—*HaKadosh Baruch Hu* wanted to make him work, because he needed to know that "the world is built on kindness" (*olam chesed yibaneh*). He had refrained from doing kindness with all the people of his generation. He would have to work day and night to rectify the fact that he did not pray for the people of his generation; he did not try, he did not do enough to bring them close. Because of this he had to work hard in the ark.

If You Cared, You Would Cry!

We truly need to understand: why did Noach not pray?! After all, when he came out of the ark, he wept and said, "Master of the World, why did You destroy Your world?" His heart broke when he saw that the world was destroyed. So why did he not pray beforehand?!

HaGaon Rabbi Chayim Shmuelevitz explains this very beautifully in his book *Sichot Mussar*. When *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* informed Avraham Avinu that He wanted to destroy Sedom, it is written: "And Avraham drew near and said: Will You indeed sweep away the righteous with the wicked?! Perhaps there are fifty righteous within the city; will You indeed sweep it away and not forgive the place for the sake of the fifty righteous who are in it?! Far be it from You to do such a thing! Shall the Judge of all the earth not do justice?!" Avraham Avinu comes and pleads for abominable people like those of Sedom, that perhaps there are righteous people there. From fifty he goes down and down to ten—the minimum is ten. Then, when he sees that he has done the utmost to advocate on their behalf, "And Avraham went, when He had finished"—he finished speaking, and he left. But he made the effort; he cared.

Noach, by contrast, did not make an effort. Noach looked around him and saw that everyone was wicked! All of them, without exception—"for the earth is filled with violence," and "for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth." Everyone was corrupt; all were swindlers, crooks, thieves, committing all kinds of abominations. Noach saw this whole situation and understood that it was a waste of time. "Should I talk to them? Why should I talk to them? Why should I pray? Will it help?! It won't help; it's a lost cause!"

Why did Avraham pray? With Avraham Avinu, Avraham prayed, yet in the end it did not help, because there truly were no righteous people there at all, except for Lot, whom *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* sent angels to save because he had done a few mitzvot. Apart from him, no one was saved. They were all truly wicked.

The difference, rather, is that Avraham knew they were wicked, yet he prayed for them. Noach understood that prayer was superfluous: the decree has been issued, they deserve it, they are all abominable, all evil and great sinners—we're done; let them die. This was Noach's sin. There is no such thing as "it won't help." If you do not pray, and you just say that it won't help, what does that show?! That you don't care! Let us imagine—we see how painful it is—families in which one of the family members is very ill, and the doctors come and tell them there is no chance, it's a lost cause. What do the family members always do? They keep praying! The doctors said there is no chance, but it hurts them, and because of the pain they do not despair; they keep praying. If you did not cry, it is a sign that it does not hurt you. That is Noach's shortcoming. It shows that you did not care. If you had cared—whether it would help or not—you would have cried.

It is written about Iyov that he was one of Pharaoh's advisers. When Bilam came and advised enslaving the Jewish people, Iyov was silent. The Gemara says: Iyov, who was silent, was punished with suffering. Iyov had terrible suffering. Where is the measure for measure? Indeed, why was Iyov silent?! He saw how Bilam was proposing the final solution and how Pharaoh was enthusiastic, and he understood that it would not help. So why speak?! So he was silent.

So *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* brought suffering upon him. When a person is in pain he screams, "Ow, it hurts!" Why are you screaming?! Will it help?! If you scream, will the pain leave you?! It will not change even the intensity of the pain—nothing. Why are you screaming?! Rather, when it hurts, you scream! If you do not scream, it is a sign that it really does not hurt. A person who is in pain screams. Noach was silent—why didn't you scream?! Therefore he is judged so harshly here, as seemingly bearing great blame for what happened with the flood.

Feeling Pain over the State of Judaism in the Holy Land

The lesson we must learn from this whole subject is that what is happening here must pain us. It must pain us! When we see the situation here in the Holy Land—on the one hand, such terrible secularism, people who know nothing of Judaism; in Tel Aviv, in certain parts, it looks worse than Paris. No Judaism, nothing. No Shabbat Kodesh, no kashrut, nothing. On the other hand, we see how the holiest and most precious thing we have, our holy Torah, is spoken against, and how people fight against the Torah.

This must pain us. And when it pains us, we must cry out; we must weep over this situation; we must pray about it and do everything we can to change the situation. When I say everything we can, I do not mean, Heaven forbid, to go and run wild, block roads, curse, and say, "May Hashem annihilate them, may Hashem destroy them." We will gain nothing from that; we will only increase the hatred. Rather, we must cry out, pray, and try to do everything we can in pleasant ways to change the situation. With Hashem's help, we hope that *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* will pour upon all of us a spirit from on high, that the Jewish people will return to the Rock from which they were hewn, and that we will merit to hear good tidings.

I want to bless the entire congregation who came here, as well as the public who listen to the shiur on Radio "Kol Berama" and through other technological means—*yashar kochacham*. May we merit to continue teaching Torah, and with Hashem's help may we merit that the power of Torah grow stronger: "And it came to pass, when Moshe raised his hand, that Yisrael prevailed." Amen, *ken yehi ratzon*.