



**YESHIVA UNIVERSITY
RABBINIC ALUMNI**

אין התורה נקנית אלא בחכמה
ברכות ס"ג

MENDEL GOTTESMAN LIBRARY

Vol. 2, No. 2

Kislev, 5717

Nov., 1956

Convention Elects Wohlberg President

MEN'S CLUB CONVENTION SUCCESS

Expectations for a record crowd at the Association of Men's Clubs Convention in the Brunswick Hotel in Lakewood for November 16-18 weekend were realized. Many clubs were anxious to have delegates participate in the workshops and sessions to bring home reports to their respective clubs. The interest in the Convention among men's clubs, generated by the Association's able representatives, reflects the vigor and energy which characterizes the Association's program.

The Convention weekend consisted of a combination layman's retreat and men's club institute. On Shabbat delegates heard colleague Klaperman deliver a talk on his visit to Russia, colleague Wohlberg deliver a talk on "The Sabbath" in his incomparable style, and many other prominent speakers. Saturday night was entertainment night and delegates enjoyed shows, music and a grandiose smorgasbord. On Sunday there was a special ladies' program, while the men heard our own Prof. Hurwitz conduct an audience participation workshop on Jewish content programming. Business sessions, reports and elections followed and the day concluded with a banquet at which colleague Lookstein was principal speaker.

All rabbis were urged to send delegates and reserve as early as possible. Many colleagues were accompanied by their delegation to this well programmed weekend.

The Association guaranteed that any delegate attending the Convention will return enthused and replete with new ideas on the Men's Club, its programming and organization. And so it was.

For details and literature on the Association write to the Association of Men's Club c/o Yeshiva or to colleague Spiro's Program Department, which is advisor to the Association.



The 13th Rabbinic Alumni Convention was held in Spring Valley, New York this year at Rubinfeld's Monsey Park Hotel and unanimously elected Harry I. Wohlberg to succeed Joseph H. Lookstein. The gathering created a glowing enthusiasm and inspiration for all participants. Nature seemed to reflect the warm comradely atmosphere as it offered a delightful set of Indian Summer cloudless days for the convention. The resultant outdoor sessions injected an informal conversational element into the discussions so that they resembled a family circle.

This year the main theme of the convention was "New Horizons in Jewish Education". Our colleagues offered presentations with a diversity of views and penetrating analyses on successful examples of certain aspects of the rabbinate relating to education. The collective pattern revealed an earnest and self-sacrificing effort on the part of colleagues to bring youngsters to Torah, giving up personal time and comfort for this goal.

The first session on Monday evening October 1st, witnessed the official opening of our convention with

Dr. Joseph Schwartz opening the dinner session. Joseph H. Lookstein, introduced our distinguished alumnus who is presently director of the Israel Development Corp., which is the official Israel Bonds sales agency. An enlightening and inspiring talk ensued.

The evening session featured committee reports, indicating the assiduous progress of our organization in many fields of endeavor. It was heartening to learn of the dedicated efforts of a few select colleagues to bring general welfare to our alumni.

On Tuesday morning, October 16th, our worthy past president, Joseph Lookstein, delivered his presidential address. It represented a major study and analysis of problems pertaining to Jewish education and was presented in his inimitable manner. Various members of the C.S.D. presented their annual reports of achievement. A most spirited participation of alumni followed which showed the great strides towards consolidation of Yeshiva ideals in the community but also pointed to the great task that still lies ahead in the outlying regions in need

(Continued on Page 6)

CHAVRUSA

is published by the Rabbinic Alumni of Yeshiva University, in cooperation with the Community Service Division of Yeshiva University, Amsterdam Ave., and 186th Street, N.Y. 33, N.Y.
 Abraham R. Besdin*Editor*
 Jacob Goldberg*Asst. Editor*
 Solomon J. Spiro*Executive Editor*

Editorial Board

Theodore Adams — *Rabbinic Welfare*, Morris H. Finer — *C.S.D.*; Mandell H. Fisch — *Alumni News*; Irving A. Margolies — *Our Alma Mater*; Sam Hartstein, *Advisor*; Sidney B. Hoenig — *Books*; Emanuel Holzer — *Alumni Profile*; Joseph I. Singer — *Periodicals*; Solomon J. Spiro — *Programming*; Joseph Weiss — *Halacha*.

Vol. 2, No. 2 Kislev, 5717 Nov., 1956

Editor's Prerogative

There are issues of pressing nature which await authoritative Halachic resolution. Both in Israel and in this country, problems arising out of our technological age and changed patterns of thinking, demand bold Halachic analysis and decision. To linger in irresolution is fraught with danger for, then, expediency and rationalization will have their play.

In our rabbinic labors, numerous problems plead for consideration by *g'dolim* conversant with the American Jewish scene. The pitfalls of new innovations, the implications of changing modes, the dangers implicit in modified procedures, — these warrant serious study by our authoritative scholars. The practicing rabbi must take a stand, and, *de facto*, render a decision by commission or omission. The detachment of the Bais Hamedrash with its relative insulation is a luxury not given to us. As Bnai Yeshiva, we wish to implement G-d's will as revealed through the Halacha. However, the press of problems and the challenge of our work requires adaptability which, with proper Halachic guidance, can be confined within the discipline of our traditions.

The Halachic paper by Norman Lamm on Late Friday Services is, therefore, a most welcome treatment of a topically pressing problem. Irrespective of the final "Halacha La' Maisa," this paper has already evoked a spirited correspondence and avid discussion. We pray for continued such efforts by colleagues to clarify the challenging problems of our day.

Abraham R. Besdin

Our Roshe Hayeshiva

By JACOB GOLDBERG



One of the most distinctive and many-faceted personalities of our Yeshiva family is our beloved Rebbi of the month,

הרב אהרן דוד בוראק שליט"א

Teacher of eminence, Darshan par excellence, Rabbi of prominence, Community Leader of achievement, Rabbi Burack has busily distinguished himself in many careers, and has labored fruitfully on many branches of the L-rd's vineyard. Foremost among his labors of love, he counts his pleasurable duties as Rosh Yeshiva for the last 37 year at our alma-mater.

Rabbi Burack received his Rabbinic education at the Telzer Yeshiva, and was given Smicha by Hagaon R'Yosel Leib Bloch and the Lomzer Rov, Hagaon R' Yehuda Leib Gordon. Coming to America just before the first World War in 1914, he became associated with Yeshiva (at that time on Henry St.) almost immediately thereafter, and began his Shiur in Talmud in 1919. Since that time, he has been an uninterrupted inspiration and source of guidance for literally thousands of talmidim, hundreds of whom have gone on to Smicha and careers in the rabbinate.

Rabbi Burack has always been recognized as one of the most articulate and effective speakers of our Roshe Yeshiva. On many occasions — both of simcha and sorrow — he has been the spokesman for the Rabbis and student body. Frequently the fea-

tured speaker at a Chanukah or Purim Chagiga, some of our choicest memories of student life are bound up with the majestic picture of this beloved figure, earnestly speaking a rich, image-full, oratorical Yiddish—pleading, inspiring, persuading and charging us with the higher duties of being a Yeshiva-bochur first and a Jew always. His zeal and devotion to Torah have not lessened with the years, as his many friends and former students testify when renewing their friendships with him.

Rabbi Burack has occupied the pulpit of the *Cong. Ohel Moshe Chevra Thilim* in Brooklyn, since his coming to America, and was elected to life tenure in his congregation more than thirty years ago — the first orthodox Rabbi to achieve this mark of honor and respect in America. He is the Chairman of the *Vaad Harosh* of the Mizrahi and vice-President of the Agudas Ho-rabonim. The list of his active affiliation and leadership in the cause of Torah and the orthodox Jewish Community would take up much of this page. Our own Yeshiva honored him in 1954 with the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

He has only happy comments to make on the inspiring and inspired expansion of Yeshiva under Dr. Belkin's leadership. The Yeshiva has grown in quantity and quality. "The bochurim," he says, "*zeinen arein getift in lernin vi in di groseh Yeshivos in Europe.*" He is too modest to add that his own devoted ministrations have played an important part in our Yeshiva's growth. This testimony we, his talmidim, gratefully add.

Our Rabbi has published the highlights of his scholarly *chidushim* in his *Sefer, Pirchei Aaron*, in two volumes on *Halacha, Hagoda* and *Droosh*. He and his beloved Rebitzen Esther (the daughter of the well known R'Ayliyohu Inselbach) have seen nachas from their two sons and daughter, and grandchildren. We wish to extend to him and to his dear family our best wishes for continued joy and achievement. We who have been nourished by his wisdom in the past know his great value to the Yeshiva and its students which he will render in the years to come.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Dear Rabbi Fisch
 c/o "Fisch Pond"

We, the undersigned children of Rabbi Samuel Adelman want you to know that our Daddy was in Russia last summer also.

Please refer back to your column under "Kruschial News"

Sincerely yours,
 Rifka, Deborah, Shulamith
 and Mordecai Adelman

Newport News, Va.

מדרג ההלכה

Conducted by Joseph Weiss

THE LATE FRIDAY SERVICE IN THE LIGHT OF HALACHA

By Norman Lamm

(Continued from Previous Issue)

The Time Element B:

The next phase of our analysis of the time-element does not involve the matter of *Tosefes Shabos* and the fear that a Late Service will result in its violation, but concerns a totally different though less severe question. And that is the subject of *Orach Arah* or *Derech Eretz*. The source of this argument is *Shabos* 23b where the Talmud relates that the wife of R. Joseph was late in kindling the candles. Her husband rebuked her for her negligence, on the basis of a *Breishoh* that:

לא ימוש עמוד הענן ועמוד האש לילה מלמד שעמוד ענן משלים לעמוד אש — רש"י אלמא אורה ארעא בהכי

His wife then began to kindle the lights much earlier when, we read, אמר לה יהוה סבא תנינא ובלבד שלא יקדים ולא יאחר

The following should be mentioned with regard to this thesis:

1) As stated, Rashi refers to it as *Orach Arah*, and it is thus of a lower level of severity, since it does not inherently involve the essential laws of *Shabos*. Further evidence in support of Rashi that this does not touch on the question of *Kdooshas Hayoim* can be adduced from *Yalkut Shimoni* (Bshalach 230) where we read as follows:

בא הכתוב ללמדך דרך ארץ מן התורה על ערבי שבתות עד שעמוד הענן קיים יהי עמוד האש צמח

2) Even more important in this connection is the possibility that this entire episode of R. Joseph and his wife, and the dictum of *Hahoo Sava*, does not refer to the Sabbath candles but to the Chanukah candles. Such is the reading of *Bahag*, *Hilchos Chanukah*. A similar conclusion may be derived from a study of the text of R. Asher (assuming that all references to *Ner* on that folio are consistent; cf. text of Alfasi), although the Vilno Gaon emends the text with the word שבת indicating that the entire discourse refers to both *Shabos* and *Chanukah*. Maimonides mentions the prohibition of *Loi Yakdim Vloi Yaacher* as a unit only with regard to Chanukah in *Hilchos Chanukah Perek 5, Halacha 5*, and not in regard to *Shabos*; in the laws of the latter (*Perek 8 Halacha 3*), he only mentions the prohibition of lateness, not earliness.

3) Another possible proof of our thesis, though admittedly debatable, is the fact that this statement by *Hahoo Sava* that *Loi Yakdim Vloi Yaacher*, is mentioned verbatim with regard to a totally different topic, that of השלמת פרשיותיו עם הצבור (see *Brachos 8b*). The similarity seems

to be more than mere literary coincidence and would perhaps indicate that *Rashi* is right, that it is only a matter of *Orach Arah* [2] see notes of editor], and therefore transcends the boundaries of *Shabos* and does not concern the essential laws of *Shabos*.

4) A possible connection between this "sugya" and our problem may be found in the commentaries *Tosafos R'Yehuda Hachasid* and *Tosafos Harosh*, [3] see notes of editor,] who, in identical language, attempt to reconcile this exhortation of *Sheloi Yakdim* with the practice of Rav which was directly contrary to it — the custom of Rav of praying the Maariv of *Shabos* on Fridays before sunset, and accepting upon himself the *Kdooshas Shabos* from that time on. They resolve the seeming contradiction as follows: the prohibition of earliness applies only when the "Shabos-act" (i.e. praying the Maariv or candle-lighting) called *Mlachah Shel Koidesh* by R. Nissim in his commentary on Alfasi, Sab. 23b, s.v. ומדאמינן is performed without a concomitant voluntary acceptance of *Kdooshas Shabos* and the consequent obligation to desist from *Mlachah*. Where *Shabos* is concurrently accepted, then one cannot rightly speak of *Issur Hakdamah*, for the latter term refers to a *Shabos-act* performed prior to the *Shabos*; and since the sanctity of the *Shabos* is submitted to at that time then, subjectively, *Shabos* already exists for that person and there is no element of earliness involved. Without this voluntary acceptance of the prohibitions of *Shabos* simultaneously with the performance of the *Shabos* act, there is in force the *Issur Hakdamah* which refers precisely to this discrepancy between his particular deed and his subjective acceptance of *Shabos*.

According to this interpretation of the prohibition of *Sheloi Yakdim* which maintains the existence of a prohibition whenever the *Shabos-act* is not simultaneous with the beginning of *Shabos*-observance, the same might apply to שלא יאחר. (And in that case we would not have to assign two different reasons, one to earliness and one to lateness, as we must according to Rashi). That is the basic premise of the prohibition — the time-lag between the *Shabos-act* and *Shabos*-observance — would apply to lateness as well as earliness, [4] see notes of editor] (in principle, though not in practice, since it is inconceivable that R. Joseph's wife kindled the lights after sunset). Thus, since our Late Friday Service, as the *Shabos-act* (usually the only one for the people who attend it) is considerably later than the factual beginning of *Shabos*-observance, that lack of simultaneity would account for its illegality, in much the same way that early kindling of the *Shabos* candles is invalid if *Shabos* is not observed therewith, or that early *Maariv* of Saturday night on Saturday before sunset is prohibited according to Rav

Finally, let me say that these considerations are mentioned only cursorily, in the hope that someone will be sufficiently interested to pursue the matter further, particularly with a view to defining more clearly both the nature and limits of this prohibition, and particularly the nature of *Orach Arah*. I also want to repeat my previous suggestion, that even if we should derive a prohibition on the basis of these views of the commentaries of R. Asher and R. Yehudah Ha'chassid, we still have leeway because of the considerable opinion that the Talmud refers exclusively to Chanukah, not *Shabos*, and even if it does refer to the latter, the matter of *Orach Arah* can probably be successfully circumvented.

The Time Element C:

Our third field of inquiry concerning the time-element in these Late Services deals with the fear that a formal and regularly scheduled Late Service might encourage the desecration of the Sabbath between the time of sunset and the beginning of these services. There is the possibility that we might, by accommodating those who do not observe the *Shabos*, give the erroneous impression of sanctioning the violation of *Shabos* and countenancing the unarticulated impression that the Sabbath really begins at 8 or 8:30 P.M. during the winter months.

Support for this *Chashash* may be read into the words of *Tosafos* quoted previously. In that same *Tosafos*, we read a further reason for prohibiting של מוצ"ש בשבת (except under the special circumstances previously discussed):

ופשיטא שלא ממהרים להבדיל ולהתפלל של מוצ"ש בשבת דגם במלאכה אסור עד חשיכא It is my feeling that *Tosafos* here intended more than a statement of factual history — that indeed the praying of the Saturday night *Maariv* was not done before sunset of the Sabbath because work was forbidden anyway. I think *Tosafos* meant not only to record a de facto restriction, but a de jure interdiction, because of the fear that an early *Maariv* might inspire premature *Mlachah* and hence *Chilul Shabos*.

But even if we should stubbornly deny this interpretation of *Tosafos*, we have the unequivocal decision of Maharshal (quoted by *Bach* 29 3) as follows:

הכי נהוג שלא יתפלל של מוצ"ש בשבת דדבר תמוה הוא לרבים לעשות שבת חול ואיכא נמי למיחש שמא יבא להקל אף במלאכה.

And that same apprehension is easily transposed to our case of the Late Friday Service: formalize the *Tfilois Kabolos Shabos* at a late hour, and people will unconsciously infer that *Shabos* does not begin until then, and hence violate the *Shabos* in this interim period.

This *Gezeirah* suggested by *Maharshal* could easily be accepted by *Tosafos*. The latter do not presume any

(Continued on Page 4)

The Late Friday Service (Cont'd)

controversy amongst the *Amoraim* concerning the question of preventent Saturday night Maariv services, and therefore apply their restrictions of *Oiness Ultzoirach Mitzvoh*, on the basis of *Tosefes Shabos Mdoireisoh*, according to the unanimous consent of all *Amoraim*. Similarly all *Amoraim* would allow the preventent Saturday Night Services only in extenuating circumstances, but disallow them otherwise, for reasons of *Chashash Issur Mlachah* as developed by Maharshal, just as they do for reasons of *Tosefes Shabos Mdoireisoh*. The same would hold true for the Late Friday Service, which would therefore be ruled out by unanimous consent.

According to the interpretation of the *Netziv*, however, (who maintains that the matter of "שבת בשבת" is a point of contention between Rav and Shmuel, and by no means unanimous, with Shmuel unconditionally permissive and Rav imposing the restrictions mentioned), the interdiction of the Maharshal is acceptable only by Rav, and not by Shmuel, who would reject this stricture along with that of *Tosefes Shabos*.

Whatever the interpretation of our particular Talmudic passage, Maimonides' unconditional decision in favor of both early Friday and early Saturday night services controverts the stricture of Maharshal. Raavad too would agree with Maimonides, because his sole objection was on the basis of the impossibility of *Smichas Geulah Letfloh*. Had Raavad felt that there was a valid *Chashash Issur Mlachah*, he would certainly have given that reason priority over the one he does mention.

What we remain with in this third phase of the time-element, is that the *Chashash Issur Mlachah* too must be resolved as a difference between the *Chachmei Ashkenaz* and *Sforad* or, if we accept the analysis of *Netziv*, a difference between *Rav* and *Shmuel*.

The "Trans-Halachic" Issues:

At this point I want to touch briefly on what I have called the "trans-halachic" issues. When we investigate the problem of the Late Friday Service in its totality, rather than concentrate on any one single facet, we find that two conflicting tendencies present themselves to us.

On the one hand, there exists a tendency to forbid the Late Friday Service, especially in the modified form soon to be presented, for reasons of *לא התגודדו שני מטבע שטבעו חכמים* and the very desire to accommodate *Amei Haaretz* who are *Mechalelei Shabos* — in fact, because they are *Mechalelei Shabos*. Establishing the usual Friday night Maariv at a later hour, or formulating some different kind of synthetic Late Friday Service, might conceivably be regarded as *Shinui Matbeyah*. The fact that some Orthodox synagogues will hold these

Late Friday Services and others will not, all within this one country, leads to a problem of *Loi Sisgoidedoo* which must seriously be considered with regard to a number of other new practices as well. The very creation of new customs is in itself objectionable; Rabenu Tam has referred to such *Minhagim* as

גיהנם למפרע
שלטי גבורים למרדכי גיטין סימן תמ"ד
The idea of changing an accepted form practiced by observant Jews in order to please and win over the non-observant was frowned upon by a number of our greatest sages. Thus, Rabenu Tam writes to his opponent, Rabenu Meshulam, the following:

והי נפשך הר"ר משולם שאתה מעורב עם הבריות שלך להוסיף על שמועתא טובה ותהי מעורב עם תלמידי חכמים ולא תקדיה המקום «בעלי התוספות» — ל"א. א. אורבאך
(עמוד 64)

I might add, in passing, that in our case we must give very careful and weighty consideration to the possibility that this very accommodation of the non-observant by providing a Late Friday Service, may very well result in a de-emphasis of the regular Saturday morning services and a diminution of attendance at these services.

On the other hand, there is equally cogent reasoning arguing for the Late Friday Service. *Sheloi Tinoil Deles Bifnai Hashovim* is an old and honored principle in our Tradition. And we must in all honesty acknowledge the fact that there are people who, as a result of their regular attendance at these Late Friday Services, are drawn closer to *Kanfei Shechinah*. I do not believe that we have the moral right to react with indifference and even callousness to the innate desire of these people to retain some affiliation and identification with Torah, however, tenuous. Nor have we the moral right to despair of them and discard a whole segment of Jewry as hopeless. We all may quote, to be sure, the words of Maimonides in his *Mamar Kidush Hashem* where he writes:

אינו ראוי להרחיק מחללי שבת ולמאוס אותם אלא מקרבם ומזרזם לעשיית המצות וכבר פרשו רז"ל שהפושע אם פשע ברצונו כשיבא לביהכ"ס להתפלל מקבלים אותו ואין נוהגים בו מנהג בזיון, וסמכו על זה מדברי שלמה ע"ה. לא יבוזו לגנב כי יגנב למלא נפשו כי ירעב, אל יבוזו לפושעי ישראל שהם באים בסתר לגנב מצות.

Admittedly there are some differences between the two cases. But can anyone deny that there are similarities too, and that the spirit of Maimonides' exhortation applies to our situation as well? May not our people too be included in the category of those who are hungry of soul and who come to "steal Mitzvos"?

Summary:

What we remain with, therefore, is considerable weight on either side. Halachically, we have the following:

a) the Time Element, with regard

to *Tosefes Shabos* finds Rav and the Ashkenazic Rishonim prohibiting, and Shmuel and the Sephardic sages permitting.

b) the Time Element with regard to the principle of *Shloi Yakdim Vloi Yaacher* depends on the interpretation of the Talmudic passage and on certain textual emendations which determine whether we are here concerned with a case of *Shabos* or *Chanukah* or both; the novellae of R. Asher and R. Yehudah Ha'Chassid and their effect on our problem; and the question of the legal power and value of the concept of *Orach Arah* which still wants definitive analysis and proper Halachic formulation.

c) the *Chashash Issur Mlachah* which again refers to the same controversy between Rav and Shmuel and Tosafos and Maimonides.

And finally "trans-halachically" we can invoke both restrictive and permissive attitudes, both of which co-exist in Jewish thought.

Post-Script

How can the problems we have raised be solved to our satisfaction. My personal feeling is that it would be best to do away with any form of Late Friday service, provided we can otherwise care for those who "come to steal Mitzvos" because they are "hungry of soul." If it can be done, so much the better.

But if that condition cannot be met, we have perhaps lost more than gained by eliminating these services. Our typical American Jew is a new species of Marrano, who is coerced into varieties of apparent apostasy not by the brutality of the Church but by the more powerful force of social convention and the pressure for conformity to upper middle class mores. We cannot justify a policy of abandoning people merely because we cannot resolve a difference of *Rishonim*. Responsibility demands of us some more serious attempt to solve the problem.

At the Mid-Winter conference, where this paper was presented in its more elaborate original form, I suggested a program whereby the service would be so modified that none of the major Halachic opinions discussed would be violated, and whereby the service would still serve the purpose for which it came into being. That program and its Halachic justifications are too lengthy to be given here. Perhaps the editors of "*Chavrusa*" will publish them in some later issue. I shall be glad to communicate with any of our colleagues interested in the further development of the ideas here presented.

Let me conclude with but this: It is not a happy circumstance that has made it necessary for us to deal so seriously with the Late Friday Serv-

(Continued on Page 5)

Alumni Profiles

By Emanuel Holzer



Jonah E. Caplan

Jonah E. Caplan received his Smicha in 1931 and began rabbinating at the Miami Jewish Orthodox Cong. (1931-1933). From there he went to Cong. Ahavath Sholom, Providence, R. I. (1933-1935) and then to Astoria, L. I. After serving for sixteen years as spiritual leader of Cong. Beth El, in Astoria, (1935-1951) he was called to Cong. Rodfei Sholom in San Antonio, Texas (1951-1954). He then assumed the pulpit of Cong. Kneseth Israel in Miami Beach, and in 1956 became the Regional Director for Yeshiva University in Miami Beach.

Jonah is a past Vice-President of the New York Board of Rabbis, a past President of the R.C.A. L.I. Region and the L.I. Division of the American Jewish Congress. The first President of the L.I. Zionist Youth Commission, he also served as one of eight delegates from Long Island to the American Jewish Conference during World War I. He played a vital role in orthodoxy in L.I. and brought back many young people to Judaism.

Jonah is married to the former Lena Herman and has three children. Faith, 19, a Junior at Stern College, Shulamith, 16 attending the local High School, and Shlomo, 9 attending the Hebrew Academy of Miami Beach.

While in San Antonio, Jonah established the Hillel Academy, converted many Jews to Shmiras Shabbos and Kasherred several homes.

Jonah thinks the modern rabbi can best influence others by his own exemplary conduct. He feels there should be more emphasis in the training period on what is the role of the Rabbi in the active Rabbinate and how his own personal life can be a great factor in achieving this desirable end.



Samuel Berliant

Samuel Berliant received his Smicha in 1929 (5689) and began his rabbinic career at Congregation Adas Kodesh, Wilmington, Delaware (1929-1931). He next assumed the spiritual leadership of Cong. Tifereth Israel of Jackson Heights, L. I. where he has served for the past twenty-five years. Samuel received his B.A. degree from City College and his M.A. in Sociology from Columbia.

Communal activity seems to be his forte. A most active personality in the Rabbinical Council of America, he has held numerous executive posts there culminating in the presidency 1951-52. His sincere devotion to the Boy and Girl Scout movement netted him the posts of Jewish Religious Advisor to the Religious Policy Committee of the Girl Scouts, Chairman of the Religious Advisory Commission on Kashruth of the Metropolitan Jewish Committee on Scouting during which he organized the Kosher Kitchen of Ten Mile River Scouting Camp, and member of the National Jewish Committee on Scouting through which he helped institute the Ner Tamid Award. As chairman of the Orthodox delegation to the Division of Religious Activities of the Jewish Welfare Board he was instrumental in arranging the voluntary draft and procurement program for Orthodox Jewish Chaplains.

Our hero is married to the former Miriam Flanzer of Chicago and has three children, Sandra Rifka 11, Ben Zion 9, who attend the Yeshiva of Central Queens, and Yetta Yola 4 who helps her mother.

Orthodoxy has progressed in Jackson Heights, L. I. Today Tifereth Israel is the largest and proudest synagogue in the area. Through the dyna-

Late Friday Service

(Continued from Page 4)

ice. But it is a fact, and though regrettable we cannot wish it out of existence. The Late Service is rapidly becoming an accepted institution in many synagogues throughout the country, and if we will not devote our attention and intellectual efforts to solving the problem Halachically, then likely as not it will become the accepted norm without the benefit of Halachic judgement and influence. Orthodoxy cannot afford many more such "solutions."

EDITOR'S NOTES

- 2) The motive of *Orach Arah* given by Rashi is against the early kindling of the Shabbos lights. Against late lighting meaning, very close to the start of Shabos, no reason is given, — it is obviously for fear of *Chilul Shabos*. The lesson of *Orach Arah* derived from the *Breisoh* about the *Amod Anan* should rather encourage a late *Kabolas Shabos* except for the lighting of candles which can't be done because of *Chilul Shabos*.
- 3) *Tosafos* in *Brochos* 27 already gives the same explanation.
- 4) The author's definition of *Shabos-act* needs clarification. There are obviously many *Shabos-acts* such as the *Tefilah* and *Seudois Shabos* which come at various times throughout the *Shabos*. If the author attaches the character of *Shabos-act* to *Maariv* because it ushers in the *Shabos*, it should be noted that this is true only if *Maariv* is recited before the *Zman*. At the *Zman*, *Shabos* is automatically here with no need of accepting it. Afterwards the *Maariv* is the same as *Shacharis* in the morning.

* * *

EDITOR'S NOTE: Our next issue will publish a D'var Halacha by Joseph Weiss and correspondence from alumni on Norman Lamms' article.

mic efforts of its energetic rabbi the congregation is in the forefront of every communal drive and is looked upon for leadership by all national organizations. All elements in the community harmoniously devote their efforts to the congregation and its ideals.

For Samuel, the greatest challenge to Orthodoxy today is to evolve a creative plan to serve the communal needs of Jewry. He feels that Yeshiva can extend its influence through trained leadership in all fields of American life, chaplaincy and education as well as rabbinic programs, being examples of what can be done. Samuel looks forward to a time when a rigid criterion for every Jewish activity seeking public acclaim as a traditional project, such as synagogue, Jewish education, Kashruth, etc., will be set and standards met in order to merit community support.

Within the Four Ells

by Irving A. Margolies

Work on the new seven-story dormitory which will house 500 students and cost \$1,500,000, is now in steady progress. The new dorm will incorporate many progressive innovations such as single rooms accommodating two students that can be easily sub-divided into two private rooms by prefabricated partitions, built-in furniture designed to provide maximum space for clothing, books, etc., and ample storage space. Also, the peripheral arrangement of the built-in furniture will render each room suitable for study group seminars, commonly called "Cram sessions." The dorm will, in addition, contain administrative offices, faculty suites, an infirmary, study hall, kitchens, and dining rooms. Plans also call for a progressive but orthodox synagogue with a prefab mechitza for visiting "Sternists," lounges and terraces that will make the place the social hub of the entire campus. Incidentally, this building will extend our campus southward to 184th Street and eastward to Laurel Hill Terrace overlooking a spectacular view of the Harlem River.

Yeshiva University is now the beneficiary of scholarship grants from government and big industry. Yeshiva was one of the three top universities chosen for a grant of \$136,296 by the National Institute of Mental Health to be used "for the training of theological students in the principles of mental health." The others are Harvard and Loyola Universities. Rabbi Fred Hollander '46, who directs the Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry of the New York Board of Rabbis, has been named to direct the program.

Big corporations like General Motors, Standard Oil of New Jersey, U. S. Steel and the Colgate-Palmolive Co. are now buying shares on Y.U. Stock Exchange by "investing in the future of our nation through the training of young people spiritually and culturally." Nor have the faculty members of Y.U. been forgotten — the Ford Foundation recently allocated over \$200,000 to be utilized solely for faculty salary increases . . . It's about time "we" gave them a raise . . .

Three cheers (not of the Bronx variety) to the Bronx Tremont Hebrew School which turned over its assets of \$85,000 to Yeshiva. The school was razed by the city to make way for the Cross Bronx Expressway leading to Yeshiva University and the George Washington bridge . . .

Here is an interesting "vacation item" you may have missed. It's the story about the first cowboy in Yeshiva's history. The distinction belongs to a T.A. student, Michael Zuckerman, 16, whose ambition to become a veterinarian led him to spend the summer at work and play on the vast prairie lands of South Dakota. At the home of "Bronco Lou" Sinykin, Michael found a strictly kosher ranch, and in exchange for Bar Mitzvah lessons which he gave to Broncho Lou's children, he received some valuable experience in farming, cattle and horse ranching and a glorious vacation in the fabled lands of the West on boot. The Sinykin family also have one teen-age daughter.

RABBINIC WELFARE

by Theodore L. Adams

The Intangibles in Welfare

In previous articles, I have discussed tangible aspects of rabbinic welfare. Social security, health and accident insurance, and other types of formal protection are, of course, vitally important.

But rabbinic welfare also involves intangibles which warrant our priority attention. How we live, the regimen of our daily existence, our habits of life, — all these are important considerations. We must not permit our traditional "batlonis" attitude to belittle their significance. In the final analysis, unless we lay a foundation of sound living, we may never realize the benefits of our long-range security programs.

First and foremost, we should consider whether we are happy in our profession. When I speak of being happy, I do not use the term in the colloquial sense of tranquility and peace of mind. Rather, I refer to our inherent adaptability to the challenges of the rabbinate. Those who are congenitally unsuited for the rabbinate should seriously consider the advisability of a change, circumstances permitting. Our natural attitudes may receive greater recognition and we may achieve a fuller sense of self-fulfillment in a kindred or unrelated field.

Frequently, unhappiness in a rabbi is due not to congenital unsuitability, but rather to a stunted manner of living, a lack of variety and balance in our lives. This defect can be corrected and for the sake of our well-functioning must be rectified.

What are our needs which warrant our attention. I will list them as follows: 1) physical 2) personal 3) social. Under physical, we require food, clothing, shelter, exercise and relaxation. Who can deny the health-factor value of eating on time in an atmosphere of unrushed relaxation, the significance of proper garb and appearance for a spirit of self-regard and confidence, the importance of periodic exercise to stimulate bodily vigor and the soothing influence of a daily afternoon nap? Those who disparage these matters do so to their own detriment.

The second category of needs are "personal." These embrace our needs for self-expression, new experiences and occasions of entertainment. We must have opportunities for expressing our abilities and talents outside the confines of our profession or community, whether it be civic, service or charitable. Some of us are gifted with wider horizons which need be explored. To overcome boredom, the affliction of blasé contentment, we must ever aspire to add variety to our lives.

Our third area concerns our social needs. Aristotle termed man "a social animal", and our faith emphasizes the social aspects of human life. Under this heading, we include the need for friendship, fraternity, love and understanding. We should cultivate friendships with colleagues or others outside our community, and occasionally with select congregants within our community. The rabbi is entitled to his day off so that he can spend it with his family or friends at his discretion.

Convention Elects Wohlberg President

(Continued from Page 1)

of intensive Yeshiva service.

A spiritual treat was Rabbi Poleyeff's "Dvar Halacha" after the luncheon session. The afternoon and evening sessions were concerned with the pressing problems and new techniques in the realm of Jewish education.

An edifying enjoyment at our supper session was the talk of Dr. Samuel Belkin who advised us to continue our efforts in behalf of orthodoxy without diluting our essence or neglecting those with tenuous ties to Judaism. *KLAL YISROEL* is our field and challenge.

Teen Age activities and adult education were the subjects of study on Wednesday, October 17th. A profusion of ideas and new horizons were dramatically presented to our colleagues. Resolutions, nominations and elections followed. Officers elected, who will help Harry Wohlberg in his leadership, were Vice-presidents, M. Grauer, I. Miller, S. Turk, C. Bahn, Financial Secretary — A. Budin, Recording secretary — S. Konovitch, Treasurer — E. Cohen.

A highlight of intellectual grandeur and a grand finale to our convention was reached with the eloquent address of our revered Dr. Soloveitchik who spoke about the dual nature of the covenants between G-d and Abraham. The *Bris bein Havesorim* was a covenant of the land of Israel, that it would wait for the Jewish people, while the *Bris Milah* was a covenant of the Jewish people that they would remain loyal and preserve their uniqueness (just as a *chasima* is unique, Val Brischo Shechosamto Bivsoreinu).

There is an element in every one of our conventions that does not appear on the agenda and never is indicated in a report. It is the feeling of relaxation, of abandoning the cares of ministration for a while and the feeling of warm comradeship that exists. Though extremely subtle, these feelings are a great attraction to conventions for our colleagues. In a great measure, it is these feelings combined with inspiration and practical knowledge, that effects the expression of "I really enjoyed the convention".