

- Jaffe (Page 1)
- Greenberg (Page 4)

EMOR

THE MAY LEHRHAUS OVER SHABBOS IS SPONSORED BY
SHALOM AND TINA LAMM IN HONOR OF
FOUNDING EDITOR, **ARI LAMM**,
WHO SUCCESSFULLY DEFENDED HIS PHD DISSERTATION. MAZAL TOV!

THIS WEEK'S LEHRHAUS OVER SHABBOS IS SPONSORED BY
HOWARD AND TOVA WEISER TO COMMEMORATE
THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THEIR PARENTS,
MOSHE AND DORA WEISS AND GITTEL WEISER
FROM BERGEN BELSEN (APRIL 15, 1945) AND
AHARON WEISER FROM EBENSEE (MAY 6, 1945),

DID THE PROPHET AMOS PREDICT THE WOMEN'S SIYUM DAF YOMI?

YAAKOV JAFFE serves as the rabbi of the Maimonides Kehillah, founded by Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik in 1963, and as the Dean of Judaic Studies at the Maimonides School.

On a recent Friday morning in a simpler time, Maimonides School celebrated the *Daf Yomi* cycle's conclusion of *Berakhot*, the first volume of the Talmud. As part of this celebration, we called forward all of our students who had completed the Tractate. The announcement of each student's name was met with applause from friends and classmates, although I discerned a somewhat louder roar when a female *mesayemet* was announced. Though some of us might think this anecdote reflects only our modern times, I wonder if perhaps it was predicted by the prophet Amos, as well.

The book of Amos is remarkably tight and focused in its scope, dealing almost exclusively with the decadent or oppressive behavior of the upper class in the Northern Kingdom of Israel under the reign of Jeroboam II. Written by Amos, a poor,¹ ineloquent, illiterate farmhand,² the book describes the excesses of the wealthy, the trampling of the poor, and a series of punishments that would follow these iniquities. The entire book is fixed on this one theme and deals prominently with sin, punishment, and destruction. Yet, following the principle in *Berakhot* (31a) that prophets conclude with a comforting message, the final seventeen verses mix in aspects of consolation, including the parable of the thirst contained in [Amos 8:11-14](#).

¹ See Richard Steiner, *Stockmen from Tekoa, Sycamores from Sheba: A Study of Amos' Occupations* (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2003).

² See [Radak to 1:1](#).

Taken out of its direct context, the central verse of the parable ([8:13](#)) would be interpreted as yet another example of punishment for the pampered, wealthy Northerners: "On that day, they shall faint from thirst—the beautiful maidens and the young men." The focus on beauty (*"yafot"*) and youth highlights that the punishment would affect the entire society, even the upper classes. Malbim takes the verse literally—the young and vibrant members of society will be physically weakened and desperate for water. Indeed, this is the way the verse is used by the *Kinot* of the 9th of Av, as a literal depiction of dehydration.³ Yet most commentators understand the fainting maidens and young men as being part of the wider parable, the deeper meaning of which holds direct relevance to Talmud study.

"The Words of Hashem"

The entire parable of Amos reads as follows ([8:11-14](#)):

Behold, days are coming—says the Lord, Hashem—and I will send a famine in the land: not a famine for bread and not thirst for water, but to hear the "Words of Hashem." They will move from sea to sea,⁴ and from North to East; they will walk around to seek out the word of Hashem, but they will not find it. On that day, the beautiful maidens and the young men shall faint from thirst—those who [formerly] swore in the sin of Samaria and would

³ See Daniel Goldschmit, *The Order of the Kinot for the Ninth of Av* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1972), 76 (#18).

⁴ Probably from the Red Sea in the South, to the Mediterranean Sea in the West ([Ibn Ezra](#)).

say, “By the life of your god in Dan!” and “By the life of the [idol] in Be’er Sheva!”—and they will fall and not rise again.

The central idea of the passage is pursuit of the “Words of Hashem,” with the pursuit of water being a parable for the pursuit of those “Words of Hashem.” The interpretation of the fainting young men and young maidens is still unclear from the context. Clearly, the young men and women who formerly pursued idolatry now pursue religious teaching—although sadly they are unable to find the teaching that they seek. But what are these “Words of Hashem?”

Most commentaries to Amos argue that it refers to the cessation of prophecy in a future era (see [Rashi](#), [Radak](#), [Malbim](#)), since most of the instances in which the phrase “Words of Hashem” appears in Tanakh refer to prophecy. Yet, on occasion it also refers to the words of legal teachings (See [Exodus 24:3-4](#), [Numbers 15:31](#), [Deuteronomy 5:5](#)). Indeed, the Talmud cites a series of opinions about the phrase, with some associating this phrase primarily with the prophetic aspects of Judaism, and others associating it with Judaism’s legal aspects ([Sanhedrin 99a](#)).⁵

The Rabbinic interpretation of the phrase “Words of Hashem” (as they appear in Amos) is found in the [first Tosefta of Eduyot](#), cited partially in [Shabbat 138b](#):

When the Rabbis entered the vineyard (=yeshivah)⁶ at Yavneh, they said: The time will come that someone will seek words of the Torah and not find it, words of the Rabbis and not find them,⁷ as it says... “the Words of Hashem”—this is prophecy, this is the end of days, this is the fact that the words of Torah will not be similar to each other. ... They said, let us begin with the words of Hillel and Shammai: Shammai says one *kav* for *hallah*...

In the version of the Tosefta found in the Talmud, “words of Torah will not be similar” is simplified as “*Halakhah*”—both of which are included in the Oral Law. For the Rabbis, the great famine for the “Words of Hashem” refers to a time when large aspects of the Oral Law will have been forgotten from Israel; indeed, the verse and its prediction provide the impetus for recording many Oral Laws in an organized form in the Mishnah. After the relocation of the Sanhedrin to Yavneh,⁸ the rabbis intuited that something still needed to be done to prevent, address, or forestall a thirst, famine, or inaccessibility of the words of Torah and of Oral Law. In this view, Amos predicted a Jewish future without sufficient access to the study of the Oral Law, a need which the Mishnah itself seeks to resolve. The thirst is a parable, in that case, for humanity seeking for a connection with God’s Torah.

⁵ We can support this view further by noting that water is often taken to refer to Torah; see [Ta’anit 7a](#), [Bava Kama 82a](#), [Isaiah 55:1-2](#).

⁶ A vineyard will also only flourish if it is sustained by ample water.

⁷ More dramatically in the Bavli, “The Torah will in the future be forgotten from Israel.”

⁸ Either immediately thereafter, when they first came to Yavneh, or shortly thereafter, when Rabban Gamliel was deposed as the *Nasi*, the day when *Eduyot* was written.

The Maidens Fainting

When examining the passage more closely, however, a puzzle emerges. The verse states, “On that day, they shall faint from thirst—the beautiful maidens and the young men.” But while the verse seems to be referring to both the maidens and the young men equally, the verb used, “*tit’alaphna*,” is written in the feminine. This seems to violate a widely held principle of Hebrew grammar that when the subject of a verb consists of a group of males and females, the verb is conjugated in the masculine form, essentially ignoring the female members of the subject class in the face of the male members. Yet here, the feminine verb form is used to refer to a subject of different genders.

In reality, though, the Hebrew verb grammar of multi-gendered subjects is conventionally mistaught and misrepresented. In Biblical Hebrew, the masculine verb is not always used to represent a group of males and females. It is a well-known and well-attested fact that a compound subject can take either the male or female verb form in Biblical Hebrew, depending on whichever subject is the primary actor of the verb. Often, the primary actor is male, and the verb takes the male form. But sometimes, the primary actor is female, and the verb takes the female form. Thus, the female form of the verb is used in all of the following cases: “And Miriam and Aharon spoke” (sg-f, [Numbers 12:1](#)); “And Deborah and Barak sang” (sg-f, [Judges 5:1](#)); “And the Maid-servants approached, they and their children” (pl-f, [Genesis 33:6](#)); “And Leah and her children approached” (sg-f, [ibid. 33:7](#)); and three times in Esther ([4:4](#), [5:14](#) and [9:29](#)): “And Esther’s maidens and Eunuchs came” (pl-f); “And Zeresh and all his friends said” (sg-f); “And Esther and Mordechai wrote” (sg-f).⁹ The grammatical forms in these examples confirm what we would already have intuited about the aforementioned biblical passages: that Miriam instigated the gossip about Moses (see [Rashi 12:1](#)), that the song is primarily Deborah’s (see especially [Judges 5:7](#)), and that Esther is the primary author of the Book of Esther.¹⁰ The phenomenon of a primary female actor resulting in a female verb form has been well known to grammarians, both religious¹¹ and secular,¹² for more than a century.

In Amos, the female verb form would indicate that while both the maidens and the young men are fainting from thirst, it is the maidens who are experiencing this thirst more strongly. If we use the interpretation of the Malbim that the verse merely focuses on the

⁹ In a standard Megillah scroll the Hebrew letter *taf*—which indicates the feminine verb form—is written large, perhaps to stress that indeed, the female verb form should be used here.

¹⁰ See [Megillah 19a](#). There are three choices for the main character of the Book of Esther, each introduced with a hero’s introduction, and whose narrative arc ends in a fitting summary and closure: Ahashverosh, Mordecai, and Haman. Esther is not the main character, as she has neither an introduction (only known as Mordecai’s cousin) nor any resolution to her narrative arc (see [chapter 10](#)). However, she is clearly the primary author (see [Megillah 7a](#)).

¹¹ Malbim *Ayelet Ha-Shahar* 176, citing two of our examples. The *Ayelet Ha-Shahar* is typically printed as the grammatical introduction to Malbim’s commentary to Leviticus. He also applies this concept to non-human nouns—see his commentary to Leviticus 23:20 ([174](#)).

¹² See Wilhen Gesenius’ [Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar](#), trans. A.E.Cowley (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2006), 468. Note that Gesenius gives a slightly different interpretation and presentation of the phenomenon.

young and vibrant members of society being physically weakened and desperate for water, we would explain the use of the female verb as Amos's observation that young women are more prone to fainting from dehydration than young men.¹³ However, if we look at the parable as a whole, then the verb must signify that the thirst for the "Words of Hashem" is experienced more by the young women than by the young men.

The Significance of Details in Biblical Parable

In an effort to address this riddle, let us take a step back and consider the genre of biblical parables more generally. Virtually every Book of Nakh contains an extended biblical parable; the use of intricate, detailed parables is so ubiquitous in the Tanakh that it exists as its own genre with its own unique rules.¹⁴ Commentators are generally of the view that each and every detail of the parable (or the signifier) corresponds to a different detail in the real world (or, the signified). Thus, Ibn Ezra's third interpretation of Song of Songs goes through each detail of the full eight chapters and explains what each detail signifies in the real history of the Jewish people. Commentators resist saying the parable "generally" captures the love between G-d and the Jewish people through the story of a couple in love and instead try to show how each detail specifically matches with a real-life event. Similarly, Radak's interpretation of Isaiah's parable of the vineyard explains how a dozen details of this short parable all correspond to a different aspect of the relationship between G-d and the sinful Jews. Again, he resists saying the parable is general in nature and instead explains each specific detail as corresponding to something in the real world. When one inspects each and every biblical parable, one sees how each detail of the parable corresponds to a different aspect of the real-life story.¹⁵

Rambam is the one notable commentator who resists this standard view, as he expands the roster of biblical parables to include a number of parables where the ranges of details are so large that they outstrip the ranges of real-life things they can signify.¹⁶ These passages that Rambam uniquely considers to be parables include the vision of the end of days ([Isaiah Ch. 11](#)), the chariot of Ezekiel (Parts

¹³ It is unclear scientifically whether this risk of dehydration is true today and whether it is tied to fluid intake, to the rate of perspiration, or to the higher body mass and higher water percentage in males. For some discussion, see Arnulfo Ramos-Jiménez et al., "Gender- and Hydration-Associated Differences in the Physiological Response to Spinning," *Nutricion Hospitalaria* 29, no. 3 (February 2014): 644-651.

¹⁴ Among the long list of biblical parables are: the Parable of Jotham ([Judges Ch. 9](#)), the poor man's lamb ([II Samuel Ch. 12](#)), the cedar and the thorn ([II Kings 14:9](#)), the song of the vineyard ([Isaiah Chapter 5](#)), the eggs in the nest ([ibid. 10:14](#)), the birth of the nation ([Ezekiel Ch. 16](#)), the two eagles and the grape vine ([ibid Ch. 17](#)), "Your mother is a lioness" ([ibid Ch. 19](#)), Oholah and Oholivah ([ibid Ch. 23](#)), the shepherds of Israel ([ibid Ch. 34](#)), the two women of Proverbs ([Ch. 7-8](#)), the lonely woman of Lamentations ([Ch. 1](#)), and the entirety of [Song of Songs](#). To some extent, the demonstrative acts of the prophets often also constitute parables, such as the barefoot prophet of Isaiah ([Ch. 20](#)), the prophet in mourning of Ezekiel ([Ch. 24](#)), or the broken marriage of Hosea ([Ch. 1-3](#)).

¹⁵ In modern times, Yaakov Medan also builds upon this assumption in unpacking the parable of the poor man's lamb. See Yaakov Medan, *David U-Bat-Sheva* (Yeshivat Har Etzion, 2002).

¹⁶ Rambam uses the word *Mashal* to refer both to metaphor (see [Laws of Foundations of the Torah, Ch. 1–2](#)) and also parable. Our discussion is focused on parable, not metaphor, however.

of [Ezekiel Ch. 1-11](#)), and the entire book of [Job](#).¹⁷ Were these descriptions of real-life events, we could easily explain the copious detail as being a thorough depiction of real life. Yet, for Rambam these are all mere parables, even without each detail corresponding to or signifying something else in real life. The detail is just for the "necessities of setting the parable," thereby making it more realistic or readable without signifying anything specific (see last line to [Guide for the Perplexed 3:23](#)). However, this view is in the minority and is uniquely associated with Rambam.¹⁸

Women's Study of Talmud

We now can return to the question of why Amos's parable specifically focuses on the women's greater thirst for water than the men's. If we followed a Maimonidean approach to the genre of biblical parables, the answer would be clear: since in the setting of the parable women and men are both thirsty, the fictional world of the parable reads more cleanly and smoothly if the women were to faint before the men (similar to Malbim's literal interpretation). But to the predominant approach to Biblical parable, this detail—like any—begs an explanation: why would the text single out the women's greater thirst for the "Words of Hashem" than the men's?

We noted above that there are different interpretations for what the "Words of Hashem" are in the first place, and thus depending on one's understanding of that key phrase, the women's greater thirst can have many interpretations. Perhaps they have more thirst and desire for the words of inspired prophecy, perhaps they pine more truly for the end of days, or perhaps it is a greater feeling and thirst for the details of the Oral Law as expressed in *Halakhah*. Traditionally, the last interpretation has been most adopted given its expression in the authoritative Tosefta. From my perspective, it follows that Amos actually predicts the thirst of women for the study of Oral Law in general and Talmud in particular.

The last few months have featured significant new interest among women across our community in the study of Oral Law, from the women's *siyum Daf Yomi* in January, to the many women worldwide who joined the *Daf Yomi* cycle anew for the study of *Berakhot* and who made the first Talmud *Siyum* in their lives this past March. Our *kehillah's Daf Yomi* group includes men who have studied Talmud their entire lives as well as women who are new to Talmud study. For many men, the study of Talmud is something that has been a familiar heritage for their entire lives; for many women, there is a greater excitement and thirst for a world newly opened to them.

The concept of thirst captures two distinct feelings: (a) an intense desire for something, coupled with (b) an extreme, unusual lack or deprivation of that thing. An avid coffee-drinker might desire coffee but doesn't "thirst" for it; but the dehydrated, near-fainting desert traveler feels thirst, experiencing both the desire and also the deprivation. Thus, men and women alike might share a *desire* for the study of the Oral Law, but it is "the beautiful maidens" who more

¹⁷ See [Laws of Kings 12:1](#), [Laws of Foundations of the Torah 7:3](#), and [Moreh Ha-Nevukhim 2:43](#) and [3:22](#).

¹⁸ On this topic in general, see Mordechai Z. Cohen, "A Philosopher's Peshat Exegesis: Maimonides' Literary Approach to the Book of Job and Its Place in the History of Biblical Interpretation," [Hebrew] *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 15 (2005): 213-264. Cohen points out that the Talmud itself ([Bava Batra 15a](#)) is explicit that the existence of details in the signifier without corresponding signified is deemed proof that a biblical passage is historical or literal, not a parable.

strongly feel and struggle with the paucity of study opportunities and lack of access for further study of Oral Law, sparking a greater *thirst*.

As a teacher, I witness each day firsthand that young women and young men both show tremendous thirst for the study of the Oral Torah. As Amos predicted, the young women often show this thirst more than the men. They thirst for the “*Devar Hashem*” and study in order to stem the tide of the Torah being forgotten from Israel, G-d forbid. Per the Tosefta, each time a Jew studies the Torah, we ensure that it continues to be remembered in future generations, avoiding a future when our nation faints from thirst. And perhaps Amos envisioned that women’s thirst—cultivated and waiting for centuries—is the one that is somewhat greater, the one whose presence manifests the true coming of the redemptive, future days when the water of the Torah quenches every thirst with an invigorating dose of “The Words of Hashem.”

HOW WILL WE RECOGNIZE SHABBAT?

GABRIEL GREENBERG is the Senior Jewish Educator and director of the Jewish Renaissance Project at Penn Hillel.

Like many around the world, the longer-term effects of staying at home are mounting in our home. As has been noted in various [newspaper](#) articles and depicted in [memes](#) swirling around social media, one common phenomenon has been people losing track of time, specifically, forgetting when they are in a given week. Whereas our normal schedules have different routines on different days, during the lockdown period each day looks highly similar to both the one before and the one after it. With the adults working from home, the kids doing schoolwork on every available surface, and without the option of going to *shul* or friends’ homes, weekends and weekdays resemble each other as never before.

This unchanging, monotonous experience of the days takes an emotional toll: sometimes felt as boredom, while at other times as anxiety. The narrator in Nicole Krauss’s novel, *Great House*, speaks to a similar feeling of tedium: “There’s a pressure mounting in my chest. I can’t pass over it.... We move through the day like two hands of a clock: sometimes we overlap for a moment, then come apart again, carrying on alone. Every day exactly the same: the tea, the burnt toast, the crumbs, the silence. You in your chair, I in mine.”¹⁹

There is obviously nothing particularly Jewish about this experience, though I believe that our tradition offers unique tools with which to think about and respond to this reality. *Sefirat ha-Omer* is one example: the process of literally counting each day during the *Omer* period, which helps to demarcate one day from the next, and to force us to verbally remind ourselves of our movement through the Jewish calendar year.

The Jewish ritual which is most central to our current moment, though, is the weekly observance of Shabbat. *Shomer-Shabbat* individuals already understand the ways in which one’s entire week becomes oriented towards Shabbat, and how one is always aware of how many days remain before it begins. This is both descriptively true, and, as Ramban notes, a prescriptive fulfillment of the commandment of זכור - “to remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy” (Exodus 20:8 and Ramban *ad loc.*). Hence, even the ways in which we refer to days in the Jewish calendar (*Yom Rishon, Yom Sheni*), serve to keep us focused on and connected to where we stand in relation to the upcoming Shabbat.

Our relationship to the Jewish calendar generally, and Shabbat specifically, would seem to suffice for traditionally observant Jews to be fairly well inoculated against forgetting the day in a given week.

Hazal, however, imagined a scenario where such would not be the case. *Shabbat* 69b describes a state of affairs wherein an observant Jew does in fact forget where they are in relation to Shabbat. Such a person, while “wandering on a journey or in the desert”, realizes that they are unsure what day of the week it is: “they do not know when Shabbat occurs.” The *gemara* here acknowledges that life’s vicissitudes can be such as to completely knock one out of synch with the calendar week. That, in certain circumstances, even *Shomer-Shabbat* individuals may lose track of where - really, when - they are. Obviously, the parallel to our situation is inexact, but there is a

¹⁹ Nicole Krauss, [Great House: A Novel](#) (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011), 195.

resonance that may help us reflect more deeply on our current moment. Indeed, this *sugya* offers further relevance, which emerges through a brief synopsis of the relevant discussion.

The *sugya* opens with an argument between Rav Huna and Hiyya bar Rav; the former being of the opinion that, on the day the traveler realizes that they do not know what day of the week it is, they begin a count of six days, following which they establish the seventh as Shabbat. The latter is of the opinion that, as soon one realizes they are out of touch with the week, they treat that very day as Shabbat. The *gemara* establishes the Halakha in accordance with Rav Huna.

Subsequently, Rava suggests that on every day of the week, the individual should do the absolute minimum needed to survive. Were one to do extraneous work, one may end up violating the actual day of Shabbat, despite it being considered an ersatz weekday. After a back and forth, the *gemara* concludes that this is the case on each day of the week, including the day that has been established as the person's Shabbat: one must perform the minimum amount of work and *melachah*, lest that day be *de jure* Shabbat, if not the *de facto* one.

At this point, however, the *gemara* encounters a fundamental problem: if the person does not know conclusively that this day is really Shabbat, and there is no experiential difference in how the day is treated - i.e. they are doing the same amount of work every day to meet their physical needs - then in what meaningful way can this day be understood as "Shabbat"? As it puts the question, "And that day, how is it recognized?" To which the *gemara* responds, "through *Kiddush* and *Havdalah*."

What does this answer mean? I believe it is ambivalent. It may be a positive, affirming response, that yes - our tradition offers ways to distinguish Shabbat in a special way, even during an interval where every day is mostly the same. Alternatively, the answer may be more pessimistic: namely, an acceptance of the dour reality that there may be exceptional periods of life where Shabbat is not deeply or meaningfully distinct from the days around it. And in such times, the only difference will be the ritual acts by which we welcome and say goodbye to Shabbat; we cannot hope to fully restore to Shabbat the requisite *kavod* (honor) and *oneg* (joy) it deserves. Rashi, in his comments (s.v. "be-kidushah"), seems to favor this latter position, while going further still. He notes that the recitation of *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* must be understood as a "simple remembrance" - as opposed to an actual fulfillment of the Biblical commandments. The purpose of doing so is "in order to establish the category of a day which is separate from the other days - lest [the concept of] Shabbat be forgotten." For Rashi, then, the answer of "*Kiddush* and *Havdalah*" is a purely symbolic one; in this case, there can be no actual recognition of Shabbat.

This latter reading, along with Rashi's gloss, is profound in its recognition of the foundational shifts that exceptional circumstances may entail. Again, the parallel is not an exact one. However, for us living through the pandemic, there is a striking recognition in the phrase, "how will [Shabbat] be recognized"? Tosafot (s.v. "oseh") tease this out further with a thought experiment: If all the Halacha were to allow this person to do was to meet their basic needs, then when would they work towards resolving their predicament? Rather, Tosafot argue, it must be that on the days established as *de facto* weekdays, they may additionally travel and trek as much as they possibly can in order to return to civilization. Consequently, Shabbat would be a substantively different day due to its lack of travel. Given this distinction between the days, why does the *gemara* ask how

Shabbat would be distinguishable? According to Tosafot, it is because "simply sitting and not going anywhere does not constitute a sufficient recognition of Shabbat." Hence the *gemara's* conclusion that only *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* will serve to differentiate between the other days - **as there is nothing else which one can meaningfully do so in such a situation.**²⁰

It is this insight which rings painfully true in the coronavirus era. When going to *shul* is not an option, and having meals with friends, family, or community is off the table, then Shabbat begins to look and feel like every other day of the week; or as Tosafot put it, this "does not constitute a sufficient recognition of Shabbat." Not to the extent that we might literally forget which day is Shabbat, but on an experiential level, the flavor of Shabbat is less distinctive without so many of its usual rituals and routines.²¹

The ambivalence of the *gemara's* resolution, therefore, emerges as even more deeply true and sustaining in our time: "*Kiddush* and *Havdalah*." Without the social framework to which we are accustomed, it is our tradition's commanded rituals which will guide us, anchoring us back to our calendar and reminding us of our more typical flow of life. Through them we will recognize both Shabbat and the weekdays in their proper places, allowing us to have a semblance of normalcy and stability as we continue to navigate through these troubling times. Additionally, we may strive to add new changes to our Shabbat schedules in order to realize a more robust sense of its holiness and difference: setting aside time for new learning or reading, going for (appropriately socially-distancing) walks, more time singing, etc. At the same time, we acknowledge that there is something irretrievably lost when the purview of our Shabbat and weekday activities is so severely limited. However long this phase may last, we shall diligently fulfill the dual mitzvot of *Zachor* (remember) and *Shamor* (observe), while simultaneously enduring the diminished senses of *oneg* and *kavod* that the Coronavirus lockdown brings with it.

LEHRHAUS EDITORS:
Yehuda Fogel
David Fried
David Kollmar
Tzvi Sinensky
Mindy Schwartz Zolty

²⁰ This insight of Tosafot - which is also adopted by Ramban and other rishonim - is compounded further in their second answer. They note, in the name of Rabbeinu Tam, the possibility that even on Shabbat itself one would be allowed to travel as much as necessary to return to civilization. If such were the case, then *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* would be the sole distinction between days.

²¹ In using the term "flavor", I am consciously invoking the *gemara* Shabbat 119a, תבלין אחד יש לנו ושבת שמו.