

Honor Your Parents

כבוד אֶת-אָבִיךָ וְאֶת-אִמֶּךָ

The Mitzvah of honoring ones parents accompanies a person throughout their life. The Torah teaches us how to relate to parents in *two* separate Mitzvohs: respect, and reverence. Each individual is supposed to behave towards his parents as he would behave towards someone before whom he stands in awe and whom he respects deeply.

One of the underlying foundations of these Mitzvohs is the basic quality of הַכְרַת הַטוֹב – the feeling of gratitude towards those people who’ve brought us in to this world, and who’ve done so much for us throughout our lives.

In this session we’ll explore the following topics:

- What are the basic parameters of ‘honoring ones parents’?
- What’s the difference between ‘respect’ and ‘reverence’ towards ones parents?
- Is a child required to obey his parents’ request?
- Need a child spend money to honor his parents?
- Can a parent have any say in regards to a *shidduch*?
- When mom says “*dear, put on your sweater, or you’ll catch a cold!*”, must a child obey?

1 – PRIMARY SOURCES

Source 1 – Shemos 20:12; VaYikra 19:3

<p>“Honor your father and your mother, so that your days may be lengthened on the land that the Lord your God is giving you”</p> <p>“A man shall each revere his mother and his father, and keep My Shabbats: I am the Lord your God”</p>	<p>כִּבֹּד אֶת-אָבִיךָ וְאֶת-אִמֶּךָ לְמַעַן יָאָרְכוּךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָךְ</p> <p>אִישׁ אָמוֹ וְאָבִיו תִּירָאוּ וְאֶת-שַׁבָּתִי תִשְׁמְרוּ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם</p>
---	---

The Torah clearly outlines 2 distinct Mitzvohs governing ones relationship towards his parents: Respect (כבוד), and Reverence (יראה). What is not clear, however, is the specific parameters of these two Mitzvohs.

As is the case with all of the 613 Mitzvohs in the written-Torah, the oral-Torah (the Talmud) comes to ‘fill in the gaps’:

Source 2 – Kiddushin 31b – Basic Parameters of Honoring & Revering

<p>The Rabbis taught: what is “reverence”, and what is “respect”?</p> <p>Reverence means: don’t stand in his place (in shul, Rashi), don’t sit in his place, don’t contradict his words, don’t take sides with his words¹.</p> <p>Respect means: provide food, beverage, clothes, shelter, & assistance in mobility.</p>	<p>ת"ר איזהו מורא ואיזהו כיבוד מורא לא עומד במקומו לא יושב במקומו ולא סותר את דבריו ולא מכריעו כיבוד מאכיל ומשקה מלביש ומכסה מכניס ומוציא</p>
---	---

The Gemara gives us a clear picture of the distinction between these 2 Mitzvohs:

Respect (כבוד)	Reverence (ירא)
<u>Do Provide:</u> - food, - clothes, - shelter, - physical-aid	<u>Do not:</u> - stand in his place, - sit in his seat, - contradict his words - take sides with him

To generalize: Respect includes looking after the parent’s physical-welfare, and Reverence means behaving towards ones parents with a healthy-dose of trepidation & humility.

There’s more to the picture though.

Providing food, shelter, clothes, etc. – the Mitzvah of ‘respect’ – costs money.

Question: whose money exactly – the fathers or the sons?

What do you think?

¹ Rashi explains this is referring to taking sides with someone else who is arguing with his father. The Ra’ah disagrees with Rashi, claiming that this is already included in ‘don’t contradict’. Rather, says the Ra’ah, this is referring to even taking sides *with* the father, in an argument, since it displays a small degree of *chutzpa*.

2 – WHO PAYS?

The Gemara addresses this issue:

Source 3 – Kiddushin 32a – Who Pays?

<p>They inquired: from whom? (i.e. who's required to pay, to fulfill “<i>respect your parents</i>”) R' Yehudah says from the son. R' Nosson, the son of Oshiah, says from the father. The Rabbi's instructed R' Yermiah that to follow the opinion of the one who holds ‘from the father.’</p> <p>[Question] The Gemara challenges from a Baraisa: It says in the verse “Honor your father and your mother”, and it says in another verse “honor Hashem from your wealth” – this teaches us that just as, in regards to honoring Hashem, the mitzvah is even so far as to incur a financial-loss, so too, regarding ones parents, one must be prepared to incur a financial loss. Now, if you hold ‘from the father’, how are you going to understand this Baraisa?!?</p> <p>(Answer) It's referring to taking time off of work.</p>	<p>איבעיא להו משל מי רב יהודה אמר משל בן רב נתן בר אושעיא אמר משל אב אורו ליה רבנן לרב ירמיה ואמרי לה לבריה דרב ירמיה כמ"ד משל אב</p> <p>מיתבי נאמר (שמות כ, יא) כבד את אביך ואת אמך ונאמר (משלי ג, ט) כבד את ה' מהונך מה להלן בחסרון כיס אף כאן בחסרון כיס ואי אמרת משל אב מאי נפקא ליה מיניה</p> <p style="text-align: right;">לביטול מלאכה</p>
--	---

To summarize: everyone (both R' Yehudah & R' Nosson) agrees that the child is required to ‘reach in to his pockets’ in some capacity, in order to fulfill the Mitzvah of honoring his parents. R' Yehudah holds that this includes even incurring a real financial-loss, whereas R' Nosson maintains that this is limited only to having to take time off of work.

The practical Halacha follows R' Nosson (שו"ע יו"ד ס' ר"מ ס"ה): The Mitzvah of respecting ones parents does **not** require one to incur a financial loss.²

This having been established, the following Gemara presents a major challenge:

² The explanation for this may be as follows: It's not considered disrespectful to the parent to cover their child's expenditures, so long as he the parent can afford it. To the contrary, the parent may indeed feel *more* honored being in the fortunate position of being able to fund himself as opposed to being dependant on others. [ספר ולרעך כמוך ח"ו] [דף 72]

3 – EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE

Source 4 – Kiddushin 31a – The Priceless Pillow

They asked **R' Ulla**: how far does the mitzvah of honoring ones parents go? He told them: go and see what one particular non-Jew, named **Damma ben Nesina**, who lived in Ashkelon, did. Once, the sages solicited him in a business-deal for \$600k, and the key was under the pillow of his father (who was sleeping)...and he didn't disturb him!

Other versions say that they requested precious stones for the *efod* (a garment worn by the High Priest), for \$600k; others say \$800k.

A year later, Hashem gave him (Damma) his reward: a red-heffer was born in his herd. The great Jewish Sages came to him (to offer a great sum of money in exchange for the cow), and he told them "I know that if I were to request from you all the money in the world, you'd give it to me! However, I simply want that amount which I lost for the honor of my father."

R' Chanina said: "Wow! Look: someone who's not even commanded, but fulfills – this is his reward! All the more so for one who is commanded, and fulfills!" As R' Chisda taught: greater is the one who is commanded, and fulfills, than the one who is not commanded, and fulfills.

בעו מיניה מרב עולא עד היכן כיבוד אב ואם
אמר להם צאו וראו מה עשה עובד כוכבים אחד
באשקלון ודמא בן נתינה שמו פעם אחת בקשו
חכמים פרקמטיא בששים ריבוא שכר והיה
מפתח מונח תחת מראשותיו של אביו ולא
ציערו אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל שאלו את ר'
אליעזר עד היכן כיבוד אב ואם אמר להם צאו
וראו מה עשה עובד כוכבים אחד לאביו
באשקלון ודמא בן נתינה שמו בקשו ממנו
חכמים אבנים לאפוד בששים ריבוא שכר ורב
כהנא מתני בשמונים ריבוא והיה מפתח מונח
תחת מראשותיו של אביו ולא ציערו

לשנה האחרת נתן הקב"ה שכרו שנולדה לו
פרה אדומה בעדרו נכנסו חכמי ישראל אצלו
אמר להם יודע אני בכם שאם אני מבקש מכם
כל ממון שבעולם אתם נותנין לי אלא אין אני
מבקש מכם אלא אותו ממון שהפסדתי בשביל
כבוד אבא

וא"ר חנינא ומה מי שאינו מצווה ועושה כך
מצווה ועושה עאכו"כ דאר"ה גדול מצווה
ועושה ממי שאינו מצווה ועושה

To fulfill the Mitzvah of honoring his father, Damma lost a lot of money! How can we resolve this Gemara with the normative opinion of R' Nossan, from above, which maintains that it is the parents financial responsibility and not the child's??

What do you think?

The Ran addresses this question:

Source 5 – Ran on Kiddushin 31a – Aggravation & Not Getting Profit

<p>The Gemara queries as to on whom falls the financial burden of providing for the parents physical-needs, and concludes that the burden rests on the parent. (We can derive this from the fact that the sages instructed R' Yermiah to act this way).</p> <p>That begs a question: if so, this seems in contradiction to that which it said earlier “<i>go and see what one particular non-Jew, named Damma ben Nesina, who lived in Ashkelon, did. Once, the sages solicited him in a business-deal for \$600k...!</i>”!?</p> <p>We can answer, that, when we say “from the father”, that’s only referring to honoring him. However, to avoid aggravating him, the son must be willing to give up all the money in the world!</p> <p>Alternatively, when we say “from the father”, that’s referring to where there’s a financial <u>loss</u>. However, this case (of Dumma) is simply talking about <u>not-gaining</u>. (The Ran proceeds to prove this 2nd answer...)</p>	<p>משל מי. מאכילו ומשקהו ומכבדו ומסקינן משל אב דכיון דעבדו בה עובדא הכי הלכתא</p> <p>וכ"ת אם כן תקשי לן הא דאמרינן לעיל עד היכן כבוד אב ואם צאו וראו מה עשה עובד כוכבים אחד באשקלון שהפסיד בשבילו ששים רבוא שטר</p> <p>איכא למימר דכי אמרינן דדוקא משל אב ה"מ לכבדו אבל כדי שלא לצערו יש לו לאבד כל ממון שבעולם אי נמי כי אמרינן משל אב ה"מ בדאיכא חסרון כיס אבל התם עבורי רווחא בעלמא הוה וה"נ מוכח בגמ' דאמרינן מיתבי נאמר כבר את אביך ואת אמך ונאמר כבוד את ה' מהונך מה להלן בחסרון כיס אף כאן בחסרון כיס ואי אמרת משל אב מאי נפקא מיניה ומפרקי' נפקא ליה מיניה לבטול מלאכה</p>
--	--

The Ran presents 2 solutions:

1. Aggravating is a different story: one needn't incur a financial loss in order to honor his parents, but, avoiding causing them aggravation (or emotional pain, etc...) is more severe. For this, even R' Nossan agrees that he must put up his own money.
2. “Losing” vs “Not-Gaining”: The Ran’s 2nd answer is that even if we’ll say that there’s no distinction between aggravation or not – in all scenario’s the son needn’t spend his own money – this Gemara, however, is referring to something slightly different: not *gaining* money. In other words, it’s true: one needn’t *lose* money to honor his parents; but, he must turn down a *potential gain* in order to honor his parents.

Practical Differences (נפקא מינה)

The practical differences between these two answers of the Ran are quite substantial:

- According to the 1st-answer, even though, normally, a child needn't spend his own \$ on honoring his parents, where there's aggravation to the parent, he *is* required to spend his money.
- According to the 2nd answer, though, this is not true – one needn't *ever* put up his own \$ to fulfill the mitzvah of honoring his parents. He needs only to refuse a financial-gain in order to honor his parents.

These 2 answers of the Ran have made their way all the way down to practical Halacha in the Shulchan Aruch [ס' ר"מ ס"ה] – The Shulchan Aruch rules like the 1st answer, and the Rama rules like the 2nd.

4 – OBEYING REQUESTS

A large gap in our understanding of honoring ones parents still remains.

The Talmud offered clear examples of the Mitzvah: provide food, clothes, etc...; don't contradict, don't sit in his place, etc.... *What about simply obeying a parents request or demand? Is this included in the mitzvah of honoring ones parents? If so, under which mitzvah (respect or reverence)?*

In truth, there's a few categories of 'requests':

➔ Category 1 – A request to do something wrong

We'll begin with the following amazing Gemara

Source 6 – Bava Metziah 32a – Parent vs G-d: Who Wins?

The Rabbi's taught: from where do we know that if ones father tells him not to return a lost-object that he needn't obey? As it says in the verse "*A man shall fear his mother and father, and guard my Shabbos, I am Hashem*" – everyone is obligated in My honor.

[Question] Only because the verse "...and guard my Shabbos", without which I could have thought that he (the child) should obey?? Why: this is a positive mitzvah (i.e. honoring ones parents), and this is a positive mitzvah as well as a negative mitzvah (i.e. returning a lost object, and not closing ones eyes to a lost object)!!?

ת"ר מנין שאם אמר לו אביו אל תחזיר
שלא ישמע לו שנאמר "איש אמו ואביו
תיראו ואת שבתותי תשמרו אני ה' (ויקרא
יט) כולכם חייבין בכבודי

טעמא דכתב רחמנא את שבתותי תשמרו
הא לאו הכי הוה אמינא צייתא ליה ואמאי
האי עשה והאי לא תעשה ועשה ולא אתי
עשה ודחי את לא תעשה ועשה

<p>(Answer) I could have thought, that, since the mitzvah of honoring ones parents has been made analogous to the honor afforded to G-d, perhaps he should listen to them (the parents). However, the lesson of “and guard my Shabbos” teaches otherwise.</p>	<p>איצטריך ס"ד אמינא הואיל והוקש כיבוד אב ואם לכבודו של מקום שנאמר כאן (שמות כ, יא) כבד את אביך ואת אמך ונאמר להלן (משלי ג, ט) כבד את ה' מהונך הלכך לציית ליה קמ"ל דלא לשמע ליה</p>
---	--

The Gemara establishes a clear halachic principle: a child needn't ever obey his parents request if it involves violating a Torah-rule.³

³ Even Rabbinic, or customs, שו"ע ס' ר"מ

This is an astounding lesson!

Parenthetically, it's well worth noting the profundity of this Gemara. This Gemara points out that one could have literally concluded that, given the choice between obeying the command of ones parents' vs G-d, All-Mighty, Creator of the universe Himself, he could listen to...his parents!! Why? Because the respect one owes towards ones parents is on par, as it were, to that due to G-d!

If so, what in fact is the Gemara's answer? Why, indeed, does G-d 'win'??

The Sefer HaChinuch gives us a penetrating explanation:

Source 7 – Chinuch #33 – The Sky's the Limit on Honoring Parents!

The root of this mitzvah is the following: it's essential for a person to recognize, and to reciprocate, to one who does kindness for him. He should not be an ungracious, unthankful individual, for this is a horrible, and disgusting character-trait, both in the eyes of man & God.

Rather, he should contemplate the fact that his father and mother are the reason for his very existence! In truth, it would be appropriate for him to do for them all the honor and respect he possibly can, since they brought him to this world, and toiled for him immeasurably in his youth.

When one develops this attitude within himself, he'll come to a recognition of the kindness of Hashem, Who is the true source of his – and his parents – existence...all the way back to the 1st-man. Hashem has brought him to the air of this earth, and provided for all of his needs throughout his entire life; his physical well-being, as well as a wise & insightful soul, without which he would be but a wild-horse. This contemplation will allow him to realize how truly appropriate it is to be diligent in his service of Hashem

משרשי המצוה זו, שראוי לו לאדם שיכיר ויגמול חסד למי שעשה עמו טובה, ולא יהיה נבל ומנכר וכפוי טובה, שזה מידה רעה ומאוסה בתכלית לפני אלהים ואנשים.

ושיתן אל לבו כי האב והאם הם סיבת היותו בעולם, ועל כן באמת ראוי לו לעשות להם כל כבוד וכל תועלת שיוכל, כי הם הביאוהו לעולם, גם יגעו בו כמה יגיעות בקטנותו.

וכשיקבע זאת המדה בנפשו יעלה ממנה להכיר טובת האל ברוך הוא, שהוא סיבתו וסיבת כל אבותיו עד אדם הראשון, ושהוציאו לאויר העולם וסיפק צרכו כל ימיו, והעמידו על מתכונתו ושלימות אבריו, ונתן בו נפש יודעת ומשכלת, שאלולי הנפש שחננו האל יהיה כסוס כפרד אין הבין, ויערוך במחשבתו כמה וכמה ראוי לו להזהר בעבודתו ברוך הוא

The respect & reverence owed towards ones parents is boundless: they've given you the priceless gift of life itself! However, one should realize this is merely a tool – a stepping-stone – towards the respect and reverence owed to the One who is the *true* source of life: G-d Almighty Himself.

→ Category 2 – A request regarding whom to marry

The great Jewish sages addressed a fascinating question regarding obeying ones parents: does this apply to a *Shidduch* – to whom the child wishes to marry?

Source 8 – Mahrik (R' Yosef Kolon, 15th century) 166:3 – Regarding a Shidduch

Regarding the matter which you (someone who asked the Mahrik a question) were uncertain, namely, whether or not a father has the authority to object to his sons choice of a particular woman whom the son wishes to marry: It seems to me, in my humble opinion, that if the woman is suitable for him, then the father has no authority to object.

Firstly, even regarding monetary matters, the Rabbi's already insinuated to R' Yirmiyah to follow the opinion of the one who holds 'from the father', and all of the Halachic-authorities that I've seen, have agreed to this. All the more so in this context, which involves direct emotional-pain and aggravation to the person himself – that is, to abandon the woman whom he wishes to marry, and then to search out someone else that he's not so excited about.

Moreover, this seems to me analogous to commanding the child to transgress the Torah. I'll explain. The Sages teach us (Kiddushin 41a) "*It's forbidden for a person to marry a woman until he sees her*" (Granted, nowadays it's technically allowed, but only because the Sages were worried that somebody else may come along and snatch her up). We see from this the great degree to which the Torah is concerned that a person choose a spouse who finds favor in his eyes. Also, in many cases throughout the Talmud, the Sages were very concerned to make a woman beloved in the eyes of her husband. Now, the Rosh has already taught us that if the father commands his son not to speak with a particular person, and not to forgive him for some iniquity which he had committed: if the son wants to make peace, he needn't obey his father's command, since it's forbidden to hate any fellow Jew whatsoever. So too here, since there's an element of a transgression (by marrying the wrong woman), he needn't obey.

ואשר נסתפקת אם יש כח ביד האב למחות ביד בנו לישא אשה אשר יחפוץ בה הבן לע"ד נראה שאם היא אשה ההוגנת לו שאין כח ביד האב למחות ביד הבן

הדא דאפילו לענין ממון אודי ליה רבנן לרבי ירמיה כמאן דאמר משל האב וכן פסקו כל פוסקי הלכות אשר ראיתי, כל שכן הכא שהוא דבר השייך בצער דגופא להניח האשה אשר חפץ בה ויצטרך לקחת אשה אחרת אשר לא תישר בעיניו כל כך.

ועוד דקרוב הדבר בעיני להיות כמצוה לעבור על דברי תורה שהרי אמרו רבותינו ז"ל (קדושין מא.) אסור לאדם שיקדש את האשה עד שיראנה אלא שעכשיו הותר פן יקדימנו אחר כמו שכתבו התוספות והפוסקים הרי שהקפידו שיקח אשה אשר יחפוץ בה ותמצא חן בעיניו וכן בכמה מקומות חשו חכמים ז"ל לחבב האשה על בעלה, וכבר השיב רבינו אשר דאם האב מצווה על בנו שלא ידבר עם פלוני ולא ימחול לו על מה שעשה לו עד זמן קצוב שאם הבן רוצה להשלים שאין לחוש לצואת אביו מפני שאסור לשנא שום יהודי כולי כדאית' בטור י"ד הכא נמי לא שנא לפי הנלע"ד מאחר שיש בדבר נדנדוד עבירה כו' כדפי' לעיל.

<p>Lastly, until now, the whole argument of ‘from the son’ or ‘from the father’, was only stated regarding something which directly affects/benefits the father, like his financial and physical welfare. However, matters which do not directly affect him, such as in our case, obviously the father yields no authority over the son, neither in terms of ‘respect’, nor ‘reverence’. (Why?) ‘Respect’ only refers to providing clothes, food, shelter, etc...; ‘Reverence’ only refers to not sitting in his place, not to contradict him, etc...all of these are examples of matters which are directly relevant to the father. However, matters which do not directly affect him, obviously the father yields no authority over the son.</p>	<p>ועוד דעד כאן לא מיפלגי אם משל אב אם משל בן אלא בדבר דשייך האב בגווה כגון פרנסת האב שצורך גוף האב וקיימו אבל במלתא דלא שייך בגווי' כי הכא פשיט' דאין כח לאב למחות בבן לא משום כבוד ולא משום מורא דלא שייך כבוד אלא כגון מאכילו משקהו מלבישו מנעילו וכו' מורא לא ישב במקומו ולא סותר את דברי כו' וכן כיוצא בזה דשייך לאב אבל במלתא דלא שייך האב בגווה פשיטא דאין כח האב למחות ביד בנו.</p>
--	---

The Maharik presents 3 compelling arguments why the son need not obey the parents' wish:

- 1) The Halacha follows the opinion of ‘from the father’. Therefore, if the son needn't give up of his own finances, then, certainly, he's not required to give up his own (prospective) wife!
- 2) Marrying the wrong person is, in a certain respect, a Torah-violation! Therefore, the son needn't obey.
- 3) Since the parent does not derive direct benefit from the sons loss (i.e. the girl!), the mitzvah of **ואם כבוד אב ואם** does not apply.

→ Level 3 – Requests with no personal benefit

The last reason given by the Maharik opens the door to an important question, with far-reaching consequences: if a parent makes a request, of which he'll receive no direct physical benefit (i.e. in contrast to all of the Gemara's examples of food, clothes, shelter, etc...), is the child *ever* obligated to comply? If yes, for what reason(s)?

What do you think??

Source 9 – Sefer HaMakneh, Kiddushin 31b – Don't Contradict!

<p>It seems to me that anything which the father instructs the son to do – if it's something from which the father does not directly gain, it is not included in “respect”. However, if it comes at no significant loss to the child, <u>it would nevertheless be included under “reverence”</u> – since, by not obeying the parents' request, the child would be contradicting him.</p>	<p>ת"ר איזהו מורא וכו' נראה דכל דבר שמצווה לו אביו אף בדבר שאין לאביו שום הנאה ממנו אינו בכלל כיבוד, אפילו הכי אם אין לבן שום הפסד ממנו זה בכלל מורא, שאם לא ישמע לו הוי כסותר את דבריו. ועיין ביו"ד סוף סימן ר"מ בהג"ה אם האב מוחה בבן לישא איזה אשה</p>
--	---

<p>In fact, if you look carefully at the Halacha in Shulchan Aruch, regarding the father's non-authority regarding whom the child wishes to marry, the implication is that in regards to <i>other</i> matters, the child <i>is</i> indeed obligated to obey his parents' request.</p>	<p>שיחפוז בה הבן אין צריך לשמוע לו עיין שם, משמע דלדברים אחרים אף על פי שאין לאב הנה ממנו צריך לשמוע לו</p>
---	---

The Sefer haMakneh makes a brilliant distinction: True, obeying requests are certainly not included in 'honor', since the parent derives no direct, physical benefit.⁴ However, it's nonetheless included in 'reverence', since it involves contradicting the parents' wishes!

Said clearly: if a child's fulfillment of his parents request involves no substantive loss, he **must** obey, since, by not doing so, it would be a violation of 'reverence' – 'don't contradict'!

⁴ R' Akiva Eiger argues that it could very well be that giving '*nachas*' to ones parents *is* included in physical-benefit, i.e. under 'respect' [שו"ת רע"א ס' ס"ה]

EXAMPLES

- 1) “*Oh, sweetie, we’d love for you to come join us here for Pesach! It would be so wonderful!*”, says Zale’s mother, who’d recently made Aliyah. Zale would love to go, but when the practical thoughts of schlepping his whole family off to Israel for a week - & the significant costs involved! – start running through his mind, he feels conflicted as to what to do. He *does* want to honor his parents....*what should he do??*

- 2) Shloimey owns his own business: “Shloimey’s Shoes: Sales & Repairs”, a quaint, but successful store-front shoe-store on Bathurst street. One day, Shloimey’s mother calls him and says that she really needs his help: she has an eye infection, and must go downtown to see an eye specialist promptly (which will certainly take the whole day). This will require Shloimey to close his store for the day. *Is he obligated to do so?*

- 3) Same scenario as #2, with one difference: it’s “Shmerel’s Shoes”, and Shloimey is simply an employee. *How may this affect the Halacha?*

- 4) Same scenario as #2 (it’s Shloimey’s store), with another variation: Shloimey’s mother doesn’t just need help for a day, but, rather, for at least 2-weeks, to travel and go see a specialist in Sweden. *How may this affect the Halacha??*