

Was the Shulchan Aruch Intended to Be a Code of Jewish Law?

By: ARI STORCH

Introduction

Rav Yosef Karo's masterful *Shulchan Aruch* is widely seen as a concise comprehensive code of Jewish law and a foundational halachic work for many Jewish communities throughout the world.¹ The *Shulchan Aruch* is so integral that many later popular halachists felt it necessary to print their works only as glosses to the *Shulchan Aruch* instead of as independent works.² However, the *Shulchan Aruch* was not Rav Karo's first foray into publishing a halachic work; it followed the monumental *Beis Yosef*, which compiles a significant amount of halachic literature and background on each topic in addition to presenting halachic outcomes. The question then arises, did Rav Karo intend for his *Shulchan Aruch* to be used as a code of Jewish law when organizing the *Shulchan Aruch*, and, if so, how does it differ from how he foresaw his *Beis Yosef* being used? There is evidence that Rav Karo envisioned a completely different use for this work when writing it; its use as a code of Jewish law may result from subsequent generations utilizing Rav Karo's work in a way unintended by Rav Karo.

Even if the current use of *Shulchan Aruch* is inconsistent with its author's objectives, it does not necessarily mean that halachah does not recognize it as a code of Jewish law. Halachic acceptance may be independent of the author's intent. Therefore, this article in no way is suggesting or recommending changes in halachic understanding. One should consult a competent rabbi for proper halachic direction.

This article will attempt to discern what use Rav Karo intended for his *Shulchan Aruch*. First, this article will analyze Rav Karo's writings when setting forth the overall objectives of the *Shulchan Aruch*. Then, this article will present relatively early sages' comments regarding how they perceived

¹ See, e.g., *Chazon Ish*, *Zera'im*, *Shevi'is* 23 (stating that although subsequent generations advocated alternative halachic rulings, the *Shulchan Aruch* formed the basis of halachah throughout much of the world at one point in history).

² E.g., *Turei Zahav*; *Beis Shmuel*; *Sifsei Kohein*; *Magen Avraham*; *Me'iras Einayim*; *Chelkas Mechokek*; *Mishnah Berurah*.

Ari Storch received *semichah* from Ner Yisroel and is the author of *Tiferes Aryeh* on *Zevachim* and *The Secrets of the Stars*. He is a real estate attorney who graduated from Georgetown University Law Center.

Rav Karo's goals for his *Shulchan Aruch*. This article will analyze some other relatively early sages' positions regarding how to resolve inconsistencies in the *Beis Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch* in an attempt to see how they felt these two works were intended to be used. Last, this article will present a novel theory as to Rav Karo's intent based on other writings of his.

Rav Karo's Stated Objectives

Rav Karo's introduction to the *Shulchan Aruch* is helpful when trying to determine his objectives, but some ambiguity therein is cause for confusion. Interestingly, in his introduction to *Shulchan Aruch*, Rav Karo refers to his *Beis Yosef* as his magnum opus.³ Rav Karo maintains it is the *Beis Yosef* that contains a comprehensive compilation of halachic literature with exceptional elucidation,⁴ not the *Shulchan Aruch*. Rav Karo asserts that the purpose of the *Shulchan Aruch* was to provide an abridged version of the *Beis Yosef*, so that scholars would be familiar enough with the material to respond quickly to halachic queries.⁵ Rav Karo divided the *Shulchan Aruch* into thirty parts, so that scholars could review it every thirty days.⁶ Thus, it initially appears that the *Shulchan Aruch* was not intended to be a standalone work; it was only for the purposes of retaining the vast information contained in the *Beis Yosef*. Even when referring to its halachic use, Rav Karo seems to insinuate that the *Shulchan Aruch* may have only been authored to facilitate the scholar with recall of the information previously gleaned from the *Beis Yosef*. The *Beis Yosef* therefore seems to be the work Rav Karo intended one should primarily utilize to render halachic rulings; the *Shulchan Aruch* should be used as an abridged version for the purposes of review.

However, Rav Karo also states that the *Shulchan Aruch* provides younger students a more accessible text enabling mastery of practical halachah at a younger age, a *girsā d'yankusa*, a text memorized in one's youth that will not likely be forgotten through the passage of time.⁷ Using many accolades, Rav Karo presents the *Shulchan Aruch* as a work comprised of defined halachic rulings.⁸ These statements both indicate that Rav Karo felt the *Beis Yosef* is not a necessary prerequisite to study *Shulchan Aruch*, and open the possibility that Rav Karo believed halachic rulings could be

³ *Shulchan Aruch Hakdamah*.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.* (referencing the concept from *Shabbos* 21b that texts memorized in one's youth are not easily forgotten).

⁸ *Shulchan Aruch Hakdamah*.

deduced directly from the *Shulchan Aruch*. Consequently, Rav Karo's introduction to *Shulchan Aruch* leaves one with some puzzlement as to what he was intending with this epic work.

Proponents that *Shulchan Aruch* Was Not Intended as a Work of Halachah

Some great scholars have opposed using the *Shulchan Aruch* as a separate halachic work. The (*sefer*) *Me'iras Einayim* (*S"ma*) vociferously contested the use of *Shulchan Aruch* as an independent halachic work.⁹ The *S"ma* understood Rav Karo's first stated objective, that the *Shulchan Aruch* was a tool to recall the rulings contained in the *Beis Yosef*, as the main reason for its compilation.¹⁰ The *S"ma* thus states that those who render halachic rulings from *Shulchan Aruch* destroy our nation and deny the truth of the Torah.¹¹ The *S"ma*'s critical attitude toward those who use the *Shulchan Aruch* as a halachic work is consistent with Rav Karo's first stated objective in his introduction to the *Shulchan Aruch*, which the *S"ma* explicitly mentions in the context of his reproach.

A passage in the *Beis Yosef* may bolster the contention that the *Shulchan Aruch* was not intended as a standalone halachic work. Citing the *Mahari ibn Chaviv* in the context of the laws of *tzitzis*, the *Beis Yosef* establishes that the language utilized by the *Tur* in a particular instance does not reflect the intent of the original tannaitic sources.¹² When concluding, the *Beis Yosef* states that he recorded the *Mahari ibn Chaviv*'s opinion solely to warn Talmudic students not to analyze the words contained in a halachic work hastily because the wording in such sources can be misleading.¹³ Rather, they must first scrutinize the primary sources.¹⁴ Requiring examination of primary sources prior to understanding the intent of a halachic work mandates that no code of law should be utilized as a standalone work. Thus, this passage from the *Beis Yosef* seems to reinforce the *Sma*'s opinion that

⁹ *Hakdamas HaRav Yehoshua Volk Katz L'Arbaas Sefarav: Perishah U'Derishah al Arbaas HaTurim, Hagabos Derishah U'Perishah al Darkei Moshe, U'Me'iras Einayim al Shulchan Aruch Chosben Mishpat s.v. v'gam el chibur hashulchan aruch.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.* The *Maharsba* similarly rebukes those in his generation who render halachic rulings from the *Shulchan Aruch* without first understanding the underlying source material; however, he makes no reference to Rav Karo's intent when publishing the work (*Maharsba Sotah Chiddushei Agados 22a s.v. yarei es*).

¹² *Beis Yosef, Orach Chaim 16 s.v. vekach kasav.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

the *Shulchan Aruch*, an apparent code of law, should not be used as a standalone halachic work.

Based on metaphysical reasoning, the *Maharal* similarly maintains that the *Shulchan Aruch* was not intended to be used as a standalone halachic work. The *Maharal* understands that Torah is a purely intellectual entity, so extracting halachic information for practical use must be derived through analytical and intellectual means.¹⁵ Therefore, one should not render halachic opinions by simply regurgitating previously recorded rulings of other authorities because that does not require analysis.¹⁶ The prerequisite of careful analysis of the original sources is not because lack of analysis can lead to error; rather, the *Maharal* understands that it is a metaphysical perversion of Torah for halachic conclusions to come about without careful analysis of the subject matter.¹⁷ The *Maharal* suggests that it is preferable to render errant rulings after analyzing the original sources than to render correct rulings from previously recorded codes of law.¹⁸ Although he does not state any specific work explicitly, the *Maharal* likely is referring to the *Shulchan Aruch* when he states that it is for the aforementioned reasons that the author of a popular legal code did not intend for people to use the work as a simple code of law.¹⁹ Rav Karo's intent for his *Shulchan Aruch*, according to the *Maharal*, was to provide one carefully reviewing the original source material direction to arrive at the proper conclusion.²⁰ Thus, the *Maharal* seems to concur with the *S"ma* that Rav Karo did not intend for readers to utilize his *Shulchan Aruch* as an independent halachic work.

Some understand other writings of Rav Karo to indicate that the *Shulchan Aruch* should not be used as a halachic work. In a responsum, Rav Karo states that a rabbi should not render a halachic decision without the *Beis Yosef* open before him.²¹ Rav Karo's reasoning is predicated on the comprehensive nature of the *Beis Yosef* and that it is organized like a "fully prepared meal."²² Rav Karo lambasts those who render halachic opinions without utilizing the *Beis Yosef* by stating they are whom R. Yehudah of

¹⁵ *Nesivos Olam Nesiv HaTorah* 15.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Shu"t Beis Yosef, Even HaEzer, Gittin V'Geirusin* 13.

²² *Ibid.* It is interesting that Rav Karo chooses to reference his *Beis Yosef* as a fully prepared meal considering his other title *Shulchan Aruch* literally means a set table. This may indicate the two were intended to be used in tandem.

the Mishnah was referencing when he stated, “an error in Talmudic study is equated with deliberately sinning.”²³ Rav Karo’s harsh language does not facially indicate that rabbis should only render halachic opinions from the information in the *Beis Yosef*, not the *Shulchan Aruch*, because Rav Karo’s undated responsum may have been written prior to the release of the *Shulchan Aruch*. However, scholars who lived after the *Shulchan Aruch* was readily accessible reference this responsum,²⁴ which indicates they felt that the *Beis Yosef* should be used as the halachic text, not the *Shulchan Aruch*.

Some Indications the *Shulchan Aruch* Was Intended to be Halachic

Other scholars seem to recognize that Rav Karo envisioned his *Shulchan Aruch* assisting in determining halachic matters. The *Rema*, famous for inserting notations of Ashkenazic practice into the *Shulchan Aruch*, may have believed the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended as a halachic work. In the introduction to his notations to the *Shulchan Aruch*, the *Rema* states that his objective is to modify the *Shulchan Aruch*, which he seems to describe as a work of halachah, to make it usable to people living in Ashkenazic countries.²⁵ In the *Rema*’s opinion, the pillars on which many Ashkenazic communities relied upon for halachah and halachic practices were not adequately represented in the *Shulchan Aruch*,²⁶ which likely targeted a different audience. The *Rema* seems to understand that the use of his more comprehensive post-notated *Shulchan Aruch* is consistent with Rav Karo’s intended purpose for the original *Shulchan Aruch*, halachic reference.²⁷ Thus, it appears that the *Rema* felt the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended to be used as a halachah reference; he merely desired to make it accessible to those living in Ashkenazic countries by providing comprehensive notes indicating where Ashkenazic practice deviates from the rulings contained in the original text.

There are indications from some great rabbinic scholars that they believed the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended as a halachic work from how they address discrepancies between the *Beis Yosef* and the *Shulchan Aruch*. The

²³ Ibid. (citing *Avos* 3:14).

²⁴ *Nachalas Shivah* 50 (citing the *Maharshak* who appears to be referencing the aforementioned responsum).

²⁵ *HaMappah Hakdamah*.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

Knesses HaGedolah contends that Rav Karo omitted many halachic opinions from his *Shulchan Aruch*, even though he cited them in the *Beis Yosef*, because he did not find other rabbinic authorities who espoused those views.²⁸ Others assert that Rav Karo's omissions in these circumstances indicate a retraction; he no longer felt those opinions were halachically sound.²⁹ The *Teshuvos Ginas Veradim* maintains that the *Shulchan Aruch* contains opinions not previously cited in the *Beis Yosef* because Rav Karo included opinions he only first encountered after releasing his *Beis Yosef*.³⁰ These approaches acknowledge that the *Shulchan Aruch* presents halachically sound information that could not be gleaned independently from the *Beis Yosef*, which demonstrates a belief that Rav Karo intended the *Shulchan Aruch* to be more than an abridged *Beis Yosef* solely authored to facilitate review. Although it is unclear if these opinions maintain that the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended to be a standalone work, it seems they at least consider it to be a complementary work to the *Beis Yosef*.

Although the aforementioned sources indicate that some discrepancies between the *Beis Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch* represent a signaling from Rav Karo that may be useful in determining halachah, other methods posited to explain inconsistencies within the *Shulchan Aruch* may lead to different conclusions. The *Ohalei Yaakov* maintains that inaccuracies exist in the *Shulchan Aruch* because Rav Karo wrote the *Shulchan Aruch* while infirm and advanced in age.³¹ The *Dvar Shmuel* states that some contradictions exist within the *Shulchan Aruch* because Rav Karo had several of his students author the *Shulchan Aruch* based on the earlier *Beis Yosef*.³² Because there were multiple authors, the work is far from uniform.³³ These explanations could equally explain many of the differences between the *Beis Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch*, which would negate the necessity to assume that the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended for use as a halachic work. Accordingly, the inconsistencies could be unintentional and not a tool used by Rav Karo to signal halachic practice.

A New Theory Based on Another of Rav Karo's Statements

Rav Karo's interpretation of the Talmudic method of amending a Mishnaic text may present a new understanding of what Rav Karo may have

²⁸ *Knesses HaGedolah, Yoreh De'ab* 35:74.

²⁹ *Yedei Eliyahu* 146.

³⁰ *Teshuvos Ginas Veradim, Even HaEzer* 4:30.

³¹ *Ohalei Yaakov* 20.

³² *Dvar Shmuel* 255.

³³ *Ibid.*

intended for his *Shulchan Aruch*. On occasion, the Talmud states, “*chisurei mechsera v’hachi katani*,” which literally means, “[the text] is corrupt and should be understood as follows.”³⁴ The simple understanding of this phrase appears to be that the Talmud is restoring a corrupted text to its initial state; however, Rav Karo presents a more nuanced view. Rav Karo maintains that Talmudic students were accustomed to learning Talmudic concepts via standardized unwritten texts when Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi (“Rebbi”) was formalizing his Mishnah.³⁵ Because matters were not committed to writing and people are prone to forgetting, mistakes had crept into the original texts.³⁶ Consequently, students would review texts that had missing words.³⁷ Rebbi wanted to teach his students with the texts with which they were already familiar, so he continued to use the corrupted text.³⁸ Rebbi believed that his students would recognize the mistakes and understand the incorrect texts in a correct fashion,³⁹ presumably based on Rebbi’s discourses. Nevertheless, the original but corrupted text was still the one utilized for teaching the material.⁴⁰ In other words, the text was merely a means for the student to recall the general subject matter, but the student needed to project Rebbi’s teachings into the text to understand it in a fashion other than that which is simply purported. The text on its own actually presented incorrect information.

It is possible that Rav Karo mimicked Rebbi’s style of recording Mishnah when authoring his *Shulchan Aruch*. Instead of utilizing new language, Rav Karo frequently quotes almost verbatim from earlier sources such as *Rambam* or *Tur*.⁴¹ As explicitly stated in his introduction to the *Shulchan Aruch*, Rav Karo may have intended for the *Shulchan Aruch* to be an abridged version of the *Beis Yosef* for the purpose of recalling the information contained within the *Beis Yosef*.⁴² The work was not intended to be a standalone work of halachah; rather, it was to trigger a reader’s memory of the more comprehensive information previously gleaned from the *Beis Yosef*, similar to how Rebbi utilized an imprecise text to cause his students

³⁴ E.g., *Berachos* 13b.

³⁵ *Klalei HaGemara* 2:14.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ E.g., *Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim* 3:8 (paraphrasing portions of the *Tur*’s language almost verbatim); see also *ibid.* 1:1–2 (clearly paralleling the structure of the *Tur*).

⁴² See *Shulchan Aruch Hakdamah* (stating that the *Shulchan Aruch* is an abridged version of the *Beis Yosef* intended to facilitate review of the *Beis Yosef*).

to recall supplemental information he delivered to them in his lectures. Unlike Rebbi, who utilized an exact but corrupted text to convey his information, Rav Karo was afforded the opportunity to modify the earlier texts slightly for elucidation while mostly retaining the exact original language, because Rav Karo's students did not need to memorize the earlier sources; they were already in written form. Thus, it is possible that Rav Karo used a mostly familiar text to stimulate his students' memory to recall the more accurate halachic information recorded in the *Beis Yosef*. Consequently, the text of the *Shulchan Aruch* may not properly reflect what Rav Karo believed to be the correct ruling. So, when Rav Karo states that the *Shulchan Aruch* will assist scholars in remembering halachic information so they may respond quickly to queries, he may mean within the earlier stated framework; the *Shulchan Aruch* will elicit the recollection of the halachic material in the *Beis Yosef*.

Rav Karo's second stated objective in his introduction to the *Shulchan Aruch* may also be akin to an ancient Talmudic practice regarding Mishnah. In the Talmudic era, students used to memorize the Mishnah, so they would have a proper foundation as they matriculated to more advanced Talmudic studies.⁴³ Utilizing the Mishnah as a proper foundation is considered fundamental to society, but rendering halachic rulings from it is considered destructive because it is not sufficiently comprehensive for conveying proper halachic matters.⁴⁴ Rav Karo encourages younger students to use his *Shulchan Aruch* as a "*girsā d'yankusa*," a text memorized in one's youth that will not likely be forgotten through the passage of time.⁴⁵ Although he refers to these students encountering practical halachah through study of *Shulchan Aruch*,⁴⁶ he may have assumed they will not be rendering halachic decisions on their own because Rav Karo prohibits rendering halachic decisions prior to achieving suitable expertise and maturity and he is referring to younger students.⁴⁷ Thus, Rav Karo could mean that these young students now have a familiar text upon which to build their halachic knowledge as their studies progress. This allows them to master the *Beis Yosef*, the work Rav Karo demands one rendering halachah have open before him,⁴⁸ at a quicker pace than others who did not

⁴³ *Avos* 5:21.

⁴⁴ *Sotah* 22a; *Rashi Sotah* 22a s.v. *shemoin halachah*; but see supra note 15 and accompanying text (presenting an approach that views this concern in metaphysical terms).

⁴⁵ *Shulchan Aruch Hakdamah* (referencing the concept from *Shabbos* 21b that texts memorized in one's youth are not easily forgotten).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Beis Yosef, Yoreh De'ab* 242; *Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh De'ab* 242:13.

⁴⁸ *Shu"t Beis Yosef, Even HaEzer Gittin V'Geirushin* 13.

first study *Shulchan Aruch*. In this regard, it is similar to those who used Mishnah as a foundation for their subsequent Talmudic study. When read in this fashion, Rav Karo's two stated objectives for his *Shulchan Aruch* blend together to achieve one overarching theme. The *Shulchan Aruch* is a tool for mastering and remembering the *Beis Yosef*, which is the primary work; it is not for rendering halachic decisions.

A common theme found among many discrepancies between the *Beis Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch* seems to support the notion that the *Shulchan Aruch* is simply an imprecise amalgamation of material meant to facilitate recall of the *Beis Yosef*. A significant amount of apparent discrepancies between the *Beis Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch* is found either in scenarios where Rav Karo quotes, almost verbatim, earlier sources such as *Rambam* or *Tur* in his *Shulchan Aruch*,⁴⁹ or in situations where Rav Karo renders a halachic verdict in his *Beis Yosef* after citing multiple sources, but simply presents those opinions in his *Shulchan Aruch* without the halachic conclusion.⁵⁰ Although there is no indication whether Rav Karo had a *Beis Yosef* open before him when authoring the *Shulchan Aruch*, it stands to reason that one who wants to condense a large work into an abridged version will systematically go through the larger work while reducing it to basic principles for inclusion in the smaller. It is therefore notable that so many discrepancies still exist between these works. The conspicuous omission in the introduction to the *Shulchan Aruch* that Rav Karo utilized this opportunity to revise and update his halachic magnum opus, the *Beis Yosef*, suggests that he did not significantly update the work through this process. Thus, while it is possible there were a few retractions and updates, it is unlikely that Rav Karo significantly overhauled the *Beis Yosef* without any reference thereto. While many of the aforementioned hypotheses as to why discrepancies arise within these works may account for some of the inconsistencies, the abundance of inconsistencies—coupled with their existence significantly occurring in situations when the *Shulchan Aruch* is either quoting an earlier source or presenting multiple opinions without the halachic conclusion found in the *Beis Yosef*—suggest that the main reason for these inconsistencies is because Rav Karo did not intend for the *Shulchan Aruch* to convey halachah precisely. He was quoting earlier

⁴⁹ E.g., *Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 14 s.v. *hasboel*; *Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chaim* 14:3 (paraphrasing the *Tur* and omitting the requirement that the requisite thirty days be consecutive).

⁵⁰ E.g., *Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 15 s.v. *niker'ab hatalis*; *Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chaim* 15:4; *Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 18 s.v. *kasuv behagabos*; *Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chaim* 18:1.

works to jog the reader's memory, so the reader could access the information from the *Beis Yosef*. Accordingly, the discrepancies within Rav Karo's works may actually be indicative of his objectives in writing the *Shulchan Aruch*.⁵¹

Conclusion

In the modern era, the *Shulchan Aruch* is largely viewed as a legal code with readily accessible halachic information. In contradistinction, historically, many great rabbinic scholars have criticized those who use the *Shulchan Aruch* to render halachic decisions. Rav Karo's own writings can be used to support the assertion that the *Shulchan Aruch* was intended: (i) for use as a tool to master the *Beis Yosef*, (ii) as a work to derive halachic guidance or (iii) as a complementary work to enhance the *Beis Yosef* by making it more accessible and comprehensive.

Recognizing Rav Karo's unique perspective on how Rebbi compiled the Mishnah may shed light on what Rav Karo was attempting to achieve with his *Shulchan Aruch*. Evidence suggests that Rav Karo did not intend for it to be a halachic work; rather, it was intended mainly as a tool to remember the information contained in the *Beis Yosef*. Much language in the *Shulchan Aruch* may only have been copied and pasted from earlier sources and may not necessarily present opinions Rav Karo felt should be relied upon for halachic purposes. Although some information in the *Shulchan Aruch* may have been intended to revise the *Beis Yosef* with retractions and updates, many discrepancies between the works seem to be the result of the inherently different natures of these works. Thus, Rav Karo likely intended for one interested in understanding halachic outcomes primarily to utilize the conclusions found in the *Beis Yosef*, not the *Shulchan Aruch*.

⁵¹ When this author presented the abovementioned theory to R. Hershel Schachter, R. Schachter stated that the *Beis Yosef* accurately represents Rav Karo's opinion and should be used for halachah, not the *Shulchan Aruch* (Discussion with R. Hershel Schachter, rosh yeshivah at Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, in Boca Raton, Fl. [May 18, 2021]). R. Schachter maintained that the *Shulchan Aruch* sometimes uses language from opinions Rav Karo felt were not halachically sound because it was intended only as a "*maftei'ach*," an index, to recall the information in the *Beis Yosef* (ibid.). R. Schachter found the abovementioned theory to be a plausible explanation for the reasoning behind the structuring of the *Shulchan Aruch* (ibid.). However, when I presented the overall concept to R. Asher Weiss, he informed me that he believes R. Yosef Karo intended the *Shulchan Aruch* to be the primary halachic reference, not the *Beis Yosef* (Discussion with R. Asher Weiss, in Estepona, Spain [November 17, 2022]). R. Weiss attributes various stylistic qualities of the *Shulchan Aruch* to R. Karo's desire to author a concise work (ibid.).

Although this perspective may largely be at odds with the present-day use of the *Shulchan Aruch*, this article in no way advocates change. It is possible that halachically acceptable usage is independent of Rav Karo's objectives when he wrote the work that has become the standard name in halachic literature. 