



# THE שבוע MATTERS

שבת קודש פרשת תולדות | מסכת יבמות דף ע"ז

לע"נ ברוך בענדיט וברכה גרוס ע"ה  
by Mr. & Mrs. Duvy Gross

## INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS

What was the answer?

## STORIES OFF THE DAF

The Brisker Rav's Chiddush

### מאי תשובה?

In the Mishnah (76b), Rebbe Shimon argued that the women of Mitzrayim and Edom are permitted to marry among the Jewish people immediately upon converting, and it is only the men that are restricted until the third generation. The sages told him that if he had a tradition that this was true, they would be willing to accept his ruling. However, if it was simply based upon a logical argument, they had an answer to reject his presentation. Our Gemara brings the response of the sages to refute the ruling of Rebbe Shimon. We find that the Torah only prohibits marrying relatives up until three generations (including the person himself). These are one's daughter and granddaughter. Although there are rabbinic restrictions which extend beyond this, the Torah itself only prohibits three generations. Yet, there is no distinction made between male and females—a daughter of a son as well as a daughter of a daughter are both prohibited. Therefore, the fact that a Mitzri is permitted after three generations is no indication that women are permitted immediately. In his Commentary to the Mishnah, Rambam explains that the response to Rebbe Shimon is that the women of Amon and Moav are permitted because they are not to be condemned for not volunteering food to the Jews in the desert. Women were not expected to advance and bring food. But the Mitzri women are not excluded from the three-generation ban of their nation. Rabbi Obadiah Bertinoro also brings this explanation for the sages. Rabbi Akiva Eiger wonders why they deviate from the words of our Gemara. Aruch Laner explains that our Gemara holds according to Rabbanan of Rabbi Yehuda (77a), who say that the Amon women should have brought food to the women of klal Yisroel. Therefore, our Gemara brings a reason unrelated to the historical reason cited in the verse.

## PARSHA CONNECTION

**This week's daf** we learn that one is not permitted to marry the first two generations of a Ger coming from אדום. The forefather of אדום is עשו, whose birth is described in this week's Parsha. The Parsha starts off with the following: וְאֶלֶּה תּוֹלְדֹת יִצְחָק בֶּן-אֲבֵרָהָם אֲבֵרָהָם הוֹלִיד אֶת-יִצְחָק. Rashi explains that although the Torah goes on to talk about יצחק's children, it starts with יצחק's father because people were spreading rumors that אבימלך was the real father of יצחק. To debunk such a claim, יצחק הק"ב created יצחק to look like אברהם and thereby showed everyone who fathered יצחק. The difficulty with this explanation is that in this week's parsha יצחק is already 60 years old. Why does the Torah only inform us now about אברהם's and יצחק's identical appearances now? The הקדוש offers the following explanation. It is true that there were some initial rumors when יצחק was born, those rumors, however, quickly died down because people refused to believe such stories about אברהם and שרה. However when יצחק had עשו, who clearly did not fit the DNA of אברהם, the rumors restarted in full force. It is therefore here that the Torah emphasizes that יצחק was the son of אברהם.

אמר רבא מלמד שחגר חרבו  
בישמעאל ואמר כל מי שאינו שומע הלכה זו  
ידקר בחרב כך מקובלני מבית דינו של שמואל  
הרמתי עמוני ולא עמונית מואבי ולא מואבית

As was his wont, the Brisker Rav was telling over a chiddush to a group of visiting talmidei chachomim. "We see in Yevamos 77a that on the basis of the question regarding the prohibition of a Moavite woman, Doeg HaEdomi very nearly managed to invalidate Dovid HaMelech altogether. When Doeg asked Avner why the Moavite women didn't meet the Jewish women with food and drink, since by anyone's standards that could still be considered modest, no one could answer. It was just then that Amasha girded his sword and said, 'I will run through anyone who doesn't wish to accept this ruling. I received from the beis din of Shmuel HaRamasi that the language of the verse is Amoni and Moavi—in the masculine—and it excludes the women of either nation!' The Brisker Rav went on, "This seems a trifle enigmatic since Doeg seemed to have a strong question. Actually, this was the very same question that bothered the go'el of Rus who did not want to redeem her. How does Amasha's action answer the question, then? Both Doeg and the go'el made one simple error; they believed that this ruling was a limud that could be asked upon. And that is why Amasha offered the only valid answer: the ruling is actually halachah l'Moshe m'Sinai, and no question can change it or invalidate it!" The Brisker Rav's guests had all been waiting for one of their host's strong pieces of lomdus and they seemed somewhat disappointed by this fairly simple cheshbon vort. When the Brisker Rav noticed this, he exclaimed, "Soon Rav Lazer (Shach, zt"l) will come and you will see firsthand his joy in a Torah-true chiddush! Chazal teach that anyone who says Torah in public and it is not as sweet as milk and honey to those listening would be better off remaining silent. (Shir HaShirim Rabbah, 4:11) This is an expression of one's honor for the Torah, and I find it especially true of Rav Lazer. That is why I usually wait to tell him any chiddush I have. He knows just how to find and feel the newness in what I say, and one can see how much he rejoices in it!"

## HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Ruling in halacha for oneself

ר' אבא אמר רב כל תלמיד חכם שמורה הלכה ובא וכו' והאמר

Didn't R' Abba in the name of Rav teach that a scholar who comes to issue a halachic ruling...

**R**ema<sup>1</sup> ruled, concerning a scholar who issues a ruling that is relevant to him, that if the ruling was issued before the question arose he is believed but if he did not rule until after the question arose he is not believed. This ruling, however, is limited to a case where the scholar states that his ruling is based on tradition (כתב) but if he presents a logical argument and can prove his position his ruling is accepted. His ruling is not accepted for himself because of the concern that he drew parallels that are not valid but if the ruling is obvious his ruling is accepted. There is a debate concerning the conclusion of Rema's ruling. Rav Mordechai Yafah<sup>2</sup>, the Levush writes that when the ruling is based on a logical argument the ruling is accepted for others but not for himself but a ruling that is obvious is accepted even if the ruling is relevant to him. Rav Dovid Halevi<sup>3</sup>, the Taz, explains that the intent of Rema is to rule that the logical argument of the scholar is accepted if the argument is logically sound and it is not necessary to rely on the authority of the scholar. On the other hand, if the acceptance of this ruling requires relying on the authority of the scholar his ruling is not accepted. Rav Chalfon Moshe Hakohen<sup>4</sup>, the Teshuvos Shoel V'nishal, asserts that the Rema addresses a case where the scholar claims that the basis of his ruling is found explicitly in an authoritative source. Although we cannot, at the moment, check his sources this is believed since the matter could be easily researched and we are thus not concerned that he is drawing an improper parallel. There was once a dispute whether a particular animal was a teraifah. One posek ruled that the animal was prohibited; a second posek ruled that it was permitted and a third posek concurred with the lenient opinion. The third posek was the owner of the animal and the question arose whether his opinion is relevant to the debate out of concern that he has ulterior motives (ארבד עגון) that the animal should be kosher. Teshuvos Shoel V'nishal wrote that in this case all opinions would agree that his ruling is not binding since the ruling applies to himself and it cannot be said that the logic of the argument is obvious since there is a disagreement on the matter.

1. רמ"א יו"ד סי' רמ"ב סע' ר"ל
2. לבוש שם
3. ט"ז ש"ק ב"א
4. שו"ת שואל ונשאל ח"ג יו"ד סי' שע"ד

## MUSSAR FROM THE DAF בהצנע לבת

מכל מקום קשיא הכא תרגימו כל כבודה בת מלך פנימה במערבא אמרי ואיתימא רבי יצחק אמר קרא ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך וגו'

**T**he Gemara tells us that a woman from Amon or Moav is free to marry into Klal Yisroel because they cannot be faulted for not providing bread and water to Klal Yisroel. Chazal explain the reason for this is because woman are understood to have the נודה of tznius "כך כבדה בת מלך פנימה". We all know that Amon and Moav cannot marry into Klal Yisroel because they do not have proper נודות. Why do Chazal then assume that Amon and Moav do have the נודה of tznius? Isn't that a נודה that we can assume only Klal Yisroel has? In fact, the ללמדהlearns that the Gemara's reference to the נודה of tznius is referring to Klal Yisroel. But perhaps we can learn that it is referring to Amon and Moav. Let's look at another related question. Why does the future Moshiach descend from David Hamelech, who we know descends from Moav? We also know the Moshiach descends from Tamar and Yehuda. Why would the future leader of Klal Yisroel descend from such a background? The Em Habanim Smicha explains that whenever Hashem gives Klal Yisroel a present, Hashem wraps it in many wrappings, some seemingly lowly, so that the outer layers obscure the true contents of the gift itself. This is done to confuse the Satan so that he won't try to stop that gift from coming to Klal Yisroel. It is the way that Hashem hides (מוציא) the gift so that nobody would ever think that a gift with such a covering would be so precious to Klal Yisroel. So too in our case, Hashem wrapped and hid the future Melech Hamoshiach with such a humble background (the incident of Tamar, a descendent of Moav, etc). If so, we see that even the unthinkable middos of Amon and Moav represent the Tznius of the Moshiach. It is now somewhat understandable how Chazal can attribute the נודה of Tznius to Amon and Moav. We see from this Yesod that it is important to practice the Middah of tznius in everything with do. Not everything has to be out in the open. Even good things should remain "under wraps" so that the Satan and הדין does not try to find fault with it.

### POINT TO PONDER

**The Gemara says** that דוד המלך held his grandson רחבעם on his lap and told him that they should both be thankful to הקיבה that only the males of מואב are ענון. This obviously took place before שלמה became king, since he only became king after his father passed away. The פסוק (פרק ג פסוק ז) in פסוק א, מלאכים א, גער, which Rashi says was because שלמה was 12 years old. How could דוד hold שלמה's son when שלמה himself was not more than 12 years old?

**Response to last week's Point to Ponder:** Since דוד comes from המואביה רות and מואב was guilty of hiring בלעם to curse the Jews, maybe מואב is only because of hiring בלעם which was done by men and would not include the women? Although the reason why מואב is not permitted to marry into ישראל בני ישראל may be different from the reason for ענון, since they are written in the same verse we assume that their criteria is the same. If ענון includes both males and females than מואב would have the same הלכה because it's in the same verse. (See רשב"א).

Yevamos has been dedicated in לע"נ Shelly Mermelstien ז"ל, ר' יוסף שמואל שמעלקא ב"ר יצחק מערמלשטיין ז"ל

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Gutterman, please visit our website, [dafaweek.org](http://dafaweek.org), or download the app

To share an insight from your Chabura please email [info@dafaweek.org](mailto:info@dafaweek.org)

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita

To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at [info@dafaweek.org](mailto:info@dafaweek.org) or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100

Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center