

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Palti ben Layish (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its comparison of the relative degree of self restraint exercised by Yosef, Boaz and Palti ben Layish.

Additional expositions of the verse in Mishlei are cited.

2) **MISHNAH:** Additional laws related to a king are presented.

3) The dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan

Another Baraisa presents a dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan that is similar to the dispute in our Mishnah.

Rava expounds a related verse that discusses the nation's reaction to Dovid Hamelech following Avner's death.

Further discussion about the death of Avner is recorded.

4) א דרגש

Ulla offers one explanation of a דרגש.

Two unsuccessful attempts are made to refute Ulla's explanation.

On the third attempt the Gemara succeeds at refuting Ulla and Ravin suggests an alternative explanation of a דרגש.

R' Yirmiyah in the name of R' Yochanan explains the difference between a bed and a דרגש.

The Gemara rejects R' Yirmiyah's distinction and offers and suggests another distinction.

R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi rules in accordance with R' Shimon ben Gamliel that a mourner's bed must be untied.

R' Yaakov bar Ami gives an exception to the rule that a mourner must overturn his bed.

5) **MISHNAH:** Additional laws related to a king going out to war are recorded.

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains why the Mishnah repeats the halacha that Sanhedrin must be consulted before going out to a discretionary war.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What was the greatness of the generation of R' Yehudah the son of R' Ilai?
2. Why did Avner deserve to be killed?
3. What was the order of the three mitzvos the Jewish Nation were supposed to fulfill when they entered the land of Israel?
4. Was the kingdom of Shlomo Hamelech ever fully restored?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The request to have a king appointed above them

תניא רבי אליעזר אומר זקנים שבדור שאלו שנאמר תנה לנו מלך לשפטנו, אבל עמי הארץ שבהן קלקלו, שנאמר והיינו גם אנחנו ככל הגוים וגו'

The Jewish people approached Shmuel HaNavi and requested that they have a king who would rule over them. An elaborate presentation of the people is described in the navi, in Shmuel 1, 8:4-20. It is noteworthy that the request is actually broken into two parts. Beginning in verse 4 and 5, the elders of the people approached Shmuel and requested, "Give us a king to judge us, like all other nations." Although Shmuel was disappointed with this request, Hashem instructed Shmuel to respond and tell the people about the rules of having a king. Only after hearing a list of rules (verses 10-18), did the people issue a new request (v. 19-20): "We will be like all other nations, our king will judge us, and go forth before us, and fight our wars." It is clear from our Gemara that the first request, that of the elders, was appropriate, while the second request, which was that of the people at large, was not proper. What does the Gemara detect as being the critical difference between these two appeals to Shmuel, both of which express a desire to be "like all other nations?"

Rashi explains that the elders requested that the king be their judge and to rule over them, which is an appropriate role for a king. The people, however, emphasized that the king serve to lead them into war, which is not the main function of a Jewish king.

יד רמה and מאירי explain that the problem with the request of the people was that by asking that the king lead them into battle, this indicated a certain lack of trust that Hashem would protect them and defend them against attack.

Maharsha notes that the elders asked that the king judge them, which could be construed to refer to the king's judging the people in areas of Torah law. However, the people asked that the king judge them "as all other nations." This suggested that the king judge based upon his own discretion, as would the king of any nation. This nuance was not a small thing, and it exposed the flaw in the people's attitude.

עץ יוסף writes that the elders' request was that the king judge the people, which is what is found by other nations, but the Jewish king would certainly use Torah law. This was a proper request. The people asked that they be allowed to have a king, and, as a result, "we will be as all other nations." It was not only that they wanted a king, but they also wrongly wanted that this be a step towards the Jewish nation's being as all other nations. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

May a bride and groom attend a funeral during sheva berachos?
מת לו מת אינו יוצא מפתח פלטרין שלו

If a relative dies the king may not exit the entrance of his palace

The Mishnah teaches that a king does not leave his palace for the purpose of attending a funeral and certainly when the deceased is not his relative he may not leave his palace. This gives rise to the question of whether a groom, who is described as a king¹, is permitted to leave his home during the week of sheva berachos to attend a funeral. Pischei Teshuvah² cites Teshuvos Shvus Yaakov who rules that if ר"ל the father of the bride dies during the week of sheva berachos the bride should not leave her home to attend the funeral. His reasoning is that since the bride usually does not leave her home during the week of sheva berachos her attendance would constitute a public display of mourning which is prohibited during the week of sheva berachos since that week is considered to be a festival for the bride and groom during which they are not permitted to publicly display mourning observances. Pischei Teshuvah infers from this that the restriction applies only to a bride who usually does not leave her home during the week of sheva berachos but a groom would be permitted to attend a funeral since it is common for him to leave his home during the week of sheva berachos and thus his attendance at a funeral would not constitute a public display of mourning during his festival.

Sdei Chemed³ disagrees and cites the derashos of Maharil who wrote that a groom may not leave his home to go to the cemetery. The ruling of Maharil makes it clear that we do not distinguish between a bride and a groom and both of them are prohibited to attend a funeral during their week of sheva berachos.

7) The king's authority

Rav and Shmuel disagree whether a king may exercise the powers listed in the parsha that discusses a king.

This dispute parallels a disagreement between Tannaim.

The Baraisa also presents a dispute whether there is a requirement to appoint a king.

Another Baraisa teaches that different groups had different intents when they asked Shmuel to appoint a king.

A Baraisa enumerates the three mitzvos that were to be performed when the nation entered the land of Israel and then puts these mitzvos in their proper chronological order.

8) Shlomo Hamelech

The Gemara describes how Shlomo Hamelech's authority diminished over time.

Rav and Shmuel disagree whether he regained his authority.

9) A king's right to spoils

A Baraisa explains how spoils are shared between the king and the nation.

The Gemara asks for the source that the spoils are shared between the king and the nation. ■

Gesher Hachaim⁴ disagrees with Sdei Chemed's conclusion. Maharil only mentioned that a groom does not go to the cemetery but he does not mention anything about attending a funeral. It is very possible that even Maharil would agree that a groom is permitted to attend a funeral and thus Sdei Chemed's position is unfounded. ■

1. ע' בית יוסף אה"ע סי' ס"ד ד"ה ומ"ש שלא.
2. פתי"ש יו"ד סי' שמ"ב סק"ב.
3. שדי חמד אבילות אות רט"ז ד"ה ואם מותר.
4. גשר החיים פ"יט סעי' ז' אות ז'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The nature of Amalek

"להכרית זרעו של עמלק..."

Today's daf discusses the mitzvah to exterminate Amalek.

Rav Chaim Brisker, ז"ל, points out that when the Rambam records the mitzvah to kill the seven tribes in Eretz Yisrael he qualifies that their memory has already been blotted out. The Ridvaz there explains that after Sancherev uprooted the nations from their homes and caused massive assimilation, the seven tribes ceased to exist. But in the very next halachah the Rambam records the mitzvah to destroy

the memory of Amalek without mentioning that Amalek is no more, clearly implying that we can fulfill this mitzvah today.

Rav Chaim explains the mitzvah to destroy עמלק, זכר עמלק, means the worldview of Amalek, which is worse than that of average idolaters. "Regular idolaters believe in Hashem but they mistakenly worship His creations instead of the primal cause. Amalek, in contrast, believes that creation and reality is entirely random, as we find in Rashi in Devarim."

Rav Moshe Sternbuch, shlit"א explains further, "Amalek is a much worse level of kefirah since Amalek by definition fights any concept of holiness. This worldview is unfortunately alive and well in our times, which explains why the Rambam does not

say that this mitzvah no longer applies. We find in the verse that the main mitzvah of exterminating Amalek is in Eretz Yisrael. The reason for this is that defilement always looks to gain a foothold where holiness abounds. This is why the main mitzvah of blotting out Amalek in our times is in Eretz Yisrael.

"We in Eretz Yisrael do our part to fulfill this mitzvah but it is really beyond our ability to remove this blight ourselves. The verse concludes, 'מחה אמחה' to teach that if we do our utmost, Hashem Himself will wage war on Amalek until no remnant remains of them at all."¹ ■

1. תשובות והנהגות, ח"ג, רכ"ג ■