

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 In memory of Israel Isser Ben Tzion ben Yaakov

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) A female from Amon and Moav (cont.)

The narrative related to R' Yochanan's proof that females from Amon and Moav are permitted to marry into the congregation is presented.

It is noted that there is a dispute between Tannaim regarding the source that females from Amon and Moav are permitted to marry into the congregation.

Rava presents three expositions related to Dovid Hamelech.

### 2) The daughter of an Amoni convert

Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan ruled that the daughter of an Amoni convert is permitted to marry a kohen.

Rava bar Ulla analyzed this ruling until he reached the conclusion that R' Yochanan referred to the daughter of an Amoni convert who, in violation of a prohibition, married a Jewish woman.

Ulla confirmed that R' Yochanan referred to that case and noted that R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish dispute this case, R' Yochanan taking the lenient position and Reish Lakish adopting the strict position.

The Gemara presents the source for Reish Lakish's position and two versions of a conversation R' Yochanan had with R' Zakkai to formulate his position.

The second version of R' Yochanan's conversation is analyzed.

R' Yosef relates that in light of the previous discussion he understands a statement of R' Yehudah.

Another version of the conversation between R' Zakkai and R' Yochanan is presented.

### 3) Clarifying the position of Rabanan

The Gemara wonders what response the Rabanan could express to R' Shimon's kal v'chomer.

Rabbah bar Chanah in the name of R' Yochanan recreates the conversation that R' Shimon and Rabanan could have regarding this point.

Two related Beraisais are recorded.

R' Yochanan develops R' Yehudah's position. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*What was the answer?*

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 only the men 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-

*(Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. In what way was Dovid HaMelech released from his yokestraps?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Is the daughter of two converts permitted to marry a kohen?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the significance of the prefix "מ" in the word מעמיו?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. How do the Rabanan respond to R' Shimon's kal v'chomer?  
\_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Ruling in halacha for oneself

והאמר ר' אבא אמר רב כל תלמיד חכם שמורה הלכה ובה וכו'  
*Didn't R' Abba in the name of Rav teach that a scholar who comes to issue a halachic ruling...*

Rema<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 (כך קבלתו), 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. The Levush<sup>2</sup> 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. The Taz<sup>3</sup> 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. The Teshuvos Shoel V'nishal<sup>4</sup> asserts that the Rema addresses a case where the scholar claims that the basis of his ruling is

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

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. ■

found explicitly in an authoritative source. Although we cannot, at the moment, check his sources he 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 tereifah. 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 (נוגע בדבר) 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' ל"ו

2. לבוש שם

3. ט"ז שם ס"ק כ"א

4. שו"ת שואל ונשאל ח"ג יו"ד סי' שע"ד ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Brisker Rav's Chiddush

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

The Brisker Rav once told 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 Amasa 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 Amasa'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 Amasa 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!" ■