

# HAMA'YAN

## Table of Contents

Abstracts	II
“This is what Hashem Commanded” / Rav Dr. Yehuda Kupperman	3
The Contradictory Usage of the Term וידי / Prof. Nachum M. Bronznick	13
If One who Returns Back from War has to bless ‘Hagomel’ / Rav Yair Rozenfeld	16
The Correct Understanding of Ibn Ezra’s Commentary at the Beginning of Parashat Va’etchanan / Rav Carmiel Cohen	27
The Three Women – A Response / Rav Eliyahou Soloveitchik	31
The Division of the three Ketubot – A Comment / Rav Ya’akov Loyfer	38
On the Matter of the Man with Three Wives: Part II and Comments on the Comments / Prof. Yisrael Aumann	49
<b>Responses and Comments</b>	
More about the Version of the Prayer after Limud / Rav Ilior Ya’akoby	69
Correction on what was written about Kuntres Ha’Shmita of the Natziv / Eitam Henkin	72
The Arouch’s Explanation of the Concept ‘Psik Reishey’ / Rav Avraham Yehuda Ross; Rav Noam Koenigsberg	73
More about Midrash and Biblical Exegesis / Dr. Ya’akov Altman	57
<b>About Books and Authors</b>	
About the Book Taharat Bat Yisrael / Rav Moshe Avraham Petrover	77
The First Researcher of Temple Matters / Prof. Zohar Amar	86
The Pshat in the Drash – Studies in the Commentary of Rav Ovadya Sforno to the Torah / Rav Gavriel Yitzchak Ravena	91
Faith in the Scientific Era / Rav Dr. Dror Fixler	98
Editorial Review of recent Torani Publications / Rav Yoel Catane	103



# Abstracts

## **Rav Dr. Yehuda Kupperman: “This is what Hashem Commanded”**

Rav Kupperman Shlita is the founder of the Michlala – The Jerusalem College for Women, and one of the innovators of contemporary Tanach study. In this article he shows us, in accordance with the sages and Hizkouny, that the issue of annulling vows [Hatarat Nedarim] is like a bridge between the first four books and Humash Devarim. The Torah indicates this not only by writing that these laws are “commanded by Hashem”, but, primarily, by the use of the opening phrase “This is what”: It is an expression indicating the degree of uniqueness of the sublime prophecy of Moshe compared to those of all other prophets throughout the ages. This indication is necessary as an introduction to the historical action of the master of all prophets, who was privileged to add an additional Chumash to G-d’s Torah, which was given us by G-d supposedly beyond his ‘original’ plan.

## **Prof. Nachum M. Bronznick: The Contradictory Usage of the Term ויהי**

Following several objections to the dictum: wherever the term ויהי appears it serves as an expression of pain, Rav Ashi concludes that there are also cases where it serves as an expression of joy. R. Yohanan states that when it appears in a case of pain, it indicates that there is no pain like this one. Likewise, in a case of joy it indicates that there is no joy similar to this one. To rationalize the contradictory use of ויהי, the Latin exclamation Vah for joy, also used in the midrashic literature, is to be employed. Thus, while ויהי is identically written, it is to be pronounced differently. In cases of pain it is divided into two syllables as follows: vai-hi, where the first syllable represents pain; Whereas in cases of joy it is divided into va-yehi, where the first syllable exclaims joy. In each case, the accent falls on the first syllable.

## **Rav Yair Rozenfeld: If One who Returns Back from War has to bless ‘Hagomel’**

This article was written four years ago, at the end of the Second Lebanon War and the safe return of the author, the Rav of Kibbutz Ein Hanatziv in Beit She'an Valley. He discusses the question of whether the blessing of HaGomel must be said by those who returned safely from war or other military activities. It turns out that this is not a simple question; it depends in part upon the questions whether there must be actual danger to bless HaGomel or that it’s enough that it will be a situation of danger, whether this Beracha is said in a natural rescue or only after a miraculous one, if it has to be said also when one is obliged to put himself in danger, etc. Rav Rosenfeld claims that just as one may say HaGomel when he is happy in the saving of his friend – so he may make the Bracha for himself.

## **Rav Carmiel Cohen: The Correct Understanding of Ibn Ezra’s Commentary at the Beginning of Parashat Va’etchanan**

Rav Cohen, of Maale Adumim, explains the meaning of Rabbi Avraham ibn Ezra’s

interpretation of the words 'אתה תהלוך' at the beginning of Parashat Va'etchanan, that is not always understood in the usual manner: the intention is that Moshe says to Hashem that all the wonders he has seen until now are just a small example of the miracles awaiting the people of Israel in the future.

### **Rav Eliyahou Soloveitchik: The Three Women – A Response; Rav Ya'akov Loyfer: The Division of the three Ketubot – A Comment; Prof. Yisrael Aumann: On the Matter of the Man with Three Wives: Part II and Comments on the Comments**

In the Tevet issue of HaMa'ayan, Prof. Yisrael Aumann published an article about a Bankruptcy Problem from the Talmud in Massekhet Ketubot, and responded to the critics of the article he previously published in "Moriah". Here Rav Eliyahou Soloveitchik proposes to interpret the differences between the Ktubot of the three women contrary to Prof. Aumann: he says that there is no systematic division in the Mishnah, and in each case there is a correct division of the estate. When the estate is small, if it were divided according to the size of each one's claim – there would remain too little for the wife who has to receive one hundred Zoos, so the Mishnah divides the estate equally; when the estate is large enough to leave a substantial amount in a calculated division – the distribution will be done in accordance with the claims. When there is an intermediate amount, not too little nor too much, the sages decided to keep a gap between the smaller and the larger Ketuba, yet not to ignore the plight of the wife who was to receive one hundred Zoos.

Rabbi Loyfer, who once wrote about this question in Hamodia newspaper, responds to the previous article of Prof. Aumann. The main part of his article focuses on a new observation on the Yerushalmi on this Mishna. His opinion is that two of the three act as one, as one gives the other permission to sue on behalf of both of them. The article shows how the Mishna goes exactly according to this principle, and clarified why the Mishna has taken just three examples, and stopped at the sum of three hundred Zoos.

Professor Aumann continues: This is a follow-up to his article in "Moriah" eleven years ago. It sets forth the reasoning behind the suggested explanation, and adduces additional Talmudic sources for it. He also presents his remarks to the comments of Rabbi Y. Loifer and Rabbi E. Soloveichik in this issue of "Hama'ayan".

This is the time to congratulate Prof. Aumann on his 80<sup>th</sup> birthday, and on the birth of his great grandson – Shlomo Ben David Ben Shlomo Ben Yisrael Aumann, שיחיה לאורך ימים טובים.

### **Responses and Comments**

Rav Lior Ya'akobi Comments on the discussion in the previous issue about the prayer after studying Torah, and he agrees that its last line, which has a curse against the peoples who do not study Torah, is mistaken. Eitam Henkin corrects an error in his article about Kuntres HaShmita of the Natziv, that he published in the previous

issue of HaMa'yan, and Rav Ross, Ram in the Sderot Yeshiva, comments by the concept 'Psik reshey' which Rav Noam Koenigsberg explained in HaMa'yan of Tevet: Rav Ross writes that the Talmud states that Rabbi Shimon (who permits a forbidden act if done without intention) prohibits "Psik Reishey", and Rabbeinou Hananel and the Arouch interpret that it means the cutting off the head of a person, which is prohibited even without intention to kill him (as opposed to the better known explication, that it means cutting the head of a rooster on a Shabat). The article deals with the question of whether a murderer may use the lack of intention to kill as a criterion for permission, when there is no assurance of the outcome of an act of murder. Dr. Ya'akov Altman responds to the article of Rav Moshe Ganz from Yeshivat Sha'alvim about Midrash and Biblical Exegesis in a previous issue of HaMa'yan.

### **About Books and Authors**

Rav Kalman Kahane ZTL, a great Talmid ChaCham, the leader of Poaley Agudat Yisrael, one of the founders of Yeshivat Sha'alvim and member of the board of HaMa'yan for many years, wrote a famous book on Hilchot Nida: Taharat Bat Yisrael. His son Rav BZ Kahane Shlita gave us some letters that his father received and sent concerning remarks on this book from Rabanim like Rav Shlomo Zalman Ouerbach ZTL, Rav Shmerl Greineman ZTL and others. Rav Petrover, Rosh Kolel in Yerushalayim and lecturer in Yeshivat Sha'alvim, put them in order, with interesting comments.

Prof. Zohar Amar wrote about a book that was recently published by Machon Shlomo Aumman of Yeshivat Sha'alvim – "Shiltey HaGiborim", and about his author Rav Avraham Portaleone from Mantua, Italy (16th century). He was a physician and scholar, new ten languages and read all the classic science books, and with all this knowledge he explained the preparation of the temple and the work in it according to Chazal writings. Rav Ravena from Be'er Sheva wrote about another Italian Rav and author – R. Ovadia Sforno, and clarifys some paragraphs in his commentary on the Torah.

Rav Dr. Dror Fixler wrote about a new book of prof. Nathan Aviezer 'Faith in Scientific Era'. He says that both philosophy and modern science aim to provide a full explanation for the world's behavior without basing their assumptions on the existence of a Divine Power. The relationship between religion and science has been the focus of several debates, but the basic issue is how the religious man and the academic can sit together. Prof. Nathan Aviezer (Wiser), Professor Emeritus, published a book proving that both can live together. In his review Dr. Fixler deals with the challenges that this book leads to Torah.

The issue concludes, as usual, with a review of recent Judaica received by HaMa'yan, By the editor Rav Catane.