

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated
L'ilui Nishmas Yosef ben Chaim haKohen Weiss (8 Elul) & Mrs. Yenta Weiss, Rivke Yenta bas Asher Anshel (13 Elul)
Family Weiss, London

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Reducing the value of the kesubah (cont.)

An incident related to reducing the value of a woman's kesubah is presented.

R' Dimi presents two statements which appear contradictory, one from R' Yochanan and one from R' Yehoshua ben Levi, related to reducing the value of the kesubah.

R' Avahu quotes R' Yochanan as claiming that there is no dispute between R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi.

Ravin reports a second version of this discussion.

R' Pappa comments that were it not for R' Avahu's statement he would assume that there is a dispute between R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi rather than conclude that there is a dispute between R' Dimi and Ravin.

The broader implication of R' Pappa's comment is highlighted.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah teaches that as a general rule twelve months were given for the couple to prepare for the nissuin. A discussion is recorded regarding the consequence of delaying the wedding. The Mishnah concludes that a later enactment prohibited a woman who is not married from eating terumah.

3) Preparing for twelve months for the wedding

R' Chisda cites a source that twelve months are allotted to prepare for the wedding.

This source is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Delaying the wedding

R' Zeira cites a Baraisa that allows the girl and her father to delay the wedding and the reason the father has that authority is explained.

A related ruling is presented.

5) Delaying the wedding of a בוגרת

R' Huna rules that a bogeres, like a widow, is given only thirty days to prepare for her wedding.

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In honor of our 23rd anniversary,
Mr. and Mrs. Benji Cohen

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In loving memory of
ר' מרדכי לייב בן ר' חיים, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by the Katz, Spira, Gutman,
Chase, Goldman, Dimarsky, Nadell, Mauer and Litwack families
In loving memory of their husband and father
ר' אביגדור שמואל בן ר' יהודה יוסף הכהן, ע"ה
Mr. Victor Katz o'h

Distinctive INSIGHT

Defining the dispute

מאי קא משמע לן? הא קא משמע לן דפליגי תרי אמוראי אטעמא דנפשייהו
ולא פליגי תרי אמוראי אליבא דחד אמורא

In general, when an argument in the Gemara can be explained in one of two ways, Rav Pappa notes that there is a preference to explain it in a manner which avoids saying that one of the opinions is outright mistaken. In this case, the Mishnah discusses a case where a woman forgoes the full amount of her kesubah, but she does so only verbally, and not in writing. At what point can she retract her willingness to release the husband from paying the entire kesubah, if at all? The Baraisa (56b) featured three opinions. Rabbi Meir stated that no reductions are allowed at all. Rabbi Yose allowed the kesubah to be diminished verbally, and Rabbi Yehuda allows it only if done in writing. The Gemara cites Rav Dimi who quotes Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. He explains that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yose discuss only when the woman expresses her position "at the beginning," but "at the end" even Rabbi Yose agrees that her willingness to diminish the kesubah must be done in writing. Rabbi Yochanan expresses an opinion that the argument in the Baraisa applies whether "at the beginning or at the end." Ravin then comes and he, too, explains the Baraisa. He says that the argument between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yose pertains only when the woman expresses her position "at the end," but "at the beginning" all require that the woman can express herself verbally. The Gemara notes that depending on how we define "beginning" and "end," Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Yochanan do not disagree at all.

Rav Pappa accepts the statement of Rabbi Avahu that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi and Rebbe Yochanan do not argue. The lesson of Rav Pappa, however, is that it would have been better to explain the issue in the Baraisa differently than did Rabbi Avahu. According to Rabbi Avahu, two Amoraim (in this case, Rav Dimi and Ravin) argue regarding the words of a third Amora (Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi). One says that Rabbi Yehoshua holds that the dispute in the Baraisa is "in the beginning," while the other says that Rabbi Yehoshua holds that the dispute in the Mishnah is "at the end." Rav Pappa felt that this is too drastic of a difference, where the words of Rabbi Yehoshua are presented in two extreme versions.

Rav Pappa felt it would have been better to say that Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Yochanan argue about the logic of the situation (in this case, at what point the woman can agree verbally to diminish her kesubah, and when it must be done in writing). Nevertheless, Rav Pappa did accept the explanation of Rabbi Avahu. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
Dr. and Mrs. Moshe Nitekman
In loving memory of their father
ר' דוד בן ר' זאב, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Lost access to the kesubah

אירכס כתובתה ... זיל כתוב לה

Her kesubah became lost ... go and write [a new kesubah] for her

Teshuvos Ohel Yosef¹ inquired about a case where the Kesubah is not lost or destroyed but merely misplaced. Is this considered the same as if the kesubah is lost entirely and a new kesubah must be drawn up immediately, or perhaps the couple is allotted some amount of time to search for their kesubah and if, after that time passes, the kesubah is not found they will draw up a new kesubah? Teshuvos Ohel Yosef responded that the language of the Gemara and Shulchan Aruch indicates that even if it is lost for a moment a new kesubah is required but, nonetheless, if it is a case where the couple does not remember where the kesubah was placed it is not considered lost.

There was once a person who, during World War II, fled and left his possessions, including his kesubah, in Belgium in the possession of a non-Jew. He inquired of Teshuvos Chelkas Yaakov whether it is necessary to write a new kesubah. Chelkas Yaakov² responded by citing a ruling of Rema. Rema³ writes that in the case of a city that was conquered following a siege or if people were exiled from a city and the kesubos of the women were lost, new kesubos must be written for all the women even though there is the possibility that the kesubos may eventually be found or recovered. The reason is that since, presently, their whereabouts are unknown they must be replaced. Accordingly, even though there is the possibility that this person may return to Belgium and recover his property from the non-Jew with whom he entrusted his belongings, nevertheless, for the moment the kesubah is considered lost and a new kesubah must be written.

Rav Moshe Shternbuch⁴ recounts a story that follows the same line of reasoning. During the Israeli War of Independence many

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

After two failed attempts the Gemara succeeds at refuting R' Huna's ruling from a Baraisa.
The last ruling of the Baraisa is explained.

6) **The restriction against a betrothed woman's eating teruma**
Ulla explains that the reason a betrothed woman does not eat teruma is fear that she will share it with her siblings.
This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.
R' Shmuel bar Yehudah states that the reason is the fear that the transaction will be cancelled.
This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What was the novelty of R' Pappa's comment?

2. How long does a woman need to prepare for her wedding?

3. Why is a father authorized to delay his daughter's wedding?

4. What is סימפון?

Jews were driven from their homes in the Old City and ended up in the Katamon neighborhood for Shabbos. Shortly before Shabbos Rav Ze'ev Mintzberg sent a message to all the refugees, who obviously did not know whether they would return to their homes in the Old City, to inform them that they are prohibited to their wives until a replacement kesubah could be secured. ■

1. שו"ת אהל יוסף סי' כ"ב.
2. שו"ת חלקת יעקב אה"ע סי' צ"ג.
3. רמ"א אה"ע סי' ס"ו סעי' ג'.
4. שו"ת תמשורת והנהגות ח"א סי' תש"ס. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Biggest Miracle

"השתא מדידהו ספו ליה..."

For about five years during the time when the Tchebiner Rav, zt"l, served in Tchebin, the Kedushas Tzion of Bovov, zt"l, also lived in the town. When the Rav married off his children, he naturally extended an open invitation to the Rebbe.

The Rebbe decided to attend a sheva brachos that the Rav made in his house. When the Rebbe arrived with his entourage, he took out some money and gave it to his son-in-law and said, "Send one of the young

men to purchase beer for drinking."

When the Rav, who was quite wealthy during his tenure in Tchebin, heard this, he said, "I am the בעל שמחה here and I already purchased the drinks. Why has the Rebbe sent out for more?"

The Boverer Rebbe answered, "I am sending out for drink because of the Tosafos who write that it is the way of a guest to give משקה to the people of his host's household."

The Rav, who was known to have encyclopedic knowledge of Shas, immediately said, "There is no such Tosafos!"

Although the Rebbe was known to be a prodigious scholar himself, he was silent and did not try to defend his position fur-

ther.

When the Rav was later reviewing Kesuvos 57b, he learned the last Tosafos on the daf. To his surprise he saw that Tosafos says there that the way of a guest is to provide משקה to the host's household to find favor in their eyes.

The Rav was so impressed with the scholarship of the Kedushas Tzion that the very next day he told the entire story to the bochurim in his yeshiva.

He concluded by saying, "Some Rebbes are known to do great miracles, but to me the Kedushas Tzion's ability to be silent about the fact that he was correct is worth more than many מופתים." ■

