

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) A woman's finds (cont.)

Rava challenges the presentation of the cited Baraisa and as a result of the challenge he changes the attribution of the Baraisa.

An unsuccessful challenge is presented.

R' Pappa and Ravina raise similar inquiries pertaining to the wages of a woman who multitasks and the Gemara does not resolve their inquiry.

2) Humiliation

R' Yehudah ben Besairah's ruling in the Mishnah that the husband collects part of the humiliation payments is unsuccessfully challenged.

A second unsuccessful challenge against R' Yehudah ben Besairah's position is presented.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah begins with the law that relates to a father-in-law's obligation to follow up on his pledge to give money to his son-in-law. The rest of the Mishnah presents the guidelines for assessing property that is included in the dowry as well as the groom's corresponding commitment concerning that dowry.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Baraisa elaborates on the Mishnah's initial ruling that a father-in-law does not have to fulfill his pledges to the brother of the son-in-law who died.

The Gemara explains why the same ruling is mentioned three times in the Mishnah.

5) MISHNAH: Additional details related to the dowry agreements and the husband's responsibilities are presented.

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

The novelty of the Mishnah's first ruling, related to how much the husband pledges to pay when his wife brings money in to the marriage, is explained.

R' Ashi explains that the Mishnah's reference to קופה refers to cosmetics.

R' Ashi limits this obligation to Yerushalayim.

R' Ashi asks a series of related questions that are unresolved.

7) The daughter of Nakdimon ben Guryon

An incident that begins with an incident of the daughter of Nakdimon ben Guryon being awarded cosmetics is recorded.

Another Baraisa presents the fate of Nakdimon ben Guryon's daughter.

The Gemara begins to challenge the assertion of the Baraisa that Nakdimon ben Guryon did not properly give tzedaka. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Preserving one's fortune

אמרה לו רבי לא כדין מתלין מתלא בירושלים מלח ממון חסר, ואמרי לה חסד

Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai and his entourage were traveling outside Yerushalayim when they met the daughter of Nakdimon ben Guryon. Although both she and her husband came from exceedingly wealthy families, the fortune of the families had been lost. When Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai asked her where the money had gone, she answered with the parable which was used in Yerushalayim, "The salt of money is deficit." Others quote the parable to state, "The salt of money is kindness." This simply means that the way to preserve one's wealth is to deplete it by giving tzedaka, or to do kindnesses for others.

Maharam Shif explains that the difference between these versions is that according to the first one, any form of tzedaka

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. If a woman works extra hard to earn more money, who receives that money?

2. What is the rationale that allows a husband to collect the humiliation payment of his wife?

3. How much is a husband expected to pay for his wife's perfumes and cosmetics?

4. Why did the daughter of Nakdimon ben Guryon lose all her money?

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated
in memory of my father,
Mr. Harold Lane,
by his son Jerry Lane, Oak Park, MI

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated
In honor of our 23rd anniversary,
Elchanan and Ruthie Abramowitz

HALACHAH Highlight

Following local custom when naming children

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר הכל כמנהג המדינה

R' Shimon ben Gamliel declares that [all matters related to the kesubah] follow local custom

There was once a man who married a woman whose mother shared the same name as his deceased mother. When they gave birth to a daughter, the father wanted to name her after his deceased mother but his wife protested giving her the same name as her living mother. The Chelkas Yaakov¹ was asked to decide the matter.

Chelkas Yaakov's initial reaction was to say that it is the father's choice to choose a name for a child. He based this on the fact that a father bears the financial responsibility to support his children². Additionally, when a son is born it is the father's duty to give the child a bris and the name of the male child is given at the time of the bris³. This also indicates that naming a child falls into the father's domain. Therefore, since it is considered advantageous for the souls of the deceased to have offspring named after them, it seems that the choice is his.

Upon further analysis he reconsiders this approach because it would lead to the conclusion that it is always the father's choice to name a child and that is known to be false. An obvious proof is that the Torah informs us that on numerous occasions it was the mother who chose the name for a child rather than the father. Da'as Zekanim⁴ also infers from the Torah that ancient custom was for the father to name the first child and the mother to choose the name of the second child. Therefore, since at the time of the wedding the husband accepts upon himself to treat his wife in accordance with the local customs,

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

ka is effective to preserve one's wealth. According to the second version, however, it is specifically through kindnesses that one merits to guarantee financial security. Kindness is greater than tzedaka in three ways (Sukka 49b). Tzedaka is only with money, it can only be provided for the poor, and it is only for the living. Kindness—גמילות חסדים—can be done as a personal favor or even as a non-financial kindness, it can be done even for those who are not poor, and it can be done even for the dead.

Ben Yehoyada notes that the different texts also result in other practical differences. According to the first text (חסר) the only way to guard one's fortune is to deplete it, by giving of one's funds to the poor. The second text (חסד) does not require that one give his assets away. A person can do favors, such as lending out his money, and this would be adequate. Furthermore, if the money is given as tzedaka to someone who is not worthy, according to the first version, the money of the giver has been depleted, and as long as he intended to do it for a mitzvah, he has done what he can. But if the point is to perform a chessed, as stated by the second version, the giver has failed, because the receiver who is unworthy has defrauded the giver, and he has not been afforded a favor. ■

as our Gemara indicates, the husband must honor those customs. Consequently, if the couple lives in a place where people are opposed to naming a child after a living ancestor the wife has the right to protest giving that name and the husband must comply with that custom. ■

1. שו"ת חלקת יעקב יו"ד סי' קל"ו.

2. שו"ע אה"ע סי' ע"א.

3. שו"ע יו"ד סי' רס"א.

4. דעת וקנים מבעלי תוספות פרשת וישב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The salt of charity

"מלח ממון חסר..."

On today's daf we find Chazal's dictum that if a person wishes to preserve his money, he must "salt" it with generous amounts of tzedakah.

The Chofetz Chaim once asked a student why he was leaving learning. "I wish to support Torah. If I make money in business then I will be able to fulfill this aspiration!"

The Chofetz Chaim answered, "My son, you are making a mistake. Right now

you think you will support Torah if you make a fortune. But you are not factoring in the stronger yetzer you will have when you strike it rich. Then you will see that it will be close to impossible for you to give even a pittance to tzedakah."

Despite the Gadol's warning the man left the yeshiva and went into business.

Twenty years later, that very same person met with the Chofetz Chaim. He had made a fortune and was exceedingly wealthy.

When he saw his old Rebbi, he said, "Oy, were you so right! I have so much, but although I can spend countless dollars on myself, I find the prospect of giv-

ing anything more than a pittance to tzedakah akin to cutting off my arm!"

Once Rabbi Rutkin told a class, "Buy whatever luxuries you feel you need and can afford. But be sure to give an amount equal to what you spend on luxuries to charity!"

Once, a certain meshulach was collecting and approached a wealthy man for a donation. The man was so incensed that he literally slapped the meshulach in the face!

The collector was able to tolerate the abuse, and he gently said, "That was for me. Now, how much will you give to the yeshiva?" ■