



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Kesuvos, Daf ג – Daf ו

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ג---2-----

MESECHTA KESUBOS

PEREK BESULA NISEIS -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- A besula should get married on Wednesday, and a widow on Thursday. The reason a besula should get married on Wednesday is that Beis Din is in session twice a week – on Monday and Thursday, and we want her to get married the night before a session, so that if her husband has a claim that she is not a besula, he can get up in the morning and immediately go to Beis Din.

GEMARA

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the reason the **Rabanan** said that the marriage should take place on Wednesday is because after kiddushin a girl is given 12 months to prepare herself for the wedding. If the husband does not enter nissuin by that time, he must begin to support her. The **Rabanan** were teaching that whenever the 12 months end, the husband still has until the following Wednesday to enter nissuin before this penalty comes into effect.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, why does **Shmuel** attribute a reason to the Mishna when the Mishna itself gives a different reason for it!? **A:** What **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** must have meant was, that if the reason for a particular day of the week is so that he can go to Beis Din if the need arises, why can't they get married on Sunday night? The reason is that we want the husband to prepare for the wedding for 3 days (Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday). If the wedding was on Sunday he would not be able to do that. Now, once the enactment was done to have them get married on Wednesday for that reason, if the 12 months end on a Sunday, he need not begin supporting her until the following Wednesday, because the **Rabanan** said he should not get married until that time.
 - We see from here that if the time for nissuin is delayed when it is not the husband's fault (e.g. because of a Rabbinic enactment), he does not have to begin supporting her. Therefore, if the nissuin is delayed because he or she was sick, or because she became a niddah, he would not have to begin supporting her.
 - Others ask this as a question. If the nissuin is delayed because he was sick, do we say he need not support since he is an oneis, just like he is an oneis when he has to wait for Wednesday based on the Rabbinic enactment, or do we say he is only excused when there is a Rabbinic enactment, but not for any other oneis? If we say that he must begin to support her in that case, what about if she was the one who got sick? Can he say, I am ready to enter nissuin and this is your fault and I therefore need not support you, or can she say it is his bad mazal that caused the delay? If in this case he must support her, what would be the case when she became a niddah? If it is at her regular time, she clearly cannot blame it on his mazal. The question would be where the niddah came at an abnormal time. In that case can she say it was his mazal? **R' Achai** said, we can answer from the Mishna. The Mishna said "if they did not marry he must support her" (not "if he didn't marry"). Clearly this can't mean where the woman purposely delayed, because that wouldn't cause him to have to support her. It must mean where she was an oneis as in one of the cases discussed, and we see that it causes him to have to support her! **R' Ashi** said this is not a good proof. It may be that he only must support when he is at fault for delaying the marriage. The reason the Mishna did not use the verbiage which suggests that the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

delay was his fault was because the earlier part of the Mishna speaks in terms of her, so the later part of the Mishna speaks in terms of her as well.

- **Rava** said, although an oneis prevents him from having to support the woman, regarding a get it does not work that way (if he gave a get on a condition and is prevented from fulfilling the condition, which would therefore make the get take effect) because of an oneis, the get still takes effect.
 - **Q:** From where does **Rava** learn that there is no concept of oneis for a get?
 - It can't be from the Mishna that says that if a man gives a divorce to take effect if he does not return in 12 months, and he died within those 12 months, in which case the Mishna says that it is not a get. This suggests that if he had gotten sick (instead of died) and that prevented him from returning, it still would be a get. He can't learn it from there, because the Mishna may mean to say that if he was sick it also wouldn't be a get, and the reason the Mishna spoke in terms of him dying is because it wanted to teach that a get cannot be given after the death of the husband.
 - Although the earlier part of the Mishna already states that concept, the **Rabanan** argue in that case and say that the get would take effect.
 - It can't be from the next part of that Mishna, that says that if the man says, the get should take effect today if I don't return within 12 months. The Mishna says if he dies within those 12 months, the get takes effect. Presumably we can say that the same Halacha would apply if he got sick, and this would be a source for **Rava**. However, this can't be the source, because it may be that only in the case of where he died is it a get, because he does not want her to fall to yibum, but when he got sick, maybe the get does not take effect.
 - Maybe it is from the story where one was prevented from returning (which would have prevented the get taking effect) because he was unable to cross the river, and he yelled, "Look I am here!", and **Shmuel** said he has not actually returned and the get therefore takes effect. We see that an oneis is not taken into account. However, it may be that only that type of oneis is not taken into account, because it is a usual oneis, and he should have built that into his consideration when making the condition.
 - **A:** It must be that the reason of **Rava** is actually based on his own logic. D'Oraisa an oneis would prevent the get from taking place, but he says that it does not because of the "tznu'os" (modest women, who will be machmir on themselves and think that an oneis happened when it did not, and they will prevent themselves from being able to remarry, staying in the status of an agunah), and because of the "prutzos" (immodest women, who will automatically assume that there was no oneis and will immediately get remarried, only to find out later that the husband was an oneis, the get was not effective, her second marriage was in sin, and her children were therefore mamzeirem).

-----Daf ל--3-----

- **Q:** Can we really say that although D'Oraisa the get should not take effect, the **Rabanan** can come along and say that it does take effect? **A:** We can say that, because anyone who gets married does so according to the will of the **Rabanan**, and the **Rabanan** therefore remove the entire marriage altogether.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, that makes sense when the original kiddushin was done with money, because the **Rabanan** can treat that transfer of money as a gift. However, what happens if the person did kiddushin with bi'ah? **A:** The bi'ah is given the status of a bi'ah of zenus.
- **Another version** of the Gemara says that **Rava** said the same would be for a get (that an oneis would prevent it from taking effect).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara asks from the previously stated Mishna that says if he dies within the 12 months it is not a get. This suggests that if he got sick it would be a get, because an oneis does not help!? **A:** It may be that if he was sick it would also not be a get, and the reason the case of death is given is to teach that there is no get after death. Although the earlier part of the Mishna already teaches that, the Mishna may be teaching that we do not follow the **Rabanan** who say that even in the case of death within the 12 months, the get is effective.
- **Q:** The Gemara asks from the second Mishna quoted earlier, when he said the get should take effect now if I don't return within 12 months, and he died within the 12 months, the get takes effect. Presumably the same would be true if he had gotten sick, and we see that an oneis does not prevent the get from taking effect!? **A:** It may be that only in the case of death does the get take effect, because it is in that case that the husband wants it to take effect so that his wife not have to fall to yibum.
- **Q:** We see from the case of the person who was prevented from returning because of the river, and yelled that he wants to be considered as having returned and have the get become batul, and yet **Shmuel** said that the get still takes effect!? **A:** This is a common oneis, and he should have taken that into consideration when making his stipulation.
- **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** said, a besula must get married on a Wednesday only after the establishment of Ezra that Beis Din be in session on Monday and Thursday. Before that time, a besula could get married on any day, because Beis Din was in session every day.
 - **Q:** Why are we giving a psak for before the establishment? Whatever happened at that time has already happened!? **A:** He means that if a place has Beis Din that is in session every day, a besula may get married on any day.
 - **Q:** We also gave a reason to wait for Wednesday to allow for time to prepare the wedding!? Why are we not concerned for that? **A:** He is discussing a case where the person was able to fully prepare before Shabbos, so he could then get married any day after Shabbos.
- **Q:** What is the Tannaic source for saying that the **Rabanan** were concerned for the respect of the Jewish women and wanted to make sure that sufficient preparation would be put into their wedding? **A:** A Braisa says like our Mishna, as to why a besula should get married on Wednesday, and then says that she could not get married on Sunday because the **Rabanan** wanted to allow sufficient time to prepare for the wedding. The Braisa says, in the time of danger, they allowed her to get married on Tuesday, but not on Monday, unless there is a real oneis. The Braisa concludes, that if the first bi'ah will be done on Friday night, we separate the couple to prevent the bi'ah, so that he not create a wound with the act.
 - **Q:** What was the danger that the Braisa refers to? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the goyim had instituted that any besulah must first be mezaneh with the governor before marrying.
 - **Q:** That is not a "danger", that would be an oneis!? **A:** The modest women would allow themselves to die rather than be mezaneh, so it led to a danger for them.
 - **Q:** Why didn't they just teach these women that they need not sacrifice their lives for this!? **A:** We are concerned for the immodest women who would be mezaneh willingly, in which case it would be assur, and for the wives of Kohanim, who would become assur to their husbands even through a forced zenus.
 - **Q:** Why didn't they just abolish the rule of marrying on Wednesday altogether, instead of simply giving a heter to marry another day? **A:** The government decree would eventually be abolished, so we don't want to abolish a Rabbinic decree in the face of a government decree.
 - **Q:** Why are we not concerned that the government would come to be mezaneh with her on a Tuesday as well? **A:** Since he was not certain that a wedding was happening then, he would not travel for the chance that a wedding was happening.
 - **Q:** What is meant by the Braisa that a wedding on Monday is mutar in the case of a real oneis? **A:** **Rava** said, the oneis is where an army is set to come into the town and will destroy the food if it is not done earlier.
 - The case is where they plan to come and stay, so delaying a week will not help the situation.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why can't they just push it back to Tuesday? Why must it be done on Monday? **A:** The people who prepare for the army's needs come the day before (which would be Tuesday), and therefore the wedding would need to take place before then.
- **Others** explain based on the oneis based on a Braisa, to be referring to the death of a parent of the bride or groom. If they die on Monday, we make the wedding immediately, and then bury them afterwards.
 - The Gemara says, this is only true if the mother of the bride or the father of the groom died, but not visa-versa (she needs her mother to help her prepare, and he needs his father to help prepare the wedding and would not be able to prepare another one if this one were to be lost).

-----Daf 7--4-----

- The Gemara previously quoted a Braisa that said that if the wedding was already prepared and the father of the groom or the mother of the bride died, we quickly make the wedding and delay the burial until after the wedding. **Rafram bar Pappa in the name of R' Chisda** said, this is only true if the meat has already been put into water (at which point it can no longer be sold and will therefore go to waste). However, if that was not yet done, the meat must be sold and the wedding must be postponed. **Rava** said, if they are in a large city with a ready market for meat, even if the meat was already placed into water, it must be sold and the wedding postponed. **R' Pappa** said, if they are in a small village (with no ready market), even if the meat was not yet placed into water the wedding is not to be postponed.
 - **Q:** Based on the above qualifications, when would **R' Chisda's** Halacha apply? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, in a city that is not large, but not very small, like the city of Mata Mechasya.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Chisda** as well. The Braisa says that if the wedding was prepared, including the meat having been placed into water, and the father of the groom or mother of the bride died, we make them have the wedding, do the first bi'ah, and then we bury the meis. They then have the 7 days of sheva brachos, and then the 7 days of aveilus, but during all these 14 days, they do not sleep together, rather he sleeps among other men and she sleeps among other women, which would also be the case if she was a niddah (they would sleep separate). We also would allow the bride (who was an aveila) to adorn herself for 30 days from the wedding. In any case, a couple may not do the first bi'ah on Friday night or Motzei Shabbos.
 - The Braisa is a proof to **R' Yochanan**, who says that although one does not observe aveilus on Yom Tov, he must do so in private (in the Braisa they don't sleep together during sheva brachos, which is a private observing of aveilus).
 - **R' Yosef the son of Rava in the name of Rava** said, they only must sleep separate if they have not yet had bi'ah. If they have, they may sleep together.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says that even after they had the first bi'ah they must sleep separate!? **A:** **Rava** made his distinction regarding a woman who got married and became a niddah.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "and similarly" in regard to a niddah, which suggests that the same Halacha applies regarding aveilus!? **A:** The Braisa does not mean to say they are the same, the Braisa means to say that they are somewhat similar in that they have to separate, but regarding a niddah they must only separate if they did not yet have bi'ah.
 - **Q:** From here it seems that people are more careful regarding niddah, and that's why they may sleep together, but are not so careful with aveilus, which is why they may not sleep together. However, we find that a woman is allowed to serve her husband in less ways when she is a niddah as compared to when she is an aveila, which suggests the opposite!? **A:** Our Braisa is discussing when he is an aveil, which we are concerned he will treat more lightly, and therefore need to be goizer even more. This other Braisa is discussing when she is an aveila, in which case we need not be concerned, because she will stop him from doing anything that is not permitted.
 - **Q:** Our Braisa said these rules apply whether his father or her mother died!? **A:** That is referring to the other halachos of the Braisa.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that whether he is in aveilus or she is in aveilus they must act with the same restrictions!? **A:** The Braisa should state that a difference would be that when he is an aveil they must sleep separately. The fact that the Braisa says they are similar refers to the other halachos.
- **R' Ashi** said, we can't compare the case of aveilus of newlyweds to the case of aveilus of others. In the case of newlyweds, since the **Rabanan** were meikel, we have to be concerned that the couple will be meikel as well, and they therefore must separate.
 - **Q:** In what way were the **Rabanan** meikel? It can't be based on the fact that we allow them to do the first bi'ah, because that is allowed based on the fact that the aveilus did not yet take effect. **A:** It must be that they were meikel in allowing sheva brachos before 7 days of aveilus.

-----Daf 17--5-----

- **Q:** The Braisa said, that the first bi'ah may not be done on Friday night or Motzei Shabbos. It is understandable why it can't be done on Friday night, because it creates a wound, but why can't it be done on Motzei Shabbos? **A: R' Zeira** said, if we allow that, the wedding would be held on Motzei Shabbos as well, and that would lead to him making calculations on Shabbos in preparation for the wedding.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, we find a number of views that hold that making a calculation for a mitzvah is allowed on Shabbos!? **A: R' Zeira** said, we are concerned that he may shecht a bird on Shabbos in preparation for the wedding.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so, when Yom Kippur falls out on Monday we should postpone it to Tuesday so that one not shecht on Shabbos in preparation for the special meal on Erev Yom Kippur!? **A:** When one is preparing only for himself, he is not so preoccupied so as to forget and be mechalel Shabbos. When he is preparing for others, it is a valid concern. **A2:** In that case the meal is not needed until Sunday, so he will have time to prepare. In this case, the wedding is Motzei Shabbos, so he is very pressed for time.
 - Once we give this reason, we can also say that the reason the first bi'ah may not be on Friday night is because we are concerned that the wedding will be Friday night and he will be mechalel Shabbos for the wedding.
- **Q:** When the Mishna says that a besula is to get married on Wednesday, does that mean that they can even have the first bi'ah on Wednesday, and we are not concerned that he will cool off by Thursday when he must go to Beis Din, or do we say that the first bi'ah should not be done until Wednesday night, because we are concerned that an earlier bi'ah will give him time to cool off and will cause him not to go to Beis Din? **A: Bar Kappara** taught a Braisa that says that a besula should get married on Wednesday and not have the bi'ah until Wednesday night (i.e. Thursday) because that is the day on which a bracha was given to the fish. We see that the reason is only based on the bracha, not on a concern of cooling off.
 - The Braisa also says that a widow should get married on Thursday and have the first bi'ah on Thursday night (i.e. Friday) because that is the day on which a bracha was given to man. The Gemara says, this bracha is more apropos than the bracha for the fish, which is why we have her do the bi'ah then. Another reason is, that we want the husband to spend time with his new wife (since she is a widow there is no sheva brachos), so we have her get married on Thursday, and he stays with her Thursday, Friday, and Shabbos, and then goes back to work.
- **Bar Kappara** darshened, that the "handiwork" of tzaddikim is thought of by Hashem as being even greater than the Creation of Heaven and Earth, because regarding their handiwork the pasuk uses the verbiage of "hands" and regarding Creation the pasuk uses the word "hand" (in the singular form).
- **Bar Kappara** darshened the pasuk of "v'yaseid tihiyeh ahl azeinecha" as if it said "oiznecha" (your ears). The pasuk is teaching that if someone hears something improper he should place his hands into his ears and prevent himself from hearing it.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** says this is the reason that a person's fingers are pointed, so that they can be placed into his ears to prevent him from hearing things he should not hear.
- **R' Yishmael** taught, this is the reason that the earlobes of a person are soft, so that they can be bent up into the ears to prevent him from hearing something improper.
- **Q:** May the first bi'ah of a besulah be done on Shabbos? Is the bleeding of a besulah the result of the blood having been sitting behind her besulim, and are now able to exit after the bi'ah (but it is not a wound), or is the blood a result of an actual wound having been created?
 - **Q:** If we will say that the blood is just sitting there, do we say that the husband wants the blood, not to create the opening, and it is therefore mutar, or does he want to create the opening and it is therefore assur? If we say he does not intend for the opening, do we pasken like **R' Shimon** that an unintended result is mutar or like **R' Yehuda**, who says that it is assur? If we hold like **R' Yehuda**, is it considered that he is doing a destructive thing by making the opening (in which case it would be mutar) or is it considered constructive, in which case it is assur?
 - **Q:** If we say the blood is a result of a wound, do we say he wants that wound and it is therefore assur, or do we say that he only intends for his own pleasure and it is therefore mutar? If we say he only intends for his own pleasure, do we pasken like **R' Shimon** that an unintended result is mutar or like **R' Yehuda**, who says that it is assur? If we hold like **R' Yehuda**, is it considered that he is doing a destructive thing by making the wound (in which case it would be mutar) or is it considered constructive, in which case it is assur? If it is considered to be destructive, do we pasken like **R' Yehuda** regarding destructive actions (he says it would be patur) or like **R' Shimon** (who says he would be chayuv)? **A:** In **Rav's** yeshiva they said that **Rav** allowed it and **Shmuel** prohibited it. In Neharda'a (**Shmuel's** city) they said that **Shmuel** allowed it and **Rav** prohibited it.

-----Daf 1--6-----

- **Q:** According to one version we said that **Rav** allowed the first bi'ah to be on Friday night, and the Gemara assumes this is because he holds like **R' Shimon** who says an unintended act is mutar. The Gemara asks, we find that **Rav** does not allow one to squeeze a cloth stopper into place even though he does not intend to squeeze out the liquid!? **A:** In that case even **R' Shimon** would agree that it is assur, because **Abaye and Rava** both said that **R' Shimon** agrees that when the consequence is inevitable (psik reisha) it is assur.
 - **Q:** We find elsewhere that **Rav** holds like **R' Yehuda**!? **A:** **Rav** holds like **R' Yehuda**, but he holds that the act is a destructive one (making the opening or the wound) and that is why it is permitted.
 - **Q:** **R' Chisda** asked, a Mishna says, that if a girl who is not old enough to have a period gets married, **B"R** say we can assume that any blood she sees after the first bi'ah for up to 4 nights is from bi'ah. **B"R** say we can assume so until the wound has healed. If she is old enough to have a period, **B"R** say we can only make this assumption for the first night, and **B"R** say we can do so for 4 nights – which is until Motzei Shabbos. Presumably this means that **B"R** allow the bi'ah to happen anytime up to Motzei Shabbos, including on Shabbos. This is problematic according to **Shmuel**!? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna means any night besides Shabbos.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, the Mishna says “for 4 nights until Motzei Shabbos”, which includes Shabbos!? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna means that he is allowed to have bi'ah again if the bi'ah was already done before Shabbos. The chiddush is that this may be done even if she continues to bleed.
 - **Q:** **R' Yosef** asked, a Mishna says that a groom is patur from saying kriyas shema from the wedding until Motzei Shabbos if he did not do the first bi'ah until that time. We see that the first bi'ah may be done on Shabbos!? **A:** **Abaye** said, he is patur because he is preoccupied with the fact that he has not yet done the first bi'ah, but he in fact may not do the first bi'ah that Shabbos.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, do we say that the preoccupation with something (without actual performance of a mitzvah) makes one patur from doing a mitzvah? If so, if one's ship sank and he is preoccupied with his financial loss, he should be patur as well, and we know that this is not the case, because even an aveil, who is surely preoccupied, is chayuv in kriyas shema!? **A:** **Rava** said, whether the first bi'ah may be done on Shabbos is actually a machlokes Tanna'im, as can be

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

seen by 2 conflicting Braisos. **Abaye** said, the Braisos may both agree with **Shmuel** and the machlokes is only regarding whether the preoccupation makes him patur from saying shema. **Rava** said, we see this is a machlokes Tanna'im from a Braisa where the **T"K** says a first bi'ah may not be done on Shabbos, and the **Chachomim** say that it may be done.

- **Q:** Who are the **Chachomim** of the Braisa? **A:** **Rabbah** said, it is **R' Shimon**, who says that an unintended act is mutar.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, **R' Shimon** would agree that one would be chayuv because this act is inevitable!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the Braisa is discussing people who know how to have a first bi'ah without causing bleeding. Therefore, the unintended act is not inevitable.
 - Based on this, the only people who are preoccupied is those who do not know how to have the first bi'ah without drawing blood.
- **Q:** **R' Ami** asked, a Mishna says that one who opens a pimple to let out the puss on Shabbos is patur, so why would the first bi'ah be assur? **A:** Puss is not absorbed in the skin at all. The blood is somewhat absorbed, and that is why it may be assur.

-----Daf 7-----

- **R' Ami** allowed the first bi'ah to be done on Shabbos. The **Rabanan** said to him, how can that take place if the kesubah was not yet written (since it was Shabbos)? He told them to let the woman take possessions from the man, to be held as security for the kesubah until it is written.
 - **R' Zvid** allowed the first bi'ah to be done on Shabbos, and he himself did so as well.
 - **R' Yehuda** allowed the first bi'ah to be done on Yom Tov.
 - **R' Pappi in the name of Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** actually allowed it on Shabbos as well, but the psak he gave was on a case where it was Yom Tov and not Shabbos. **R' Pappa in the name of Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** only permitted it on Yom Tov, and not on Shabbos. **R' Pappi** asked **R' Pappa**, what would be the logic for that? You can't say it is because once making a wound is allowed for food preparation it is also allowed for other reasons as well, because based on that, one should be able to burn incense on Yom Tov since he may make a fire for food preparation!? **R' Pappa** answered, the pasuk says "Ach asher yei'acheil *l'chol nefesh*" – only something that is done by all people may be done on Yom Tov. A bi'ah is done by all, whereas burning incense is not.
 - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, based on this, it should be assur to shecht a deer on Yom Tov, since not everybody is able to eat deer!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the need has to be something that is needed by all people, and food is a need for all.
 - **R' Yaakov bar Idi** said that **R' Yochanan** ruled in Tzaidon that it is assur to have the first bi'ah on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** We never use the verbiage of "ruling" to introduce an issur!? **A:** We find instances where this is used for an issur.
 - The Gemara paskens that it is mutar to do a first bi'ah on Shabbos.
- **R' Chelbo in the name of R' Huna in the name of R' Abba bar Zavda in the name of Rav** said, a marriage to a besula or a widow require the making of sheva brachos.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Huna** says there is no making of the brachos for marriage with a widow!? **A:** When a previously unmarried man is marrying the widow, the brachos are made. When it is a previously married man, the brachos are not made.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Nachman** said that **Huna bar Nosson** taught a Braisa that teaches that the brachos must be done with a minyan based on the pasuk by the marriage of Boaz to Rus, who were each previously married!? **A:** **R' Huna** must have meant that with previously married people we only make the brachos for one day, not for seven days.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Chachomim** instituted that the couple should rejoice together for 3 days. What type of couple is being discussed? If they were not previously married, they rejoice for 7 days, and if they were previously married, we just said that they only rejoice (i.e. make the brachos) for one day!? **A:** We can say that it refers to previously married people, and although the brachos are for one day, they rejoice (he doesn't go to work) for 3 days. We can also say that it refers to previously unmarried people, and although the brachos are made for 7 days, the requirement to rejoice is only done for three days.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that when a besula marries there are 7 days of brachos and when a widow marries there is one day of brachos. Presumably this is even when she marries a previously unmarried man, and is not like **R' Huna** said!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where she married a previously married man.
 - **Q:** If so, why doesn't the Braisa state that specifically? **A:** The Braisa wanted to mention very general rules, without getting involved in the finer details.
- We mentioned above that **R' Nachman** learned the requirement that the brachos be made with a minyan from the marriage of Boaz and Rus. **R' Avahu** learns this requirement from the pasuk of "b'makheilos barchu Elokim Hashem mimkor Yisrael" (the brachos regarding the "mekor" are to be done in a "kahal", which is at least 10 people).
 - **R' Nachman** uses the other pasuk to teach what **R' Meir** said in a Braisa, that even the babies in their mothers' stomachs sang praise at Kriyas Yam Suf. **R' Avahu** said, if the pasuk was teaching that, it should have said "mibeten", not "mikor".
 - **R' Avahu** said, the reason that 10 people were called together in the pasuk with Boaz was because he wanted to announce the Halacha that a woman from Moav may marry a Jew (it is only a man of Moav who may not). If the point was to gather them for the brachos, why did he have to gather "zikeinim" (as stated in the pasuk)? **R' Nachman** said, if he wanted to announce a psak, he didn't need 10 people to do so. **R' Avahu** would say that he called 10 people in order to publicize his psak.
- A Braisa says, we make the sheva brachos at the time of nissuin. **R' Yehuda** says that they are even made at the time of eirusin.
 - **Abaye** said, **R' Yehuda's** shita was said in the province of Yehuda, where the couple would be together in seclusion after the eirusin.
- A Braisa says, we make sheva brachos at the time of nissuin and "birchas eirusin" at the time of the eirusin.
 - **Q:** What bracha is "birchas eirusin"? **A:** **Ravin bar R' Adda and Rabbah bar R' Adda** both said in the name of **R' Yehuda** the verbiage of the bracha (which is essentially the same as we say in today's times), but without the bracha ending. **R' Acha the son of Rava** said that **R' Yehuda** would end off with an ending (Baruch ata Hashem...).
 - The view that does not make an ending says this bracha is like a bracha on food or mitzvos (which has no ending). The view that does require an ending says this is like Kiddush, which has an ending.
- A Braisa says, we make the sheva brachos with a minyan for all 7 days after the wedding.
 - **R' Yehuda** said, this is only done when there is a new person (who had not been there before) at the meal.
 - **Q:** What brachos are made? **A:** **R' Yehuda** lists the brachos as we make them at sheva brachos today.

-----Daf 8-----

- **Levi** made 5 brachos at the chasunah of **R' Shimon, the son of Rabbi**. **R' Assi** made 6 brachos at the chasunah of **Mar the son of R' Ashi**.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes between them is whether there was one creation of man, and therefore only one bracha commemorating that is necessary, or whether there were 2 separate creations (one of man and one of woman) and therefore 2 brachos are needed for that? **A:** It may be that all agree that there was ultimately only one creation. The machlokes may be whether we follow

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

what Hashem “originally intended” to do (make man and woman separately) or what He ultimately did (made them together).

- **R’ Ashi** made all 6 brachos on the wedding day. On the following days he only made them if there was someone present who was not present previously. However, in any case he added “shehasimcha bim’ono” and “asher barah”.
 - After 7 days from the wedding, until the 30th day, if a party is made for the groom, whether it is said to be a wedding party or not, they add “shehasimcha bim’ono”. After the 30 days, if it is stated as being for the wedding, it is added. If not, it is not added. **R’ Pappi in the name of Rava** said, this continues up until 12 months have passed.
 - **Q:** If a party is made before the wedding, and is said to be in honor of the wedding, how much before the wedding can it be that one would still add “shehasimcha bim’ono”? **A: R’ Pappa** said, once the beer has begun to be made.
 - **Q:** We find that **R’ Pappa** would even add this from the eirusin (which is before the time that the beer was made)!? **A: R’ Pappa** was wealthy and therefore all preparations were considered to be done for him already at the time of the eirusin.
 - **Ravina** added this at the time of the eirusin of his son, explaining that he was sure that they would go through with the wedding. Ultimately they did not go through with the wedding.
 - **R’ Tachlifa** of Eretz Yisrael made six long brachos, but we do not pasken like him.
 - **R’ Chaviva** would say “shehasimcha bim’ono” by a bris, but we do not pasken like him, because the pain of the baby prevents a complete happiness from taking place.
- **R’ Nachman in the name of Rav** said, the groom is counted as part of the 10 required people for saying the sheva brachos, however an avel cannot be counted as one of the 10 for his purposes.
 - **Q:** A Brasia says that grooms and aveilem may be counted for the 10!? **A: Rav** may argue on a Braisa.
- **R’ Yitzchak in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, a groom may be counted for the 10, but an avel may not.
 - **Q:** A Brasia says that grooms and aveilem may be counted for the 10!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing for purposes of benthcing. **R’ Yochanan** was discussing the 10 needed to make the row to comfort the mourners after the burial.
 - **Q:** We find that **R’ Yitzchak in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, the sheva bachos must be said with 10 people and the groom may be counted for the 10, but an avel may not counted in the 10 needed for the birchas aveilem. Now, there is no birchas aveilem at the row after the burial, so that is not what **R’ Yochanan** could have been referring to!? **A: R’ Yochanan** must have been referring to the bracha made in the street during the meal of the aveilem.
 - **Q:** We find that **R’ Yitzchak in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, that the birchas aveilim needs to be made all 7 days and the avel may not be counted towards the 10. The meal in the street is not done all 7 days, so that cannot be what he was talking about!? **A:** That same bracha is made all 7 days if there is a new person who is coming to comfort the avel. The Gemara proves this in a long story where **R’ Chiya bar Abba** had the bracha made after the first day because a new person had come to comfort the mourners.
 - **Ulla** said, originally they would give a lot of wine to the mourners to drink, to help comfort them. When aveilem began to become intoxicated, they stopped the practice. The Gemara says that burial used to be a very expensive process, to the point that the family would refuse to bury the dead. **R’ Gamliel** instructed that he himself be buried in simple linen clothing. That led to that becoming the standard, and drastically reducing the cost of burial. **R’ Pappa** said, today people are buried in clothing worth a mere zuz.

-----Daf װ---9-----

- **R’ Elazar** said, if a husband says that he found an “open entrance” with the first bi’ah with his wife (he claims that she did not seem to be a besulah, but does not have a claim that she did not bleed, either because she was

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

from a family who didn't bleed when losing besulim or because he lost the sheet that they had bi'ah on), he is believed in regard to making her assur on himself.

- **Q:** Why should she become assur to him? This is a sfek sfeika – it is a safek whether she had bi'ah with somebody before or after the eirusin, and even it was after, it is a safek whether it was willingly or forced!? **A:** He was talking about the wife of a Kohen, who becomes assur even if she was forced. **A2:** The girl was given to eirusin by her father when she was less than 3 years old, and if the bi'ah was done before then, the besulim would have grown back.
- **Q:** What is the chiddush of **R' Elazar** to say that a person is believed to make her assur on himself? A Mishna already says, if a man says he was makadesh a particular woman and she says it is not true, he becomes assur to marry her relatives and she is mutar to marry his relatives (he is believed to have given the woman kiddushin only in regard to himself)!? **A:** We would have thought that in the Mishna he is sure about his claim and that is why he becomes assur to her. However, when a man says he “found an open entrance”, he is not really sure about that claim, and we would think that he therefore does not make her assur even to himself in that case.
- **Q:** How could **R' Elazar** have said this, when we find that elsewhere he says that a woman does not become assur to a man unless it is done through warning and seclusion, and like the story with Dovid and Batsheva (to be explained later in the Gemara), and the husband's saying so based on his knowledge should not be enough!?

- **Q:** That statement of **R' Elazar** doesn't seem to make any sense, because the story of Dovid did *not* involve a warning and seclusion, and in fact Dovid did *not* become assur to Batsheva at all!? **A:** What he meant to say is that a woman does not become assur to her husband unless there is a warning and seclusion, as we can see from the story of Dovid, where there was no warning and seclusion, and in fact he did not become assur to her.

We are still left with the question that a man should not be believed on his statement to make his wife assur to him!? **A: R' Elazar** can't mean to say that she can only become assur with a warning and seclusion, because that would mean that even 2 witnesses would not be able to make her assur. Rather, he must mean to say that she only becomes assur with 2 witnesses, or, if there is a warning and seclusion even one witness would be enough. Based on this, a man's statement of “an open entrance” is given the status of 2 witnesses. And, the reason why Batsheva did not become assur is because she was considered to be a woman who was forced, who does not become assur to her husband. Another reason we can give for why she did not become assur is based on **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason**, who said that every soldier who went to war in the times of Dovid would write a get for his wife before he left, that stated that she is divorced from the time of the get if he eventually dies at war. Therefore, she was retroactively divorced at the time that she was with Dovid.

- **Abaye** said, our Mishna is a proof to **R' Elazar's** Halacha. The Mishna says the besula should get married on Wednesday so that the husband can go to Beis Din the next morning if need be, and he not be given a chance to cool off. Why are we afraid that he will cool off? It must be because if he goes to Beis Din she would become assur to him, and we therefore don't want him to decide not to go. Now, presumably the case is where he is going to Beis Din with a claim of having found an open entrance, and we see that the husband is believed to make her assur to himself with that claim!
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Mishna may be discussing where he comes to Beis Din with a claim that she did not bleed (which is a more certain claim than the claim of having found an open entrance).
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a man says he found an “open entrance”, he is believed to make her lose her kesubah.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, what is the chiddush of **Shmuel**? This principle was already taught in a Mishna which says that in Yehuda, if a chosson and kallah ate together without witnesses present (who can testify that they were not secluded together), he may not later claim that she was not a besulah, because in that geographic the custom would be to allow the chosson and kallah to seclude with each other. The Mishna seems to suggest that only in Yehuda a man may not make this claim, but in other areas a man

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

may make this claim. Now, regarding making her assur on him, a man would even be able to do that in Yehuda as well. It must be that the Mishna is discussing his ability to not pay her the kesubah. Presumably the claim he makes is that he found an “open entrance”, and we see that for such a claim one may hold back payment of the kesubah!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he makes a claim of not seeing any blood, which is a stronger claim.