



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Kesubos Daf Chuf

- The Braisa quoted earlier said, if the document was authenticated by other witnesses, or if Beis Din can compare the signatures to the signatures on another document *which itself was challenged and then upheld*, then the witnesses who say that the document is passul are not believed.
  - This is a proof to **R' Assi**, who says that in order for a document to be used as a basis for authentication of another document, the document being used as the basis must have itself been challenged in Beis Din and then upheld.
  - In Nehardai it was said, we can authenticate the signatures of witnesses by comparing them to the signatures on 2 kesubos or 2 sale documents which tell of a sale in which the buyer has held quiet possession for 3 years.
    - **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, these other documents must come from someone other than the one who is looking to collect with the current document in question. However, if it comes from him we cannot use it to authenticate, because we are concerned that he studied them and forged the signatures. If they come from someone else, he doesn't have them for an extended period of time to study and then forge the signatures.
- A Braisa says, a person may write his testimony down, and then use that to remind him of his testimony which he can then give even many years later.
  - **R' Huna** said, this may only be done when he remembers the essential testimony and only uses the writing to remind him of some details. **R' Yochanan** said, this may even be done if the writing is needed to jog his memory about the essential testimony.
    - **Rava** said, according to **R' Yochanan**, if one witness forgot the testimony, the other witness would be allowed to remind him.
      - **Q:** Can the litigant remind the witness of the testimony? **A: R' Chaviva** says that would be permitted, and **Mar the son of R' Ashi** says that he may not.
      - The Gemara paskens that the litigant may *not* remind the witness of the testimony. However, if the witness is a talmid chachom, his testimony is valid even if he was reminded by the litigant, as we find that **R' Ashi** said testimony after being reminded by **R' Kahana**, who was the litigant.
- A Mishna says, mounds that are near the city or the path, whether they are old mounds or new mounds, are considered to be tamei (we assume that a meis was buried under the mound). Mounds that are far from the city or path, if they are new we consider them tahor, and if they are old we consider them tamei. The Mishna says, **R' Meir** says "near" means within 50 amos and "old" means it is 60 years old. **R' Yehuda** says, "near" means there is no mound that is closer than it, and "old" means that no one remembers the origins of the mound.
  - **Q:** What is meant by the "city" and the "path"? **A: R' Zeira** explains, the "city" refers to the city closest to the cemetery, and the "path" refers to the path to the cemetery.
    - **Q:** It makes sense to be concerned for a mound near the path, because it is possible that people were on the path to bury someone on Friday afternoon, could not make it to the cemetery in time, and decided to bury the meis in a mound near the path. However the concern for the city near the cemetery seems to make no sense!? **A: R' Chanina** said, we are concerned that women buried their miscarriages there and amputees buried their limbs there. These people are embarrassed to bury in the cemetery and they therefore bury within 50 amos of the city.

- **R' Chisda** said, we can learn from **R' Meir** that people can remember testimony for up to 60 years, and not longer.
  - The Gemara says this is not so. It may be that people remember even longer. However, in the case of remembering the details of a burial site, it is not important to people, and therefore people don't try and remember it.