

13 Elul 5782
Sept. 9, 2022



Kesuvos Daf 65

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Granting Wine for the Widow

The *Mishnah* had stated: He also gives her half a *kav* of beans, a half a *log* of oil, and a *kav* of dried figs, or a *maneh* of pressed figs.

The *Gemora* notes: The *Mishnah* did not mention wine. This would support Rabbi Elozar’s opinion, for Rabbi Elozar said: We do not provide wine as an allowance for a woman (*since wine arouses a woman’s desire for intimacy, and since she is being supported through an administrator and living separately from her husband, it may lead her to unchastity*). And should you point out the following Scriptural verse: *I will go after my lovers, those who give me my bread and my water, my wool and my linen, my oil and my drinks* (‘shikuyai’; which indicates that a woman does require an allowance for wine); it may be replied that the reference is to things which a woman desires. And what are they? Jewelry.

Rabbi Yehudah of Kefar Neviraya, and, others say: of Kefar Nafor Chayil, made the following exposition: From where is it derived that no allowance for wines is made for a woman? It is from that which was stated: *So Chanah rose up after she had eaten in Shiloh, and after he drank*. It seems that only ‘he drank,’ but she did not drink.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, then, would you also interpret that only ‘she had eaten,’ but he did not eat? [That would not be a reasonable explanation.] The *Gemora* answers: [The exposition is not based on the usage of the masculine form instead of the negative.] We made the exposition because the text has deliberately been changed. For let us see: It was dealing with her, why did it change (the form when it dealt

with drinking)? Consequently, it may be deduced that ‘he drank,’ but she did not drink.

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbi Elozar from the following *Baraisa*: If a woman is accustomed to drinking wine, we give her wine. The *Gemora* answers: It is different when she is accustomed to drinking wine, for Rav Chinana bar Kahana said in the name of Shmuel: If the woman is accustomed to drinking wine, we give her one cup of wine. If she is not accustomed to drinking wine, we give her two cups of wine.

The *Gemora* asks: What is he saying (*why do we give her more if she is not accustomed to drinking*)?

Abaye explains: If the woman is accustomed to drink two cups of wine in front of her husband, then, we give her one cup of wine when she is not in front of her husband. If she is not accustomed to drink more than one cup of wine in front of her husband, then, we do not give her any cups of wine when she is not in front of her husband.

Alternatively, we can answer the challenge on Rabbi Elozar from the *Baraisa* differently. If the woman is accustomed to wine, we provide her with wine in order for her to season her dish. For Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: It happened that when the Sages awarded the widowed daughter-in-law of Nakdimon ben Guryon (*an extremely wealthy man in Yerushalayim during the time of the destruction of the second Beis Hamikdash*) a weekly allowance of two *se’ahs* of wine (*a huge sum*) for seasoning her dishes from one Friday night to another. She said to them, “May you grant such allowances to your daughters (*cursing them, for she believed that this was a stingy*

amount).” A Tanna taught: She was a woman awaiting *yibum* and hence, they did not reply Amen after her (*they did not wish that their daughters should be granted such an enormous amount in this type of situation*).

A Baraisa taught: One cup of wine is becoming to a woman; two are degrading. If she has three, she will demand from her husband marital relations. If she has four, she solicits even a donkey in the street and doesn’t care at all.

Rava said: This was taught only in respect of a woman whose husband is not with her; but if her husband is with her, we are not concerned about her drinking.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely, there is the case of Chanah whose husband was with her (*and she, nevertheless, abstained from drinking wine*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is different when they are guests, for Rav Huna stated: How do we derive that a guest is forbidden to engage in marital relations? It is from the following verse discussing Chanah [I Shmuel, 1:19]: *And they rose up in the morning early and worshipped before Hashem, and returned, and came to their house, to Ramah, and then Elkanah knew his wife; and Hashem remembered her. Only when they returned home did they engage in marital relations, but not before. (This explains why Chanah could not drink wine, for they were guests in Shiloh and they weren’t allowed to have relations there.)*

The *Gemora* records an incident: Choma, the widowed wife of Abaye, came to Rava and asked him, “Grant me a food allowance,” and he granted her the allowance. “Grant me an allowance of wine,” she demanded. Rava said to her, “I know that Nachmeini did not drink wine.” She replied, “By the life of the master, I swear that he gave me to drink wine from goblets as large as this (*she demonstrated the size by stretching out her arm and forearm*). As she stretched out her arm, her arm became uncovered and a light shone upon the court (*due to her beauty*). Rava rose, went home and solicited (*his wife*) Rav Chisda’s daughter. “Who has been

today at the court?” enquired Rav Chisda’s daughter. “Choma, the wife of Abaye,” he replied. Thereupon, she (*Rava’s wife*) followed her (*Choma*), striking her with the straps of a chest until she chased her out of Mechoza. “You have,” she said to her, “already killed three men (*Abaye being her third husband*), and now you wish to kill another man!”

The *Gemora* records another incident: The widowed wife of Rav Yosef the son of Rava came before Rav Nechemia the son of Rav Yosef and said to him, “Grant me a food allowance,” and he granted her the allowance. “Grant me an allowance of wine,” she demanded, and he granted her. He said to her, “I know that the people of Mechoza drink wine.”

A final incident is related: The widowed wife of Rav Yosef the son of Rav Menashya of D’vil came before Rav Yosef and said to him, “Grant me a food allowance,” and he granted her the allowance. “Grant me an allowance of wine,” she demanded, and he granted her. She continued, “Grant me an allowance of silk.” He asked her, “Why do you require silk?” She replied, “For you, for your friends and for your friends’ friends (*to enable her to keep up the social standing which she held previously*).” (64b5 - 65a3)

The Mishnah had stated: He must provide for her a bed, a mattress, and a mat.

The *Gemora* asks: Why should he provide her a mattress and a mat?

Rav Pappa replied: This is done only in a place where it is the practice to fill the bed with ropes (which would cause her discomfort), causing her to age.

The *Gemora* cites a Baraisa: We do not provide her with a pillow and a mattress. In the name of Rabbi Nassan it was stated: We do provide her with a pillow and a mattress.

The *Gemora* asks: What are the circumstances of the case? If it is a case where she is accustomed to it, what is the



reason of the Tanna Kamma (that we do not provide it for her)? And if it refers to a case where she is not accustomed to it, what is the reason of Rabbi Nassan?

The Gemora answers: The (ruling of the) Baraisa was necessary only in the case where it was his custom (to sleep with a pillow and a mattress), but it was not her custom. The Tanna Kamma is of the opinion that her husband may say to her, "When I go away, I will take them with me, and when I return (and sleep with you), I will bring them back with me (and provide for you as well," while Rabbi Nassan holds the opinion that she can tell him, "It might sometimes happen (that you will return) at twilight (on Friday night), when you will be unable to bring them (on account of the Shabbos restrictions against carrying), and so you will take mine and make me sleep on the ground." (65a3 – 65a4)

Shoes

The *Mishnah* had stated: A husband must provide for his wife a kerchief for her head, a belt for her loins, shoes from festival to festival and clothing of fifty zuz from year to year.

Rav Pappa asked of Abaye: Is this Tanna 'stripped naked and wearing shoes'? [Is it logical that the husband should provide for his wife shoes three times a year, but she only receives new clothing once a year? Isn't having new clothing for the festival more important than having new shoes?]

Abaye answered: The *Tanna* was located in a mountainous region where one cannot possibly manage with less than three pairs of shoes each year (*but clothing would last throughout the year*), and indirectly, the *Tanna* taught us that these shoes should be given to her on the occasion of the festival, so that she might derive joy from them. (65a4 – 65b1)

Provincial Zuzim

The *Mishnah* had stated: A husband must provide for his wife clothing of fifty zuz from year to year.

Abaye comments: The *Mishnah* is referring to the provincial zuzim (*which are only worth an eighth of the Tyrian zuzim*).

Abaye explains himself: Since the *Mishnah* states: These minimums are applicable to a poor person in Israel. But with a wealthy person, everything is according to his honor; if you would think that we are referring to the Tyrian zuzim, from where would a poor person have fifty zuz? It is therefore evident that the *Mishnah* is referring to the provincial zuzim. (65b1)

Worn-out Clothing

The *Mishnah* had stated: [He must provide for her clothing of fifty zuz from year to year.] And he does not give her, either new clothes [in the summer, worn-out in the winter, but he gives her new clothes worth fifty zuz in the winter, and she covers herself in their worn condition in the summer, and the worn-out ones are hers].

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: The wife's leftover food belongs to the husband. Her leftover worn-out clothing belongs to her.

The *Gemora* asks: What does she need her worn-out clothing for?

Rachava answers: She wears them while she is a *niddah* in order that she does not become repulsive in the eyes of her husband (*by wearing the same clothes then that she wore when she was tahor*).

(Based on the above) Abaye notes: The worn-out clothing of a widow belongs to the husband's inheritors. He explains: The only reason that the woman keeps her worn-out clothing is that she should appear repulsive in the eyes of her husband; here, when she is a widow, we are not concerned if she appears repulsive. (65b1)

Friday Night

The *Mishnah* continued: He gives her a *ma'ah* of silver for her needs, and she eats with him on Friday nights.

The *Gemora* asks: What does it mean that “she eats with him”?

Rav Nachman says: It means that she actually eats with him on Friday night.

Rav Ashi says: It means that she has marital relations with him on Friday night.

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Ashi: Why does the *Mishnah* use the language of “eating” if it means marital relations?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishnah* wished to use an appropriate expression, as it is written (regarding the way of an adulterous woman): *She eats and wipes her mouth and says, “I have done no wrong.”*

The *Gemora* asks further from the following *Baraisa*: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: She eats with him on Friday night and on *Shabbos* day. How can this be referring to marital relations? Didn’t Rav Huna say that the Jewish people are holy and they do not engage in marital relations during the day?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Baraisa* can be in accordance with Rava’s opinion, for he says that it is permitted in a dark house. (65b1 – 65b2)

Nursing Women

The *Mishnah* had stated: [And what work must she do for him? She is required to spin the weight of five *selas* of warp in Judea, which equals ten *selas* in the Galil; or the weight of ten *selas* of weft in Judea, which are twenty *selas* in the Galil.] But if she was nursing, they decrease her earnings obligation and increase her maintenance.

Rabbi Ulla the Great lectured at the door of the Nasi’s house: Although they said that a man is under no obligation to maintain his sons and daughters when they are minors, he must maintain them while they are very young. Until what

age? Until the age of six. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rav assi, for Rav Assi stated: A child of the age of six may go out of the boundary of the city with the *eruv* of his mother.

How do I know this? It is from the *Mishnah* which states: But if she was nursing, they decrease her earnings obligation and increase her maintenance. What can be the reason for this? Surely, it is because the child must eat together with her.

The *Gemora* asks: But is it not possible that the reason is because she is sick (*and requires more food*)?

The *Gemora* answers: If that were the case, the *Mishnah* should have stated: If she was sick. Why did the *Mishnah* state: If she was nursing? (*Evidently, it is on account of her child.*)

The *Gemora* persists: But is it not possible that the *Mishnah* wishes to teach us that an ordinary nursing mother is considered sick? (*The Gemora concludes that you cannot provide proof that a young child needs to be supported from our Mishnah.*)

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: A nursing woman is given an additional allowance for wine, because wine is beneficial for her milk. (65b2 – 65b3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, AF AL PI

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Purchasing New Shoes

The *Mishnah* had stated: A husband must provide for his wife a kerchief for her head, a belt for her loins, shoes from festival to festival and clothing of fifty *zuz* from year to year.

Rav Pappa asked of Abaye: Is it logical that the husband should provide for his wife shoes three times a year, but she only receives new clothing once a year? Isn’t having new clothing for the festival more important than having new shoes?



Abaye answered: The *Tanna* was located in a mountainous region where one cannot possibly manage with less than three pairs of shoes each year (*but clothing would last throughout the year*), and indirectly, the *Tanna* taught us that these shoes should be given to her on the occasion of the festival, so that she might derive joy from them.

The Terumas Hadeshen (36) proves from our *Gemora* that one should recite the blessing of *shehechiyonu* when purchasing new shoes, for the *Gemora* explicitly states that the woman rejoices on account of her new shoes.

R' Yochanan (*Brachos* 59b) states that a *shehechiyonu* is only recited when one purchases significant clothing, but there is no requirement to recite the blessing when purchasing socks and shoes since they are not *choshuv*.

The Rosh (*ibid*, 9:16) rules that this *halachah* is only applicable to a wealthy person; however, a poor man would recite a *shehechiyonu* when purchasing a new pair of shoes, since for him, it is a tremendous joy.

The Rema (*O"c*, 223:6) quotes from others that one should not say *tevaleh v'tischadesh* (*you should wear out and you should renew*) on a new pair of shoes, for it will require the killing of another animal (*to get its hide*), and it is written: And He is compassionate on all his creations. He concludes that that this reason is extremely weak and not logical, but many people are careful not to say it.

DAILY MASHAL

Healthy Outlets

By: Rabbi Simcha Feuerman

Although Torah thought endorses abstention and strict modesty as an ideal and a beneficial approach to preventing sin, it is not the only approach espoused by our Sages. The *Gemara* (*Ta'anis* 23b) tells us that the wife of the tzaddik, Choni Hameagel, would adorn and beautify herself in order to greet him when he came home. When a student inquired

about the propriety of this behavior, he explained, "She does this in order that I not be tempted to look at other women." Furthermore, the *Gemara* (*Kesubos* 65a) relates an incident where a great sage became aroused by a female plaintiff in court, and upon returning home asked his wife to join him in the bedroom. (It should be noted, the Ben Yehoyada maintains that this sage was not actually aroused and offers a clever reinterpretation of the text. But it is not clear that other commentaries agree with him, and it is certainly far from the simple reading of the text.)

The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 47a) offers the following related advice: "When trying to cope with desire, discipline of children, and communication to one's wife, one should push away with the left hand, but draw near with the right." This push-pull idiom is a metaphor for creating some distance or rebuke, while still also being gentle and maintaining a welcome and open stance. While this *Gemara* is fascinating and requires discussion in many respects, the focus of the comments which follow will be on its statement regarding desire: The *Gemara* seems to be saying that one should not push it away too strongly, lest it results in some form of internal backlash, such as despair and transgressing in even worse ways.

It should be noted, Rashi (*Op. Cit.*) does not agree with this interpretation. He understands it as a warning to be careful in not shutting off desire completely, as it can lead to dysfunction and an inability to procreate. However, the Ra'vad (*Ba'aley Hanefesh*, *Sha'ar HaKedusha*) clearly understands this *Gemara* as suggesting a way to abate and control desire by engaging in permitted sexual relations. (He does point out that this is the least meritorious and least holy reason for marital relations, but still identifies it as a valid approach for the right kind of person.)