

15 Elul 5782  
Sept. 11, 2022



Kesuvos Daf 67

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

It was taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok said: May I see consolation if I have not seen her (the daughter of Nakdimon ben Gurion) picking barley among the horses’ hoofs in Acco. I applied to her this Scriptural verse: *If you know not, O fairest among women, follow the footsteps of the sheep and graze your kids*; read not ‘gediyosayich’ – (your kids), but ‘geviyosayich’ – (your bodies; referring to the woman). (67a1)

**Gold Bars**

Rav Shemen bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: If the woman brought gold into the marriage in her dowry, we assess it and enter it into her *kesuvah* according to its actual value (*no addition of fifty per cent, as in the case of cash since they do not exaggerate the value of gold and no subtraction of a fifth as in the case of goods are made because gold is not subject to wear and tear*).

The *Gemora* asks from the following *Baraisa*: Gold is regarded as utensils. Does this not mean that gold is treated like silver utensils, which do, in fact, depreciate (*and therefore, we would subtract a fifth in the kesuvah*).

The *Gemora* answers: No; the *Baraisa* means that gold is treated just like gold utensils (*and they do not depreciate*).

The *Gemora* asks: If so, the *Baraisa* should have stated that gold is regarded just like its utensils?

And furthermore, we learned in a *Baraisa*: Gold is regarded as utensils. Gold *dinars* are treated as cash (*and we add fifty percent to it*). Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: In a place

where the custom is not to exchange them, we assess them and enter them into her *kesuvah* according to their actual value.

[*The Gemora is attempting to prove that the Baraisa is referring to silver utensils; in order to do so, the Gemora must first clarify Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel’s opinion.*] The *Gemora* asks: Which case is Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel referring to? If you say that he is referring to the latter statement (*gold dinars are treated as cash*), it may then be inferred that the *Tanna Kamma* maintains that gold *dinars* are treated as cash even where the custom is not to exchange them. What would be the logic in that? If they cannot be spent, why would they be treated as cash? Rather, it is evident that he is referring to the first statement of the *Baraisa*, and this must be the explanation: The *Tanna Kamma* maintains that gold is regarded just as silver utensils (*and therefore, we would subtract a fifth in the kesuvah*). Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel disagrees and holds that gold is treated as gold *dinars* in a place where the custom is not to exchange them (*and therefore, we assess them according to their actual value without subtracting a fifth*). (*It emerges that the Tanna Kamma maintains that gold is treated like silver utensils; this would be inconsistent with Rabbi Yochanan’s ruling.*)

The *Gemora* answers: No! In fact, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel is referring to the latter statement (*gold dinars are treated as cash*), and we are discussing a case in which the gold *dinars*, with difficulty, may be used as currency. The following would be the explanation of their argument: The *Tanna Kamma* maintains that we add fifty percent since they can be used as cash. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel disagrees

and holds that we do not add fifty percent since they can only be used as currency with difficulty.

Alternatively, the *Gemora* answers: The entire *Baraisa* can be in accordance with Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, and there are seemingly some missing words in the *Baraisa*, but this is what it means: Gold is regarded as utensils. Gold *dinars* are treated as cash (*and we add fifty percent to it*). When are they treated as cash? Only in a place where the custom is to exchange them, but in a place where the custom is not to exchange them, we assess them and enter them into her *kesuvah* according to their actual value; these are the words of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, for Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: In a place where the custom is not to exchange them, we assess them and enter them into her *kesuvah* according to their actual value. (*Accordingly, we have no proof or challenge to Rabbi Yochanan's opinion regarding gold itself.*)

The *Gemora* asks: At any rate, the *Baraisa* should have stated that gold is regarded just like its utensils?

The *Gemora* remains with that difficulty.

Alternatively, the *Gemora* answers: The *Baraisa* is discussing broken pieces of gold (*which wear away in use; they are indeed to be treated in the same way as silver utensils, their price being entered in the kesuvah after a deduction of one fifth had been made; Rabbi Yochanan, however, deals with the case of large gold bars which do not wear away, and whose full value must consequently appear in the kesuvah*).

Rav Ashi says that the *Baraisa* is referring to gold dust. (67a1 – 67a3)

Rabbi Yannai stated: The spices of Antioch are like money.<sup>1</sup> Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani stated in the name of Rabbi Yonasan: A woman is entitled to seize Arabian camels in

<sup>1</sup> Fifty percent is to be added to the amount the wife brings in on marriage. These spices were so famous that they could always be sold and thus easily turned into cash.

settlement of her *kesuvah*.<sup>2</sup> Rav Pappi stated: A woman may seize shirts manufactured at Bei Michsei for her *kesuvah*. Rav Pappi further stated: A woman may seize sacks made at Rodya and the ropes of Kimchonya for her *kesuvah*.

Rava stated: At first I said: A woman is entitled to seize money bags of Mechoza for her *kesuvah*. What was [my] reason? Because [women] relied upon them. When I observed, however, that they took them and went out with them into the market and as soon as a plot of land came their way they purchased it with this money, I formed the opinion that they rely only upon land. (67a3)

### **Mishnah**

One who gives his daughter in marriage without specifying (*an amount for her dowry*) may not give her less than fifty *zuz*. If he stipulated to give her in marriage bare of any dowry, the husband may not say, "When I take her into my house, I will provide her with clothing," but he is required to clothe her while she is still in her father's house. And likewise, one who gives an orphan in marriage may not give her less than fifty *zuz*. If there is in the charity fund, they support her according to the honor due to her. (67a3 – 67a4)

### **Provincial Zuzim**

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

[Abaye explains himself] From where do I know this? The latter part of the *Mishnah* states: One who gives an orphan in marriage may not give her less than fifty *zuz*. If there is in the fund, they support her according to the honor due to her. And we asked: What fund are they referring to? Rachavah said: It is a charity fund. If you would think that we are referring to the Tyrian *zuzim*, how much more than

<sup>2</sup> Though these are movable objects, they are, owing to the ready sale they command, treated like cash and deemed to have been pledged for the *kesuvah*.

fifty *zuz* does she require? It is therefore evident that the *Mishnah* is referring to the provincial *zuzim*. (67a4)

### ***Marrying an Orphan Off***

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If an orphan boy and an orphan girl applied for maintenance, the girl orphan is to be provided for first and the boy orphan afterwards, because it is not unusual for a man to go begging, but it is unusual for a woman to do so.

If an orphan boy and an orphan girl applied for charity funds in order to get married, we enable the girl orphan to marry first and the boy orphan is married afterwards, because the shame of a woman is greater than that of a man.

The *Gemora* cites another *Baraisa*: If an orphan applied for assistance (*from the charity fund*) to marry, a house must be rented for him, a bed must be prepared for him and he must also be supplied with all the household objects required for his use, and then he is given a wife in marriage, for it is said: *Sufficient for his needs, in that which is lacking for him*. ‘Sufficient for his needs’ refers to a house; ‘in that which is lacking’ refers to a bed and a table; ‘for him’ refers to a wife, and so it is said elsewhere: *I will make for him a helpmate corresponding to him*. (67a4 – 67b1)

### ***According to the Pauper’s Needs***

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: ‘Sufficient for his needs’ implies that you are commanded to support a poor person, but you are not commanded to make him rich; ‘in that which is lacking for him’ includes even a horse to ride on and a servant to run before him. They said in regards to Hillel the Elder that he took for a certain poor man who was from a wealthy family a horse to ride upon and a servant to run before him. On one occasion, Hillel could not find a servant to run before him, so Hillel himself ran before him for three *milin* (6,000 *amos*).

A related *Baraisa* is cited: It once happened that the people of Upper Galilee bought for a poor person from a wealthy family of Tzipori a *litra* of meat every day.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the greatness about a *litra* of meat?

Rav Huna answered: It was a pound of (*very expensive*) fowl’s meat. Alternatively, you can say that they purchased ordinary meat with a *litra*’s weight of money.

Rav Ashi replied: The incident took place in a small village (*and there were not so many people that would buy the remainder of the meat*) and everyday an entire animal had to be wasted for his sake.

The *Gemora* records a related incident: A certain man once came to Rabbi Nechemiah for maintenance. Rabbi Nechemiah asked him, “What do your meals consist of?” He replied, “Of fatty meat and old wine.” “Will you agree,” Rabbi Nechemiah asked him, “to join me with eating lentils?” The pauper consented, lived with him on lentils and died. Rabbi Nechemiah exclaimed, “Woe unto this man, whom Nechemiah has killed!”

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary, he should have said, “Woe unto Nechemiah, who killed this man!”

The *Gemora* answers: The man himself was at fault, for he should not have spoiled himself to such an extent.

The *Gemora* cites a similar incident: A man once came to Rava for maintenance. Rava asked him, “What do your meals consist of?” He replied, “Of fatty meat and old wine.” Rava asked him, “Did you not consider the burden on the community?” The man replied, “Do I eat from their food? I eat the food which belongs to Hashem, for we learned in the following *Baraisa*: *The eyes of all look to You with hope and You give them their food in the proper time*. This teaches us that Hashem provides for every individual his food in accordance with his own habits. Meanwhile, there arrived

Rava's sister, who had not seen him for thirteen years, and brought him a fat chicken and old wine. "What a remarkable incident!" Rava exclaimed; and then Rava said to him, "I apologize to you, come and eat." (67b1 – 67b2)

### ***A Gift and a Loan***

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If a man has no means to support himself, but he does not wish to be maintained out of the charity fund, he should be granted the necessary sum as a loan, and then as a gift (*we do not ask him to repay it*); these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The Chachamim, however, said: It is given to him as a gift and then it is granted to him as a loan.

The *Gemora* interrupts and asks: As a gift? He, surely, will refuse to accept the money as a gift!?

Rava replied: It is offered to him initially as a gift (*and if he refuses, we lend him the money*).

The *Baraisa* continues: If a man has means to support himself, but he does not wish to use his own money, he should be granted the necessary sum as a gift, and then, we will collect payment from him?

The *Gemora* interrupts and asks: If we will demand payment from him, he will not take anymore!?

Rav Pappa replied: We will collect from his estate after he dies.

The *Baraisa* continues: Rabbi Shimon says: If a man has means to support himself, but he does not wish to use his own money, we do not get involved with him. If a man has no means to support himself, but he does not wish to be maintained out of the charity fund, we tell him to bring a collateral and take the money, for this way, his mind will be put at ease (*thinking that it is indeed a loan*).

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: 'Lend' refers to a man who has no means to support himself, but he does not wish to be maintained out of the charity fund - to whom the allowance must be given as a loan and then we turn around and give it to him as a gift. 'You shall lend him' refers to a man who has the means to support himself, but he does not wish to use his own money - to whom the allowance is given as a gift and repayment is claimed from his estate after his death; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. The Sages, however, said: If he has the means and does not wish to maintain himself, we do not get involved with him. To what, however, is the verse 'you shall lend him' to be applied? The Torah employs ordinary phraseology. (67b2 – 67b3)

### ***Mar Ukva's Acts of Charity***

Mar Ukva had a poor man in his neighborhood into whose door-socket he used to throw four zuz every day (*in a way that the pauper did not know who was his benefactor*). Once, the poor man thought, "I will go and see who is doing this kindness for me." On that day, it happened that Mar Ukva was late at the Beis Medrash, and his wife was coming home with him. As soon as the poor man saw them moving the door, he went out after them, but they fled from him (*in order that he shouldn't be embarrassed*) and ran into an oven from which the fire had just been swept (*but was still extremely hot*). Mar Ukva's feet were burning and his wife said to him, "Raise your feet and put them on mine." As he was dejected (*thinking that he was not as worthy of divine protection as his wife*), she said to him, "I am usually at home (*and the poor people can find me easily*) and my benefactions are immediate (*since she provided them with ready-made food*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why was it necessary for them to flee?

The *Gemora* answers: Because Mar Zutra bar Toviah said in the name of Rav, and others say that it was Rav Huna bar Bizna who said it in the name of Rabbi Shimon Chasida, and others say that it was Rabbi Yochanan who said it in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai: It is more preferable for

a man to throw himself into a fiery furnace than that of publicly putting his neighbor to shame.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this concept?

The *Gemora* answers: It is from the action of Tamar; for it is written [Breishis 38:25]: *As she was taken out* etc. (*She chose to be burned rather than publicly put her father-in-law to shame. It was only through Yehudah's own confession after he received her private message that she was saved.*)

The *Gemora* cites another incident with Mar Ukva and his charitable acts: Mar Ukva had a poor man in his neighborhood to whom he regularly sent four hundred zuz on *Erev Yom Kippur*. On one occasion, he sent the money with his son who came back and said to him, "He does not need your help any longer." Mar Ukva asked his son, "What have you seen?" The son replied that they were aromatizing his house with old wine. Mar Ukva said, "Is he so delicate?" He, therefore, doubled the amount that he had previously been sending.

When Mar Ukva was about to die, he requested, "Bring me my charity accounts." Finding that he had given seven thousand of Siyankian *dinars* (*an astonishingly large sum*), he exclaimed, "The provisions are scanty and the road is long," and he immediately distributed half of his wealth to charity.

The *Gemora* asks: But how was he permitted to do such a thing? Didn't Rabbi Il'ai say: It was decreed in Usha that one who gives liberally to charity should not give more than a fifth of his wealth (*for then, he will be forced to beg for support himself*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is applicable only during a man's lifetime, since he might thereby be impoverished, but after death, we have no need to be concerned for this. (67b3 – 67b5)

The *Gemora* records a related incident: Rabbi Abba used to bundle money in his scarf and sling it behind his back allowing the poor people to take from it. [They would know who was giving, but he would not know who was taking.] He would, however, slant his eyes behind him (so he can guard the money) from swindlers. (67b5)

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Who Needs the Horse?***

There once was an incident, where a certain Rebbe came to visit the Kotzker Rebbe. The Kotzker Rebbe gave him tremendous honor, and arranged for him a lavish feast. His disciples were astonished, for they knew that the Kotzker Rebbe did not hold this other individual in such high esteem.

The Kotzker explained: The *Gemora* states: You are commanded to support a poor person, but you are not commanded to make him rich. You must provide for him a horse to ride on and a servant to run before him.

Now, it is understandable, the Rebbe said, that a person might need a horse to ride on, for perhaps, he is weak or ill, but what is the necessity in having a servant running before the horse? That is silly!

It is therefore evident, the Rebbe concluded, that one is obligated to provide even foolish things for a fool. This guest, although he might not be worthy of the honor we bestowed upon him, it is obvious that this is the manner in which he wishes to be treated. It is therefore our obligation to honor him.