

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The intention of the rebellious wife (cont.)

The Gemara concludes the second version of the incident involving the rebellious wife.

A final ruling pertaining to the rebellious wife's right to worn out clothing and when the גט will be given is presented.

### 2) Rebelliousness

Shmuel is cited as ruling that documentation is drawn up against an ארוסה who is rebellious, but not against a yevama.

This ruling is challenged.

One resolution is suggested but subsequently rejected.

Another resolution is offered but also rejected.

A final resolution is suggested and accepted.

### 3) Adjustments to the kesubah resulting from rebellion

The Gemara defines the value of a טרפיקא.

A Baraisa supports this definition.

Shmuel explains why a penalty is assessed against the wife for Shabbos when she is rebellious, but she is not credited for Shabbos when he is rebellious.

Shmuel explains why the wife pays more for her rebelliousness than a husband.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah elaborates on the various financial responsibilities a husband has towards his wife.

### 5) Identifying the author of the Mishnah

It is noted that the Mishnah that rules that the wife must be given two kav of wheat a week follows neither R' Yochanan ben Beroka or R' Shimon.

A suggestion is made to explain how the Mishnah is consistent with R' Yochanan ben Beroka.

The suggestion is rejected and an alternative suggestion is offered.

What appears to be a contradiction between two statements of R' Chisda is resolved and the Gemara explains how to reconcile our Mishnah with different Tannaim.

### 6) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Mishnah's ruling concerning barley is clarified.

It is noted that the Mishnah did not make an allowance for the wife to receive wine. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How long is a rebellious wife give before granting her a גט?

2. Is a spouse's rebelliousness calculated daily or weekly?

3. Why is there a discrepancy between males and females regarding the amount a rebellious spouse must pay?

4. Does every woman receive twice as much barley as wheat?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Various sizes of a loaf in halacha

רבי שמעון אומר שתי ידות לככר משלש ככרות לקב. חציה לבית המנוגע

When someone enters a house which is plagued with tzara'as, he becomes tamei immediately. His clothing, however, does not become tamei (to require immersion in a mikveh) until he carries in the house the amount of time necessary to eat half of a loaf of bread (כדי אכילת פרס). The loaf which is referred to in this measurement is a loaf made of wheat flour, and the size of the loaf is as prescribed in our Gemara.

According to Rabbi Yochanan ben Beroka, the size of a full loaf is comprised of one half of a kav of wheat. A meal, therefore, which is half of this loaf, would contain the volume of one quarter kav of wheat. Rabbi Shimon holds that two meals can be eaten from two-thirds of a loaf when three loaves can be made from one kav. The size of a single loaf is one-third of a kav, and one-third of that, which is necessary for one meal, is one-ninth of a kav. The time framework to become tamei upon entering a house which is afflicted with tzara'as is the time it takes to eat one half of a loaf. According to Rabbi Yochanan this is the volume of one quarter of a kav of wheat, and according to Rabbi Shimon it is one-sixth of a kav (half of a third of a kav).

Rashi notes that according to Rabbi Shimon we said earlier, in reference to eiruv, that a single loaf can provide enough for three meals (each meal is therefore one ninth of a kav). Yet, here we calculate that the time framework for becoming tamei in an afflicted house is based upon assuming that there are two meals in a loaf (each meal is one sixth of a kav). How can this be resolved?

Rashi explains that a loaf is large enough for two average meals. We are lenient in regards to eiruv, and we break the loaf into three parts, even if it suffices just minimally for a meal, as each meal would be a smaller volume than we calculate for the afflicted house. It turns out, according to Rashi, that the loaf given by a husband to his wife for a meal is a minimal amount, as we find that the Gemara compares the meal of eiruv to that given by the husband for his wife.

Rashi adds that the amount of time calculated for a meal in regards to birkas hamazon is equal to half a loaf. This means that from the beginning of the time a person eats until he finishes is within the time one eats half a loaf, this consumption will join to be included in the birkas hamazon, as this is a full meal. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Are women prohibited from gazing at men?

מה בין מורד למורדת? ... מי שוכר את מי...

What is the difference between [a husband who] rebels and [a wife who] rebels? ...

Rav Yechiel Michel Epstein<sup>1</sup>, the Aruch Hashulchan, expresses uncertainty whether a woman is permitted to recite Krias Shema in the presence of a tefach of an uncovered man. Do we say that just like there is a restriction for a man to recite Krias Shema in the presence of a tefach of a woman uncovered so too there is a parallel restriction against women, or perhaps the restriction only applies to men who have a greater tendency towards improper thoughts. The second approach seems more reasonable for two reasons. First of all, this restriction is not found in the Poskim and secondly, our Gemara seems to indicate that woman do not have improper thoughts about men.

Rav Yekusial Yehudah Halberstam<sup>2</sup>, the Klausenberger Rebbe, cautions against misunderstanding our Gemara. What the Gemara intends to convey is that women do not have a tendency towards improper thoughts, thus we do not find Shulchan Aruch warning women, for example, to avoid looking at the garments of men the same way that men are warned against gazing at the garments of women. It is clear, however, that women also have a yetzer hara and such improper thoughts are not permitted. Evidence to this posi-

tion can be found in the Sefer Hachinuch<sup>3</sup> in his discussion of the prohibition against drawing near to one of the עריות. Sefer Chinuch mentions, amongst other restrictions, that men are not permitted to gaze at women. He then proceeds to write that this prohibition applies to men and women alike. This clearly points to the conclusion that women are prohibited to have improper thoughts about men.

Rav Yoel Teitlebaum<sup>4</sup>, the Satmar Rav, on the other hand, maintains that there is no prohibition against women gazing at men and therefore, we find that shuls were constructed in a way that allows the women to see the men. Rav Betzalel Stern<sup>5</sup>, the B'Tzeil Hachochmah, cites as proof to this position the ruling of Shmuel<sup>6</sup> that a man may not wish Shalom to a woman (אין שואלין בשלום אשה). He notes that the restriction is only for a man to initiate the conversation, but it is permitted for a man to respond Shalom to a woman who initiated. The fact that a woman is not restricted against initiating a wish of Shalom to a man indicates that these types of restrictions do not apply to women.

1. ערוה"ש או"ח סי' ע"ה סעי' ה'.
2. שו"ת דברי יציב אה"ע סי' ל"ה.
3. ספר החינוך מצוה קפ"ח.
4. שו"ת דברי יואל סי' י"א אות ח'.
5. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ה סי' מ"ח.
6. גמ' קידושין ע: ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Shabbos Lottery

"מיחזי כשכר שבת..."

A man once purchased a lottery ticket and won. Although winnings consisted of a sizable sum, the man wondered if he had a possible halachic problem on his hands as the drawing had taken place on Shabbos. Rav Shmuel Chaim Sofer, zt"l, thought the issue was worth researching, and he asked his father, Rav Shimon Sofer, zt"l: "Since the drawing had been on Shabbos, perhaps this is similar to the case in Kesuvos 64a that if a husband

is recalcitrant and uncooperative in fulfilling his obligations toward his wife, the halachah is to add to her kesuvah for every day that he refuses to fulfill comply. We do not add to her kesuvah for Shabbos, however, since this appears to be שכר שבת, money earned for services provided on Shabbos. Perhaps here too, we should prohibit the gains won on Shabbos."

His father did not wish to prohibit the winnings, although he also did not state outright that this was permitted. "What is clear to me is that if one's own cow gives birth on Shabbos there is no problem of שכר שבת, since this isn't even remotely comparable to business, the reason behind the prohibi-

tion. There aren't even two parties involved!"

The editor of the Tal Talpios, zt"l, brings the above exchange but concludes unequivocally that money won in a lottery drawn on Shabbos is permitted. He brings many proofs for this.

The proof from our daf is surely not conclusive. In our Gemara, the mistreated woman is being paid a fine by the husband for his transgression of עונתה לא תגרע. In the case of the lottery, the man won money because his ticket was the correct number. The fact that the drawing happened to be on Shabbos is not comparable to payment for services rendered or withheld on Shabbos! ■

