

A

בס"ד

Intro

Today we will בע"ה learn דף קל"א of דף כבא בתרא מסכת בבא בתרא of the topics we will learn about include.

A continuation of רבי יוחנן בן יוחנן 's opinion regarding האומר איש פלוני יירשני במקום שיש בת

בתי תירשני במקום שיש בן

If a שכיב מרע, a dying person, assigned all his assets to a distant relative as an inheritance and excluded the closer relative, such as the assets should go only to his brother and not to his daughter, or only to his daughter and not to his son:

רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה says אם אמר על מי שראוי ליורשו

דבריו קיימין

If he assigned the assets to an eligible heir, the צוואה is effective.

The question of בבריא היאך

What would the Halachah be regarding a healthy person who assigned his assets to an eligible heir?

כתובת בנין דכרין

If a person's wife dies before her husband, he inherits all her assets and her Kesubah. When he subsequently dies, the Chachamim initiated that the sons of each wife inherit their mother's assets and כתובה, and it is not be divided equally among all his children.

הכותב כל נכסיו לאשתו לא עשאה אלא אפוטרופא

If a dying person assigned all his assets to his wife, she becomes the manager of the estate, but she does not receive these assets, because there is an assumption that a person would not exclude his children from their inheritance. Therefore we must say

לא נתכוין אלא לעשותה אפוטרופא

כדי שיחלקו לה בניו כבוד

His intention was merely to appoint his wife to manage the estate, so that his sons will fulfill their obligation and give her proper respect.

All agree regarding

אשתו ארוסה

ואשתו גרושה

במתנה

If he assigned his assets to a wife who was only engaged to him but not yet married, or to his divorcee, she receives all the assets, and does not become an אפוטרופוס.

The Machlokes regarding

בת אצל הבנים

If he wrote all his assets to his daughter and excluded his sons from their מתנה or she merely becomes a אפוטרופוס?











So let's review ...

The Gemara in the previous Daf discussed רבי יוחנן בן 's opinion regarding's

האומר איש פלוני יירשני במקום שיש בת

בתי תירשני במקום שיש בן

If a שכיב מרע, a dying person, assigned all his assets to a distant relative as an inheritance but excluded the closer relative, such as the assets should go only to his brother and not to his daughter, or only to his daughter and not to his son:

רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה says אם אמר על מי שראוי ליורשו

דבריו קיימין

If he assigned the assets to an eligible heir, the צוואה is effective, because the Pasuk states

והיה ביום הנחילו את בניו

The word הנחילו implies that the father has the authority over inheritance, and this teaches

התורה נתנה רשות לאב להנחיל לכל מי שירצה

The father has the right to bequeath his assets to any heir of his choice.

The Gemara inquires

בעי רבא

בבריא היאך

What would the Halachah be regarding a healthy person who assigned his assets to an eligible heir?

Do we say

כי קאמר רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה

בשכיב מרע

דבר אורותי הוא

אבל בבריא לא

Perhaps this Halachah applies only to a dying person, because since the ירושה is imminent, this can be considered ביום הנחילו.

However, this Halachah does not apply to a healthy person, because since the ירושה is not imminent, this cannot be considered ביום הנחילו.

OR

Dedicated By: _

אפילו בבריא נמי

This Halachah applies even to a healthy person.



האומר איש פלוני יירשני במקום שיש בת בתי תירשני במקום שיש בן

If a שכיב מרע assigned all his assets to a distant relative as an inheritance but excluded the closer relative

ובי יוחןן בן ברוקפ

אם אמר על מי שראוי ליורשו דבריו קיימין

If he assigned the assets to an eligible heir, the צוואה is effective,

והיה ביום הצוזיכו את בציו

The father has the authority over inheritance בחורב נחקב רלוח אגב אדקוחיא אבא אקי לינצב



KAT YA

בבריא היאך

What would the Halachah be regarding a healthy person who assigned his assets to an eligible heir?

Do we say

ני קאמר ובי יוחנן בן ברוקה

בשכיב מרע – דבר אורותי הוא אבל בבריא לא

Perhaps this Halachah applies only to a dying person, because since the ירושה

is imminent, this can be considered ביום הבחילו

However, this Halachah does not apply to a healthy person, because since the ירושה is not imminent, this cannot be considered ביום הכחילו.



This Halachah applies even to a healthy person.







The Gemara brings proof that this Halachah applies even to a דרים from a Braisa regarding

כתובת בנין דכרין

If a person's wife dies before him, he inherits all her assets and her Kesubah. When he subsequently dies, the Chachamim initiated that the sons of each wife inherit their mother's assets and כתובה, and it is not divided equally among all his children.

The Braisa states תא שמע דאמר לו רבי נתן לרבי שניתם משנתכם כרבי יוחנן בן ברוקה רבי נתן

Your ruling in the Mishnah in מסכת כתובות regarding בנין concurs only with רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה. The Mishnah there states

לא כתב לה בנין דיכרין וכו' חייב שתנאי ב"ד הוא

If the husband did not write the clause of בנין דכרין into the Kesubah, this stipulation is still in effect and the sons receive their mother's Kesubah, because it is an obligation imposed by the Chachamim upon all.

אפילו בבריא נמי

This Halachah applies even to a healthy person.

כתובת בנין דכרין

If a person's wife dies before him, he inherits all her assets and her Kesubah.

When he subsequently dies, the Chachamim initiated that the sons of each wife inherit their mother's assets and כתובה, and it is not divided equally among all his children.

YNE KD

דאמר לו רבי נתן לרבי שניתם משנתכם כרבי יוחנן בן ברוקה

רבי נתן said to רבי נתן Your ruling regarding בנין דכרין concurs only with רבי יותנן בן ברוקה.

The Mishnah there states

לא כתב לה בנין דיכרין... אינון ירתון כסף כתובתיך... חייב

שתנאי ב"ד הוא

If the husband did not write the clause of בכין דכרין into the Kesubah, this stipulation is still in effect and the sons receive their mother's Kesubah, because it is an obligation imposed by the Chachamim upon all.



Dedicated By: _







As the Gemara explains, רב נתן holds ירתון תנן

The Kesubah wording for this clause is ירתון, an inheritance, in which the sons of the wife with the larger Kesubah receive a larger inheritance than the sons of the wife with the smaller Kesubah.

Now, this stipulation can take effect only according to רבי איוחנן בן ברוקה, because he holds a father has the authority to give one son a larger ירושה than another.

However, this stipulation cannot take effect according to the ארכמים, because

שהתנה על מה שכתוב בתורה

This stipulation contradicts the Hilchos ירושה in the Torah that the inheritance must be divided equally among all sons.

The above discussion proves that ברי יוחנן בן ברו יוחנן בן בריי יוחנן בן בריי יוחנן בן בריי because he compares בריי יוחנן בן ברוקה to the Halachah of רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה, and since בנין דכרין is part of the Kesubah at the time of the marriages when he is usually in good health, it must be that the Halachah of רבי יוחנן בן בריקה applies even to a בריא.



The Kesubah wording for this clause is ירתון, an inheritance, in which the sons of the wife with the larger Kesubah receive a larger inheritance than the sons of the wife with the smaller Kesubah.

This stipulation can take effect only according to רבי יותכן בן ברוקה, because he holds a father has the authority to give one son a larger ירושה than another.

However, this stipulation cannot take effect according to the חכמים, because

שהתנה על מה שכתוב בתורה

it contradicts the Hilchos ירושה in the Torah that the inheritance must be divided equally among all sons.

The above discussion
proves that רבי יותנן בן ברוקה's Halachah applies
even to a כתובת בנין דכרין
to the Halachah of רבי יותנן בן ברוקה,

and since בנין דכרין is part of the Kesubah at the time of the marriages when he is in good health, it must be that the Halachah of רבי יותנן בן ברוקה applies even to a בריא.







The Gemara proceeds with two other explanations of the Mishnah in כתובת בנין דכרין and the Halachah of כתובת בנין דכרין's opinion.

רבי answered רבי יסבון תנן

The Kesubah wording for this clause is יסבון, a gift, and is considered a מתובת בנין דכרין, a gift, and מתובת בנין דכרין seconsidered a חנאי while he is alive, not an inheritance after he dies. Therefore, this חנאי does not contradict the Torah, because it takes effect before he dies.

רבי however rejected this explanation, because דקיימא לן בנין דכרין לא טרפא ממשעבדי

בנין דכרין cannot be extracted from properties that the father sold to others after the Kesubah was written, and this can only be true if

ירתון תנן

This feature is considered a ירושה and since it takes effect only after he dies, it cannot be collected from משועבדים; But this cannot be true if יסבון תנו

That this feature is considered a מתנה, because since this takes effect immediately, this can be collected even from משועבדים.

The Halachah of כתובת בנין דכרין can concur even with the

דאמר לו רבי נתן לרבי שניתם משנתכם כרבי יוחנן בן ברוקה

רבי נתן said to רבי נתן Your ruling regarding בנין דכרין concurs only with רבי יותנן בן ברוקה.

רבי נתן answered רבי

אינון <u>יסבון</u> כסף כתובתיך... תנו

The Kesubah wording for this clause is "תכנון", a gift, and מתכה is considered a כתובת בנין דכרין while he is alive, not an inheritance after he dies. Therefore, this תנאי does not contradict the Torah, because it takes effect before he dies.

However רבי himself rejected this explanation...

דקיימא לן בנין דכרין לא טרפא ממשעבדי

בנין דכרין cannot be extracted from properties that the father sold to others after the Kesubah was written.

This can only be true if

ירתון תכן

This feature is considered a ירושה and since it takes effect only after he dies, it cannot be collected from משועבדים; But this cannot be true if

יסבון תנן

That this feature is considered a מתנה since this takes effect immediately, this can be collected even from משועבדים.







אב"י says even if we assume that the wording for בנין דכרין IS הירושה , the חכמים would agree that it takes effect, because the Kesubah mentions both, sons who receive דרושה; and המזונות, the unmarried daughters who are not eligible for ירושה will receive support from the father's estate;

And since מזונות is definitely a מתנה; הוה לזה במתנה ולזה בירושה

We apply the Halachah of the previous Mishnah on $\eta \tau$ קכ"ט that states

כתב בין בתחלה בין באמצע בין בסוף משום מתנה דבריו קיימין If a person wrote a will for ירושה with different amounts and he also added the word מתנה either in the beginning, the middle or at the end, his מתנה is effective, because as Rashi in מסכת יבמות explains

דמדאדכר לשון מתנה בהאי שטר צוואה לחד מינייהו כולהו נמי מתנה נינהו

Since the word מתנה was used in this אואה, it applies to all the people and fields that are mentioned in the same צוואה. Therefore, even though the clause of בנין דכרין reads ירתון, it is also a מתנה, and it can take effect.

=======



"AK"

Even if we assume that the wording for ירושהם IS בכין דכרין To use if we בכין דכרין would agree that it takes effect,
because the Kesubah mentions both,

מזונות

Unmarried daughters who are not eligible for ירושה will receive support from the father's estate בנין דכרין

Sons who receive ירושה

And since מתנה is definitely a מתנה;

הוה לזה במתנה ולזה בירושה

We apply the Halachah of the previous Mishnah that states

כתב בין בתחלה בין באמצע בין בסוף משום מתנה - דבריו קיימין

If a person wrote a will for ירושה with different amounts and he also added the word מתנה either in the beginning, the middle or at the end, his מתנה is effective,

because as Rashi in אסכת explains דמדאדכר לשון מתנה בהאי שטר לוואה לחד מינייהו כולהו נמי מתנה נינהו

Since the word אונגע was used in this אנגוא, t applies to all the people and fields that are mentioned

Therefore, even though the clause of בכין דכרין reads ירתון, it is also a מתנה, and it can take effect.



Dedicated By: __







The Gemara continues:

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל הכותב כל נכסיו לאשתו לא עשאה אלא אפוטרופא

If a dying person assigned all his assets to his wife, she becomes the manager of the estate, but she does not receive these assets, because as the Rashbam explains אומד הדעת הוא

דאין אדם מניח את בניו ונותן הכל לאשתו

There is an assumption that a person would not exclude his children from their inheritance. Therefore we must say לא נתכוין אלא לעשותה אפוטרופא

כדי שיחלקו לה בניו כבוד

His intention was merely to appoint his wife to manage the estate, so that his sons will fulfill their obligations and give her proper respect.









The Gemara continues with several other applications of this Halachah:

1.

פשיטא בנו הגדול

לא עשאו אלא אפוטרופוס

If he assigned all his assets to his oldest son, the same is true; the son becomes a אפוטרופוס but he does not inherit all the assets, because ®

רוצה הוא שיחלקו לו אחיו כבוד

שהרי חייבין בכבודו

The father wants his sons to give respect to their oldest brother.

2.

And even regarding בנו קטן המוטל בעריסה לא עשאו אלא אפוטרופוס

If he assigned all his assets to his youngest son lying in the cradle, he becomes an אפוטרופוס but he does not inherit all the assets, because

רוצה הוא בכבודו

3.

Regarding

אחר

במתנה

If a person assigned all his assets to a complete stranger he receives all the assets, and does not become an אפוטרופוס, because ®

לכבודו לא חייש

Dedicated By: ___

The father is not concerned for his honor, and if his intention was that he becomes an אפוטרופוס, he should have specified so.

7

Several applications of this Halachah



פשיטא בנו הגדול לא עשאו אלא אפוטרופוס

If he assigned all his assets to his oldest son, the same is true - the son becomes a אפוטרופוס but he does not inherit all the assets,

because

רוצה הוא שיחלקו לו אחיו כבוד שהרי חייבין בכבודו

The father wants his sons to give respect



בנו קטן המוטל בעריסה לא עשאו אלא אפוטרופוס

If he assigned all his assets to his youngest son lying in the cradle, he becomes an אפוטרופוס but he does not inherit all the assets,

because

רולה הוא בכבודו



אחר במתנה

If a person assigned all his assets to a complete stranger he receives all the assets, and does not become an אפוטרופום,

because

לכבודו לא חייש

The father is not concerned for his honor, and if his intention was that he becomes an aboliok, he should have specified so.







8 4.

אשתו ארוסה ואשתו גרושה

במתנה

If he assigned his assets to a wife who was only engaged to him but not yet married, or to his divorcee, she acquires all the assets, and does not become an אפוטרופוס, because כיון דלא גייס בהו

לא חשש בכבודן

Since they are not intimate, he is not concerned for her honor.

======



אשתו ארוסה ואשתו גרושה במתנה

If he assigned his assets to a wife who was only engaged to him, or to his divorcee, she acquires all the assets, and does not become an אפוטרופוס,

because

כיון דלא גיים בהו לא חשש בכבודן

Since they are not intimate, he is not concerned for her honor.

9 .

The Gemara inquires about the following:

1.

איבעיא להו

בת אצל הבנים מהו

What is the Halachah if he wrote all his assets to his daughter and excluded his sons from their ירושה? Is this considered a מתנה, because

A father is not concerned for his daughter's honor. OR

She becomes an אפוטרופוס, because חש לכבודה

A father IS concerned for his daughter's honor; As when the assets are not sufficient for both the daughter's מוונות and the son's, the daughter gets all the assets for מוונות to maintain her honor.

2.

אשה אצל בני הבעל מהו

What is the Halachah if he wrote all his assets to his wife, and excluded his sons from a different wife?
Is this considered a החנה, because their obligation to respect her is secondary, and לא חש לכבודה

OR

Dedicated By: ___

She becomes an אפוטרופוס, because חש לכבודה

?

בת אצל הבנים מהו

What if he wrote all his assets to his daughter and excluded his sons from their ירושה?

She becomes an אפוטרופוס, because

חש לכבודה

A father
IS concerned for his
daughter's honor.

Is this considered a מתנה, because

לא תש לכבודה

A father is not concerned for his daughter's honor.

As when the assets are not sufficient for both the daughter's מזונות and the son's מדונות, the daughter gets all the assets for מדונות to maintain her honor.



אשה אצל בני הבעל מהו

If he wrote all his assets to his wife, and excluded his sons from a different wife?

She becomes an אפוטרופוס, because

Is this considered a מתנה, because

לא תש לכבודה תש לכבודה

because their obligation to respect her is secondary







3.

אשה אצל האחים מהו

If he had no sons or father, and he wrote all his assets to his wife, and excluded his brothers from their ירושה; Is this considered a מתנה, because they have no obligation to give her respect; therefore

לא חש לכבודה

OR

She becomes an אפוטרופוס, because אשתו כגופו, he wants everyone to give his wife respect as they would for him; therefore

חש לכבודה

רבינא משמיה דרבא says בכולהו לא קנה בכולהו לא קנה In all these cases, she becomes an אפוטרופוס and does not acquire the assets, aside for אשתו ארוסה ואשתו גרושה And accordingly בת אצל הבנים לא קנה

While בכולהו קני says בכולהו קני בכולהו קני בכולהו קו In all these cases, she acquires the assets and does not become an אפוטרופוס, aside for האשה אצל האחין האשה אצל בני הבעל בני הבעל And accordingly בת אצל הבנים בת אצל הבנים

This discussion continues in the next Daf.





