



שבת קודש פרשת ויגש | מסכת כתובות דף ט״ז

לע״נ בילה שרה בת אפרים הכהן

INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS

Follow the Majority

כל קבוע כמחצה על מחצה דמי

he משנה says that if a woman says she that when she got married she was a and deserves 200 and the husband says she was an אלמנה and she is only entitled to 100, we believe the husband if there are no עדים. The גמרא says this must be against Γ''_{κ} because Γ''_{κ} would say that the wife is believed. explains that this is because the woman has a חזקת הגוף which supports her claim. Later the גמרא asks that even according to רוב why we don't believe the wife based on רוב since ד"ה כיון in תוספות says that this question must only be against מוציא ממון ע"י רוב who holds you can be מוציא ממון ע"י הוב, but according to שמואל whom we pasken like one could not be מוציא ממון based on רוב alone. The בעל המאור disagrees and says that the אמרא's question is even according to שמואל since in addition to the רוב to back up her claim, and רוב וחזקה is enough to be מלחמות הרמב"ן. The מלחמות in מלחמות makes a critical point about this. The מלחמות takes issue with the premise of both the רש"י mentioned earlier and the בעל המאור that there is a relevant חזקת here. He says that a חזקה that works is a חזקת that most women are not מזנה. However, the issue here is not whether she was מזנה or even if she was a בעולה. The issue is only if she had been a נשואה to anyone prior to her marriage. After all, even a בתולה שנישאת ולא נבעלה who gets divorced and is still a בתולה only gets a חזקה of 100 when she remarries. So her חזקת הגוף is not relevant, and there is no כתובה that a woman doesn't marry. In fact, women are expected to marry. So there is no חזקה to speak of here. The פני יהושע asks that what the רמב״ן said can't possibly be true because if it were then why did the גמרא suggest that our משנה wasn't like ר"ג According to the there is no חזקת הגוף in our משנה and רמב"ן only believed a woman because of her understood גמרא the רמב"ן here answers that according to the חתם סופר the גמרא understood in it's question that if מוציא ממון held that a ברי וחזקה is enough to be מוציא ממון then certainly a should be enough since רובא עדיף, to which the גמרא answers that is different כרי וכרי

PARSHA CONNECTION

STORIES Gladdening OFF THE DAF Gladdening and Groom

״כיצד מרקדים לפני הכלה...״

av Yosef Chaim Sonnenfeld, zt"l, was known to truly cherish the great mitzvah of making a chosson and kallah happy at their simchah. Whenever he would attend any wedding, he would always make sure to sing and dance a great deal with a lot of enthusiasm and vitality.

When the Rav grew older, even though he could no longer dance as he used to, he would still tell others to dance. He would stir up the dancers so that their rejoicing would be the way it ought to-so that it could gladden the hearts of the new couple. Rav Yosef Chaim would always say, "In Kesuvos 16b the Gemara asks: keitzad merakdin lifnei hakallah? This is generally translated as, 'How does one dance before the bride?' But the word merakdin doesn't only mean to dance. The proper word for dance would be rokdin. The word merakdin actually means to cause others to dance. This is why I am so careful to make sure that the dancing is up to par even though I myself am no longer capable of dancing much. I thus fulfill the mitzvah of being meraked, of being mesameach, of bringing joy, to the chosson and kallah!"

Once, the Sar Shalom of Belz, zt"l, commented on this avodah. "The Gemara asks: מרקדים לפני הכלה how should one dance before the bride? If you look, you'll find that the first letter of each of these words spells HaMelech. This teaches us that a person can dance before the kallah with the same attitude and the same devotion to Hashem as experienced by the chazzan as he intones HaMelech during the Yomim Noraim!"

HALACHA Look at the Kallah? HIGHLIGHT

אם יש עדים שיצתה בהינומא

If there are witnesses that she went without a veil vnei Miluim¹ cites the Maharit who related that one time there was a wedding, and since the bride's face was covered, the witnesses did not see her. The Maharit's father ruled that the kiddushin was not valid since the witnesses could not identify the bride and therefore required the couple to perform another kiddushin. Avnei Miluim, as well as Pischei Teshuva², disagreed with this conclusion and maintain that it is not necessary for the witnesses to see the bride since there is a presumption (חזקה) that the bride is the one who is accepting the kiddushin. Teshuvas Chessed L'Avrohom³ agreed, in theory, with Avnei Miluim but wrote that since nowadays the presumption is based on the testimony of women, who do not have credibility in this matter, there is no legal presumption to rely upon. Therefore, he writes that the witnesses should look at the bride's face sometime before the kiddushin

Teshuvas Beis Shlomo⁴ also addressed a rov who. based on Maharit, ruled that the witnesses should look at the bride's face before the kiddushin to be able to testify who accepted the kiddushin. Beis Shlomo criticized this ruling in very sharp terms and wrote that one should not deviate from the ruling of Rema⁵ who wrote that the custom is to cover the face of the bride. The Mishneh Halachos⁶ also wrote that the custom is for the bride's face to remain covered. Furthermore, if witnesses do look at the bride's face perhaps they should be disqualified from serving as witnesses for violating the prohibition against gazing at women.

On the other hand, Rav Moshe Shternbuch⁷ writes that the Brisker Rov, insisted that the witnesses look at the bride's face before the kiddushin and he writes that the custom is to look at the bride before the veil is pulled down over her face.

- 1. אבני מילואים סי׳ ל״א סק״ד
- 2. פת״ש שם סק״ה
- 3. שו״ת חסד לאברהם מהדו״ק אה״ע סי כ׳ 4. שו״ת בית שלמה אה״ע סי׳ ט׳
 - נ. רמ״א אה״ע סי׳ ל״א סע׳ ב׳.

 - 6. שו״ת משנה הלכות חי״ד סי׳ ל״ד 7. שו״ח חשורוח והוהגוח ח״ד סי׳ רף״ז

MUSSAR **More Than** FROM THE DAF Words

תנו רבנן: כיצד מרקדין לפני הבלה

he Gemara asks how one should dance in front of Kallah. It then brings the machlokes of Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel concerning how far one can go in praising the Kallah.

Shouldn't the Gemara have asked "how does one praise the Kallah?" since based on their responses that appear to be the question that Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel address?

In 1971, Professor Albert Mehrabian, a Professor of Psychology at UCLA did a study and concluded that in any conversation 7% of the information was gleaned from the word itself, whereas 93% of the information was nonverbal. That nonverbal component included body language 55% and tone of voice 38%.

When we speak to others, we are giving off all kinds of messages from our nonverbal communication.

Perhaps that is the pshat in our Gemara. Bais Hillel and Bais Shammi were discussing how important nonverbal communication is when one is dancing in front of the Kallah. It is a very sensitive time and therefore, one has to be careful regarding the message of one's body language.

When we welcome our kids home or are listening to a loved one, they are subconsciously picking up on our body language. If our whole body (eyes, tone of voice, body, etc) is giving off the impression that we care about them and what they say, we will successfully be able to build our most important relationships.

POINT TO PONDER

writes that we do not say that a woman has a רש"י ד"ה הבעל מהימן אזקת of being a חזקת הגוף due to her חזקת. Since the debate is over the amount of her כתובה, how can the חזקת הגוף help her? Even if she was still a מנה when she got married, her כתובה may be only a מנה if she was a גרושה מן האירוסין. The husband is not saying that she wasn't a בתולה, he is just saying that she was a אלמנה.

Response to last week's Point to Ponder:

Why can't we assume that the child of a pregnant woman whose father is unknown is ספק ספיקא because of a ספק ספיקא? Did he go her which would render the child רוב כשרים, and even if she went to him warranting the קבוע f ספק, there is still ספק if the father was פסול or כשר.

The קידושין דף עג in ריטב״א assume that this would be a ספק ספיקא and the only time when we would not rely on it would be if we knew for sure that she went to him. However, the שב שמעתתא ד' כג writes that since there is only one ספק, about who was with her, it is not considered a ספק ספיקא.

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Yitzchok Gutterman, please visit our website, dafaweek.org, or download the app To share an insight from your Chabura please email info@dafaweek.org

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at info@dafaweek.org or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100 Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center