

POINTS TO PONDER

- The גמרא says that a עני בן טובים who is embarrassed, causes shame for the whole family. עוספות writes that this is because they should have watched him. Why isn't the fact that they do not support him financially an embarrassment for the family?
- With regards to one's wife the גמרא says אשתו כגופו. Does the גמרא mean that it's as if he was directly embarrassed when his wife was injured, meaning that her shame also his shame, or does it mean that he has "rights" to the money because they are one unit.
- 3. The משנה writes that if someone committed to give his son-in-law money, and the son-in-law dies, he doesn't have to give same to his brother, who is now the בם. The משנה says יכול יכול יכול meaning he can say that he only agreed to give one brother the money and not the other. Why does the משנה use the terminology, "he could say" instead of just saying, that he is not obligated to give the ביבו?
- 4. אבל אחיו או יתן או תשב עד שילבין ראשה writes אבל אחיו או יתן או תשב עד שילבין או this sentence?
- 5. The daughter of רבן יוחנן בן זכאי that her father's money was gone because he didn't give enough צדקה. If this reason was acceptable to רבן יוחנן בן זכאי, why did he say that because כלל ישראל didn't do "רצנו של מקום" they are now subjected to a lowly nation? Based on what she said this was an individual punishment for her father, which is unrelated to the לכל.

לע"נ אבי מורי הרב יעקב בן ר׳ קיים משה יצחק ז"ל ע״נ הרב צבי ליפא בן יחיאל ישראל זצ״ל

If you have any comments or suggestions, please email Rabbi Grunhaus at <u>Ygrunhaus@gmail.com</u>

לימוד מסכת כתובות מוקדש : לע״נ ר׳ חיים יהודה ב״ר אליעזר ז״ל וא MEMORY OF MR. HERBY STAVSKY