

## **POINTS TO PONDER**

- 1. מעשה ידיה writes that מעשה ידיה which was instituted נגד מזונות the יורשים get as well. What is מציאה adding/explaining? מציאה is unrelated to מזונות.
- 2. The גמרא says that all the מלאכות that a wife does for her husband a אלמנה does for the יורשים. Is the גמרא suggesting that she should do all except for the more personal ones, or is the main point only that she shouldn't do the personal ones, but she doesn't have to do any for them?
- 3. The אלמנה says that a מזונות for 2 or 3 years after her husband died, loses her מזונות. She only loses the מזונות for the past but not for the future. Why would there be a difference? If not asking is considered forfeiture.
- 4. The אמרא asks who needs to bring a אלמנה that a אלמנה received מזונות if she claims that she didn't get any. The גמרא suggests that maybe the assets are in "her possession". How can they possibly be in her possession? The יורשים inheritance of the assets obviously means that they own them just like their father owned them. Would there be such a discussion regarding a husband paying his wife מזונות?
- 5. The מדונות which says that a lady should write these assets I sold for מדונות and these I sold for my גמרא. The גמרא than suggests that this is a עצה טובה. If it's meant to help her avoid being perceived as a רעבתנית why did the בריתא combine selling for and the מדונות, it should just say if she sells for her כתובה write it, so that people shouldn't assume that it was all for מדונות?

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 <a href="mailto:Ygrunhaus@gmail.com">Ygrunhaus@gmail.com</a>